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<td>LGA</td>
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</tr>
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<td>LNRS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>Local Strategic Partnership</td>
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<tr>
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<td>MSP</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>MTO</td>
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<td>NDO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIS</td>
<td>New Enterprise Incentive Scheme</td>
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<tr>
<td>NIP</td>
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<tr>
<td>NJI</td>
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<tr>
<td>NN</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRA</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Renewal Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRS</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTC</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Technology Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWSC</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Work Support Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoH</td>
<td>Office of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA</td>
<td>Public Housing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHCC</td>
<td>Public Housing Customer Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHDEP</td>
<td>Public Housing Drug Elimination Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID</td>
<td>Project Initiation Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Public Service Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCs/TROs</td>
<td>Public Tenant Councils/Tenant Representative Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTEP</td>
<td>Public Tenant Employment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QHWRA</td>
<td>Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAB</td>
<td>Regional Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAESP</td>
<td>Remote Areas Essential Services Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Residents Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Renewal Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Reach for the Clouds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTRS</td>
<td>Regional Tenant Resource Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHT</td>
<td>SAHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRCSSP</td>
<td>Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV</td>
<td>Sustainable Energy Authority of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>Technical and Further Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANF</td>
<td>Temporary Assistance to Needy Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TasBGAS</td>
<td>Tasmanian Building Group Apprenticeship Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEIS</td>
<td>Tenant Employment Incentive Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP</td>
<td>Tenant Employment Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>Vocational Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WtWV</td>
<td>Welfare to Work Voucher Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAP</td>
<td>Youth Apprenticeship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YP²</td>
<td>Young People-Purpose-Place-Personal Support-Proof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>Young Women’s Christian Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 INTRODUCTION

Raising the rates of economic participation of disadvantaged Australians is an important objective of the Australian government’s welfare reform agenda. In the area of housing this has led to an initial focus on public housing tenants who have very low rates of economic participation. This has led to a new provision within the 2003 Commonwealth State Housing Agreement (CSHA) requiring state governments to reform public housing management in ways that increase the economic participation of public housing tenants. For example, the bilateral agreement between the Commonwealth and Victoria sets out one of the agreed strategic priorities in the CSHA Bilateral Plan July 2003 – June 2008 (p. 9) in the following terms:

The reduction of inherent workforce disincentives that may result from policy settings and the legacy of past decisions within social housing. The Commonwealth has indicated that rental rebate policy that links rent to improved (earned income) is an area for reform…

This deliberate linking of housing assistance with economic participation can be usefully assessed against the background of developments in other industrialised countries where there have been similar declines in levels of economic participation amongst some low income groups. Two countries where this link has been most clearly featured in policy and program development at least back to the mid 1990s are the United States of America (US) and the United Kingdom (UK).

These two countries make good comparators for Australia for three reasons. First, the initiatives in both of these countries, like Australia, largely focus on public housing or social housing areas or estates built during the post-war period. Initially tenants were employed whereas now very large numbers of these tenants are outside or marginal to the labour market. This follows a combination of changes in labour markets, including greater wage inequality, unemployment and precarious employment, and allocation policies that channelled very low income and otherwise disadvantaged people into this housing. In the US, the policy response is broadly referred to as ‘welfare reform’ which seeks to increase labour market participation and reduce ‘welfare dependency’. In the UK, the high level of ‘worklessness’ in deprived areas has become a focus for the development of a number of ‘area based initiatives’ since the mid 1990s. In both countries there has been extensive program development and associated research and evaluation.

Second, they can be compared in terms of the longer history of welfare regime development in each country. Here, following Esping-Anderson (1990, 1999), welfare regimes refer to the ways in which welfare production is allocated between state, market and households. Among all the differences of allocation it is possible to distinguish patterns and ideal types. Esping-Anderson develops a typology with three types: liberal, social democratic and conservative. In this typology a liberal regime has three core elements: social guarantees are restricted to ‘bad risks’; a narrow conception of what risks should be considered ‘social’; substantial state
encouragement of private markets. A social democratic regime is committed to comprehensive risk coverage, generous benefit levels and egalitarianism. The conservative regime is characterised by risk pooling and familialism (Esping-Andersen, 1999:ch5). Using this typology both Australia and the US have liberal welfare regimes. The UK has a welfare regime that sits somewhere between the liberal and the social democratic.

One broad comparative indicator of welfare regime type can be found in the size of social expenditures as shown in Figure 1.1. What this shows is that Australia and the US, both with liberal welfare regimes, have similar size welfare states expressed in terms of social expenditure as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The UK has a considerably larger welfare state. In all three countries the size of the welfare state measured in this way has increased. However, the rate of increase in the UK has been considerably greater than Australia and the US.

**Figure 1.1: Social expenditure, per cent of GDP, 1986-2000**

![Graph showing social expenditure as a percentage of GDP for Australia, United Kingdom, and United States from 1986 to 2000.](image)


More specifically there is the type of housing systems that have developed in each of the three countries. As Hulse (2003) demonstrates, in a comparative discussion of assistance to tenants in rental housing markets, the concept of welfare regime types is useful in understanding developments in housing policy.

Housing policy in the US embodies a limited conception of what risks should be considered 'social' and limited responses. In the post-World War II (WWII) period public housing rapidly became defined as a residual form of provision 'very often being used as an adjunct to the private sector, state assisted urban renewal operations, rehousing the most stigmatised sections of the urban poor' (Harloe, 1995:357). The broader background to this limited public housing provision is that a larger number of low income households find their housing in the private rental market some of whom receive cash assistance. Several aspects of current housing policy characterise the market emphasis of liberal welfare regimes. First, policy development is increasingly requiring public housing tenants to participate in labour
markets. This is nowhere more evident than in the title of recent legislation, the *Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act* 1996, that sets the policy framework for a suite of measures being implemented through the federal agency the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Second, support for low income households is increasingly restricted to demand side income support. In the US there is considerable evidence of the lack of supply of housing affordable by low income households (Andrews, 1998, Nelson et al., 2004, Harloe, 1995). However, policy support for measures able to increase the supply of this housing is absent.

Australian housing policy like the US embodies a narrow conception of risks that should be considered social. Like the US Australia has a small and residualised public housing system accompanied by a larger private rental market with limited income support for a much larger number of low income households (Hulse, 2003). Policy development linking housing assistance to labour market participation is required through a provision in the recent *CSHA*. This provision is the one directing state housing authorities to address the growing labour market disengagement of public tenants. In other words work on linking housing assistance to labour market participation is a relatively new development in Australia. Like the US Australian housing policy is restricted to demand side assistance for low income households. There is considerable evidence of continuing shortages of housing that can be afforded by low income housing (Yates et al., 2004).

The UK, according to Esping-Andersen (1999:87), has a welfare regime that sits somewhere between the liberal and the social democratic, and has perhaps been becoming more liberal since the 1970s as neo liberal ideas and policy became increasingly ascendant. This in-between categorisation is evident in the development of housing policy. In the post WWII period there was a large expansion of state provided housing through local government reaching nearly 30% of households. From the 1970s the proportion of households in this tenure declined because of a cessation of the building program and a large scale privatisation program. Also, the public housing system was further residualised as moderate income households left, often through the sales program, and new tenancies were targeted towards low income and disadvantaged households. Current housing policy maintains this in-between status. On one hand social housing remains at about 20% of households and there is a continuing reinvestment in the stock. However, on the other hand the level of capital investment in the social housing stock is continuing to decline in real terms and there is no sustained effort to invest in new social housing in areas of high demand (Russell et al., 2004). Also like the US and the UK the level of expenditure on demand side benefits, Housing Benefit, has increased (Kemp, 2000).

---

1 The principal difference for Australian households compared to US households is that principal breadwinners have had more secure labour market arrangements because Australia for much of the 20th century included welfare guarantees in labour market arrangements, often referred to as the ‘wage earners welfare state’ (Castles 1985, 1994).
1.1 The Report

It is against this background that the central purpose of this report is to inform the policy debate about how to respond to the high levels of labour market disengagement experienced by public housing tenants. The report has three main aims:

- Describe and compare Australian and overseas housing assistance measures designed to promote economic participation;
- Describe the study designs used in Australian and overseas evaluations of policy initiatives and programs;
- Identify opportunities for the further evaluation of Australian programs and the way in which this might be undertaken.

The report that follows responds to these aims in four sections. They are:

- A description of the nature and level of economic participation of public tenants in Australia through which this report aims to give a little more definition to the ‘problem’ of low levels of economic participation;
- Describe and review Australian, US and UK housing assistance measures designed to promote economic participation using a typology developed along a spectrum of direct to indirect forms of support and intervention that supports comparison and assessment;
- Describe and review the study designs and methods used in research and evaluation of housing assistance measures designed to promote economic participation in Australia, US and UK;
- Discuss future initiatives that could further inform program and policy development work aimed at overcoming the economic disadvantage experienced by low income renters.
2 AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS AND EMPLOYMENT

Large public housing estates in Australia were built after WWII to stimulate the building industry and regional economies and provide housing for workers in the manufacturing industries. Other objectives were to redevelop slum areas, test new building materials and methods of housing production, and test new housing designs and neighbourhood planning concepts (Jones, 1972, Hayward, 1996, Peel, 1995, Dalton, 1988). Public housing estates originally developed to house low-income workers and their nuclear families are no longer as suitable for the needs of present tenants. For example, Hudson (Hudson, 2002) demonstrates for Victoria a mismatch between stock size and location and the demand profile of applicant households. Further, much of the public housing stock is ageing and some of the land on which public housing estates stand have lost their economic value in current market conditions. In some non-metropolitan regional areas where resource industries previously operated but have now shut down this loss of economic value is pronounced (Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000). Nevertheless, public housing continues to increase the level of housing affordability for more than 300,000 public housing tenant households (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2003). Also public housing appears to provide a wider set of benefits to public housing tenant households, including health improvements, greater sense of security and better school outcomes. However, the connection between moving into public housing and improved employment outcomes is less clear (Phibbs and Young, 2005).

This section extends the analysis of the connection between public housing and employment by presenting national aggregate employment trends of public housing tenants who are of working age, that is, aged 15-64. First, we examine trends in employment among working age public housing tenants from 1971 to 2001 using Census data. We then move on to compare the full-time and part-time employment rates of working age public housing tenants with the general working age population between 1981-2001 using the Survey of Income and Housing Costs (SIHC). Third, we examine the extent to which public housing tenants rely on wage or salary as a principal income source between 1981 and 2001, as compared with the general population. The data source we employ is again the SIHC. Finally, we examine the current employment profile of public housing tenants in comparison with another housing assistance group, Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) recipients, using the 2000-01 SIHC.

Figure 2.1 shows the employment rate among working age male public housing tenants between 1971 and 2001. The figure clearly shows a steep fall in employment among male public housing tenants in all states between 1971 and 2001. Overall, the employment rate fell from 85% to 33% (see AUS in Figure 2.1). The most dramatic decline has been in Tasmania, where the employment rate for male public housing tenants fell from 84% to 17% between 1971 and 2001. The smallest decline has been in the Northern Territory, where the employment rate fell from 87% to 52%
between 1971 and 2001. However, this still represents a decline of more than one-third of the employment rate in 1971. For the rest of the states/territories, the employment rate among male public housing tenants fell from over 80% to approximately 35% over the last three decades.

Figure 2.2 shows the employment rate among working age female public housing tenants between 1971 and 2001. There has been a general decline in employment rate among female public housing tenants, though the decline has been somewhat small in comparison with males. Overall, the percentage of female public housing tenants employed fell from 38% to 26% between 1971 and 2001 (see AUS in Figure 2.2). Again, the decline is smallest in the Northern Territory, with the employment falling from 42% to 38% over the three decades, while the decline has been largest in Victoria, with the employment rate falling from 40% to 20%.

While employment levels among males remained higher than females in 2001, overall there appears to be convergence in employment rates among male and female public housing tenants. This is partly due to the decline in manufacturing industries, in which males are more likely to be employed than females, and the expansion of service industries such as retail, in which females are more likely to be employed than males. According to 2001 Census, employed males are more likely to be working in the manufacturing industry than other industries, that is, 16% are employed in the manufacturing industry. In contrast, employed females are more likely to be working in the retail trade and health and community services than other industries, the percentage being 17% in retail trade and 17% in health and community services industries. Public housing tenants have similar profiles, with 21% of employed males working in manufacturing industry, and 22% and 20% of employed females working in retail trade and health and community services respectively. The trends also mask differences between full-time and part-time employment. According to the 2000-01 SIHC, part-time employment among public housing tenants has increased from 7% to 13% between 1981 and 2001. This favours females as over three-quarters of part-time employed persons have been females since 1981.
Figure 2.1: Proportion of working age male public housing tenants who are employed, 1971-2001, per cent


Figure 2.2: Proportion of working age female public housing tenants who are employed, 1971-2001, per cent

Figure 2.3 shows the full-time and part-time employment rates of working age male public housing tenants, as compared to the general working age male population from 1981 to 2001.

While the part-time employment rates of males in public housing has mirrored the slight rise in part-time employment rates for all males, full-time employment among males in public housing has remained consistently below the level for all males, and full-time employment among males in public housing has fallen dramatically in comparison with the general male population. Full-time employment among the general male population has fallen from 81% to 68% over the last two decades. However, among male public housing tenants, the proportion in full-time employment has fallen from 64% to 25%.

Figure 2.4 shows the full-time and part-time employment rates of working age female public housing tenants, as compared to the general working age female population. Both the full-time and part-time employment levels of females have been below that of the general female population, but while part-time employment for females in public housing and the general female population have increased by the approximately 7 percentage points between 1981 and 2001, full-time employment for female public housing tenants has fallen in contrast to the rise in full-time employment for all females. Females in public housing have obviously not shared in the general rise in employment participation among females. It is important to note also that the proportion of public housing tenants who are females have increased over the years. Between 1981 and 2001, the percentage of working age public housing tenants who are females increased from 60% to 67%.

Figure 2.3: Proportion of working age males employed full-time and part-time, 1981-2001, per cent

Figure 2.4: Proportion of working age females employed full-time and part-time, 1981-2001, per cent

![Proportion of working age females employed full-time and part-time, 1981-2001, per cent](image)


Figure 2.5 compares the proportion of working age public housing tenants whose principal income source is wage or salary with the working age population in Australia from 1981 to 2001. Clearly, the proportion of all working ages whose principal income source is wage or salary has increased over the last two decades from 53% to 58%. In contrast, the proportion of working age public housing tenants whose principal income source is wage or salary has dropped from 36% to 22%. This is clearly in line with the falling employment rates observed over the last three decades in Figures 2.1 and 2.2. The decrease in reliance on wage or salary as a principal income source has been matched by increasing levels of welfare dependence. As shown in Figure 2.6, the proportion of working age public housing tenants whose principal income source is government cash transfers has increased from 55% to 70%, as compared to almost no changes for the general working age population. In 2001, the extent to which public housing tenants rely on government cash transfers is over three times the extent of reliance exhibited by the general Australian population.
Figure 2.5: Proportion of working age persons whose principal income source is wage or salary, 1981-2001, per cent

![Graph showing proportion of working age persons whose principal income source is wage or salary, 1981-2001, per cent.]

Source: 2000-01 SIHC

Figure 2.6: Proportion of working age persons whose principal income source is government cash transfers, 1981-2001, per cent

![Graph showing proportion of working age persons whose principal income source is government cash transfers, 1981-2001, per cent.]

Source: 2000-01 SIHC
Comparisons between working age public housing tenants and CRA recipients, another housing assistance group, further demonstrates the very high level of labour market marginalisation. The level of employment among public housing tenants is 28%, as compared to 31% among CRA recipients. This means that 61% of public housing tenants are not participating in the labour force, that is, neither employed nor looking for employment, as compared to 48% of CRA recipients. 66% of working age public housing households\(^2\) are jobless, that is, with no employed working age persons. In comparison, 56% of working age CRA households are jobless. Among public housing tenants who have left full-time education and are not working for pay, 57% have not worked for pay for more than five years, as compared to 39% of CRA recipients.

The analysis of the employment profile of working age public housing tenants yields several important conclusions:

- Employment rates among public housing tenants have fallen over the past three decades, much more so among males and females, leading to a convergence in employment rates between the two genders;
- The fall in employment trends among public housing tenants over the last two decades are caused by a decline in full-time, rather than part-time, employment (see Figures 2.3 and 2.4);
- The full-time employment profiles of public housing tenants have worsened in contrast to the general population, increasing the divergence in employment levels between public housing tenants and the general population;
- The proportion of public housing tenants who rely on wages or salaries as their principal income source has decreased steadily over the two decades, in contrast to an increasing reliance by the general population on wages or salaries as their principal income source. Moreover, the proportion of public housing tenants who rely on government cash transfers as their principal income source have increased despite little change in this proportion among the general population;
- There are various dimensions of the employment profiles of public housing tenants that are clearly inferior to another housing assistance group, CRA recipients.

The declining level of economic participation among working age public housing tenants, as indicated by their employment profile, is now seen as a problem by the Commonwealth and State governments and has led agreement that new housing assistance measures will seek to increase the level of public housing tenants. The next section details Australian measures, as well as overseas housing assistance measures that aim to promote both housing policy and economic participation goals.

\(^2\) Public housing households with at least one working age person.
The review of Australian, US and UK housing assistance measures aimed at increasing economic participation revealed a wide range of measures. In order to systematically describe and compare these measures a typology was developed. As Esping-Andersen (1999:72) suggests in his discussion of welfare regimes, typologies can be useful for three reasons. They can assist in distinguishing key features or contours of social and economic arrangements; identifying logics and perhaps causality; and in generating hypotheses.

The typology being used in this report has six broad categories that describe a continuum of measures that at one end focus attention on measures that directly employ recipients of housing assistance and that at the other end focus on program measures that support the social development of those receiving housing assistance and might assist in finding or being more ‘job ready’. The six elements of the typology are:

- Direct employment required or supported by housing agencies;
- Nearby or adjacent economic development initiatives;
- Employment incentive or requirement included in the landlord/tenant relation;
- Asset planning and (re)development of social housing stock;
- Service system agreements between housing agencies and others;
- Indirect support for economic participation through community initiatives.

One of these categories, nearby or adjacent economic development initiatives, is necessary to capture the full range of measures in both the US and UK. In both these countries there is a history of establishing enterprise zones. They are established by designating a geographic area and then applying a different set of rules, generally in terms of subsidies and taxation, than those that normally apply to firms. In both these countries the location and operation of these zones have been related to areas where housing assistance measures have become concentrated. Australia has no history of enterprise zones.

### 3.1 Australia

In this section we describe measures used by Australian state/territory housing authorities to promote economic participation among their tenants. In Table 3.1, the measures are classified under the broad elements of the typology discussed above, with the exception of nearby or adjacent economic development initiatives, which are not used in Australia to promote economic participation. The measures are briefly described in this section, but a detailed account can be found in appendix 1.
3.1.1 Direct Employment Required or Supported by Housing Agencies

Housing authorities provide employment opportunities for tenants by employing tenants directly and/or inserting a tenant employment clause into contracts requiring successful tenderers to engage tenants in works done in public housing areas. The latter approach is more widely used than the former. Works that are typically contracted out include construction, physical upgrading, and cleaning and grounds maintenance.

New South Wales (NSW) and Victoria are two states that have employed tenants in positions within their state housing departments. Under NSW’s Tenant Employment Project (TEP) pilot, tenants were employed in client service officer and temporary clerical officer positions, and also allowed access to call centre traineeships (NSW DOH, 2000a). In Victoria, tenants are employed in concierge, maintenance and administrative positions (VIC OOH, n.d.).

The tenant employment requirement in contracts has been used in various states. Examples include:

- TEP construction and building contracts in NSW required successful tenderers to employ at least two tenant trainees for the works at existing market rates (NSW DOH, 2000a);

- The Public Tenant Employment Program (PTEP) in Victoria requires successful contractors of cleaning and gardening contracts to employ at least 25% effective full-time employees within three months of the commencement of the contract and 35% effective full-time employees after 12 months (Street Ryan and Associates Pty Ltd, 2004);

- The South Australian Housing Trust’s (SAHT) maintenance zone contracts contain a specific requirement for contractors to engage at least one apprentice to do the work. Contractors who have won contracts in excess of $250,000 are required to be registered with Inskill SA, which requires contractors to collect credits through the employment of apprentices, graduates and staff with special needs and provide work placement experience and vocational training for staff (SAHT, 2003a, SAHT, 2004c);

- Construction contracts created under Western Australia’s urban renewal program, New Living, stipulate that successful contractors have to employ Aboriginal apprenticeship labour, some of whom are public housing tenants (WA DHW, 2000).

3.1.2 Employment Incentive or Requirement Included in the Landlord/Tenant Relation

Employment incentives or requirements are included in housing authorities’ rent-setting structure to encourage economic participation among tenants. Rents are typically set at approximately 25% of household income. Thus, the sudden increase in rent payable that a tenant incurs upon gaining or increasing participation in paid
employment can act as a disincentive to employment. The housing authorities’ rental rebate policies aim to reduce the financial disincentives that may apply when a tenant gains paid employment. In all states/territories, tenants rents are capped at the market rate, so the maximum rent paid by tenants is the market rent (SCRCSSP, 2004). However, some states/territories have additional schemes that aim to reduce the financial disincentives associated with rent increases:

- Under NSW’s Tenant Employment Incentive Scheme (TEIS), an unemployed tenant who gains paid employment is entitled to a grace period of up to 12 weeks, during which rent is not adjusted to the new income level (NSW DOH, 2004b, NSW DOH, 2004a);

- A 16-week grace period pilot program provides a 16-week rent freeze for tenants and residents of Neighbourhood Renewal Areas (NRAs) who gain employment before rent is re-assessed on their new income (VIC OOH, 2004j);

- In Queensland, a tax allowance scale is applied to earned income so that the amount of tax paid on the first $20,800 per year of earned income is removed before income is assessed for rent payments. Public housing rent reviews are conducted once every six months, and rent is adjusted at the time of the review rather than from the time income increases (QLD DOH, 2004b);

- In Western Australia, a weekly working allowance of $30 is deducted from the assessable income of unemployed non-disabled tenants who gain employment and is continuous for as long as the tenant remains employed. For disabled tenants, the working allowance is $50 (WA DHW, n.d.-b);

- The Northern Territory’s Employment Incentive Scheme facilitates stepped rent increases over the first six months of employment. The purpose is to gradually increase the rent to the market rate when the normal consequence of the rise in income would be a requirement to pay market rent immediately (Territory Housing, 2004).

Housing authorities also typically have transfer or relocation rules that support economic participation by making employment a priority criterion in applications for transfers, e.g. in NSW and Queensland (QLD DOH, 2004b).

3.1.3 Asset Planning and (Re)development of Social Housing Stock

Housing authorities in Australia typically advocate the breaking up of large concentrations of social housing and encourage social mix. The anticipated outcome is that unemployed social housing tenants will gain employment as they get influenced by new social norms including economic participation, and reap benefits from informal networking with employed residents in the neighbourhood. Housing authorities typically try to achieve deconcentration of social housing and promotion of social mix by (Johnston, 2003):

- Locating the construction sites for individual social housing properties across a range of suburbs, instead of concentrating them in one suburb as estates;
- Purchasing dwellings for social housing in existing mixed suburbs;
- Developing dwellings intended for sale to owner-occupiers in areas with high concentrations of social housing;
- Assisting social housing tenants into other tenures, such as private rental housing or homeownership.

A tenure mix strategy has been pursued by most housing authorities in Australia under their urban renewal strategies and other schemes. These include:

- The Community Renewal Strategy in NSW. Community renewal areas include Airds and Bradbury (NSW DOH, 2003j, NSW DOH, 2003a, NSW DOH, 2003g, NSW DOH, 2003i);
- The Neighbourhood Renewal strategy (NRS) in Victoria. Properties have been upgraded and sold in the Latrobe Valley (Hughes, 2004);
- The Urban Renewal program in Queensland. Urban renewal areas include Manoora, Leichhardt, Goodna, Rasmussen, Deception Bay and Vincent (QLD DOH, 2004a). Queensland’s Home Purchase Assistance scheme helps low-income persons access homeownership through products such as housing loans and deposit assistance (QLD DOH, 2004a);
- The urban renewal program in South Australia. Targeted areas include the Parks area (Westwood), Lincoln Gardens, Mitchell Park, Whyalla and Salisbury North (SAHT, n.d.-e, SAHT, n.d.-b, SAHT, n.d.-d, SAHT, n.d.-f, SAHT, n.d.-c);
- The New Living program in Western Australia. Areas include Kwinana and Lockridge (McCotter, 1998). Properties are also offered for sale to tenants through the ‘Goodstart’ and ‘Right to Buy’ home purchase assistance schemes (Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000);
- Tasmania’s Affordable Housing Strategy, Streets Ahead home purchase incentive and Home Ownership Assistance Program (HOAP) (Housing Tasmania, 2004). The Bridgewater/Gagebrook Urban Renewal Program (BURP) also supports a home purchase program for public housing tenants (Downie, 2001).

3.1.4 Service System Agreements between Housing Agencies and Others

Cross-agency agreements are an essential strategy in all states/territories to secure partnerships and pool resources required to promote and sustain economic participation outcomes for public housing tenants. Housing authorities typically enter into service system agreements with other government departments and local councils, education and training providers, and not-for-profit organisations with an employment focus, though they sometimes collaborate with private sector organisations.

Government department and local council partners in various states/territories include:
Education and training provider partners include:

- University of NSW and Macquarie Fields Outreach Technical and Further Education (TAFE) (NSW);
- Swinburne University and Corio Bay Senior College (Victoria);
- Brisbane North Institute of TAFE and Queensland University of Technology (Queensland);
- Tasmania TAFE (Tasmania).

Not-for-profit organisations with an employment focus include:

- Mission Australia and Oasis Youth Support Network (NSW);
- Salvation Army Employment Plus (Western Australia);
- Project Hahn and Colony 47 (Tasmania).

An example of a collaboration that has included all the types of organisations mentioned in this section, including private organisations, is the ‘Reach for the Clouds’ (RFTC) project in Victoria. The project seeks to bridge the digital divide between public housing tenants and the rest of Victoria by providing computer and internet access to tenants in the Atherton Gardens high-rise public housing estate. The Victorian Office of Housing (OoH) has provided funding to rewire the buildings; Multimedia Victoria has provided a grant to prepare a Project Initiation Document (PID); the Community Support Fund has given seed funding to support research; the Community Jobs Program (CJPg) and Lucent Technologies has helped to employ and train staff; Hewlett Packard has donated personal computers, printers, a digital camera and scanners for training; Microsoft has provided a site licence for Windows and Office ’97; the Brotherhood of St Laurence (BSL) and City of Yarra have provided funds to employ a training co-ordinator; Swinburne University is evaluating the project over three years (Meredyth et al., 2002).

3.1.5 Indirect Support for Economic Participation through Community Initiatives

Housing authorities provide indirect support for economic participation through community initiatives, including support for community enterprise, community development programs, tenant participation in decision-making, bridging the digital divide, local business engagement and community jobs programs.

Community enterprises that have been set up with the support of housing authorities include:

- Furniture recycling, catering and laundromat businesses in NSW;
• Catering, construction and furniture removal and restoration enterprises in Victoria;
• Home-based businesses and a lavender production business in South Australia.

Community development programs include:
• Leadership courses in NSW;
• Community greening initiatives in NSW, Victoria, Western Australia and Australian Capital Territory (ACT);
• Adult learning projects in Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania;
• Youth development and assistance programs in Victoria and the territories;
• Early start for children initiatives in Tasmania.

Tenant participation in local decision-making is designed to empower residents and mobilise resources and energy (DHS, n.d.). This has indirect links to economic participation as tenants engaged in local decision-making are often given opportunities for training and skill development. For example:

• Training is provided in NSW to assist tenants to improve their skills to work in the community, including starting and running a community group, campaigning on behalf of residents and resolving community conflicts (NSW DOH, n.d.);
• The Victorian OoH organises training on governance issues, group processes and financial management (VIC OOH, 2003);
• The Tenant Participation Program in Queensland provides opportunities for tenants to access training to develop public housing management and community development skills, such as governance, computer and book-keeping training (QLD DOH, 2004b).

The lack of access to information technology (IT) is a critical area of disadvantage as it forms a barrier to employment. Public housing tenants are particularly disadvantaged in this area in comparison to the rest of Australia. According to the 2002 General Social Survey, only 36.6% of working age public housing tenants have access to the computer from home, as compared to 69.3% of the working age population. Only 18.5% of working age public housing tenants have internet access from home, as compared to 52.7% of the working age population. In Victoria, only 21.6% of residents at Atherton Gardens has computer use at home, as compared to 49.4% of the surrounding area of Yarra-North and 46.6% of Melbourne as a whole. Atherton Gardens’ residents are also three time less likely to have internet access from home than Melbourne residents (Meredyth et al., 2003b). In some states, the provision of greater access to IT and the development of IT skills has been seen as a means of increasing the opportunity for economic participation. Key initiatives that have been introduced to overcome the digital divide are:

• Establishment of neighbourhood technology centres (NTCs) in NSW;
• RFTC project in Atherton Gardens in Victoria;
• Easy Computing Community Centre and The Parks IT Room in South Australia.
• Local business engagement is used in South Australia to co-ordinate training programs with local employers.

Community jobs programs are used in Victoria and Queensland to create employment opportunities for tenants. Under the CJPg in Victoria, funding is provided to government bodies or not-for-profit organisations to employ unemployed people to work on community projects (VIC OOH, 2004j). Participants gain 16 weeks of employment at award wages and accredited training in carpentry, painting, landscaping and in other household renovation skills (VIC OOH, 2004n). The Community Jobs Plan (CJPn) in Queensland is a Breaking the Unemployment Cycle initiative that funds organisations to provide full-time employment for three to six months for long-term unemployed persons and persons at risk of become long-term unemployed. Projects include public works projects, Landcare and environmental restoration projects and innovative projects such as community events co-ordinations and website development. Projects that are given priority include projects in areas of high unemployment and Community Renewal areas (QLD DET, 2004).
Table 3.1: Australian policy initiatives designed to use housing assistance to promote economic participation: examples by state/territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Northern Territory</th>
<th>Australian Capital Territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct employment required or supported by housing agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to state housing authority positions &amp; traineeships</td>
<td>Tenant Employment Project client service officer &amp; call centre traineeships &amp; temporary clerical officer positions</td>
<td>Concierge, maintenance, administration positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant employment requirement in contracts</td>
<td>Tenant Employment Project cleaning &amp; grounds maintenance contracts &amp; construction &amp; building contracts, Community contracts, WorkiT contracts, Handypersons contracts</td>
<td>Public Tenant Employment Program cleaning and gardening contracts</td>
<td>Construction contracts through the Housing Industry Trade Training and Housing Industry Trade Training Plus programs</td>
<td>Maintenance zone and construction contracts</td>
<td>New Living construction contracts</td>
<td>Capital Investment Program contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment incentive or requirement included in the landlord/tenant relation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment incentives in rental rebate policy</td>
<td>Rent ceiling at market rate, Tenant Employment Incentive Scheme</td>
<td>Rent ceiling at market rate, 16-week rent-freeze grace period</td>
<td>Rent ceiling at market rate, Tax allowance scale to the first $20,800 of earned income</td>
<td>Rent ceiling at market rate</td>
<td>Rent ceiling at market rate, Working allowance</td>
<td>Rent ceiling at market rate</td>
<td>Rent ceiling at market rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer/relocation rules</td>
<td>Employment is a priority criterion</td>
<td>Employment is a priority criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asset planning and (re)development of social housing stock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service system agreements between housing agencies and others**

| Cross-agency linkages | Partners incl. Department for Women, Mission Australia, University of New South Wales, Macquarie Fields Outreach Technical and Further Education institution, Oasis Youth Support Network | Partners incl. Corio Bay Senior College, City of Greater Geelong, City of Yarra, Victoria, Swinburne University | Partners incl. Department of Education, Brisbane North Institute of Technical and Further Education, Queensland University of Technology, community organisations | Partners incl. Job Network providers, Salvation Army Employment Plus, Technical and Further Education institution | Partners incl. Project Hahn, Colony 47, local councils, Tasmania Technical and Further Education institution | Community agencies | Funding provided to community organisations and community development workers under the Community Linkages Program |

**Indirect support for economic participation through community initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community enterprise</th>
<th>Cover-Up Curtains, furniture recycling, Triple C Catering, The Enterprise Project, Claymore Laundromat</th>
<th>Catering, construction, furniture removal and restoration enterprises</th>
<th>Development of new businesses and links between local businesses and schools in Deception Bay</th>
<th>Home-based businesses, Lavender Blues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community development programs</td>
<td>Leadership courses, community greening initiatives</td>
<td>Youth development programs, adult learning, community gardens</td>
<td>Community Access Schools, Deception Bay Life Long Learning project</td>
<td>Work Bank, Playford Community Capacity Building Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant participation in</td>
<td>Tenant community</td>
<td>Training provided</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Management Support Program, Manage Your Garden course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant participation in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult learning, computer training, community greening, early starts for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models to assist youth tenants pursue continuing education</td>
<td>Community Linkages Program, youth advocacy, community gardens, art &amp; music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Tenant participation in | Tenant community | Training provided | Tenant | Management Support Program, Manage Your Garden course |
| Models to assist youth tenants pursue continuing education | Community Linkages Program, youth advocacy, community gardens, art &amp; music | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Northern Territory</th>
<th>Australian Capital Territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>local decision-making</td>
<td>work training: community groups, advocacy and resolving community conflict</td>
<td>on governance issues, group processes and financial management</td>
<td>Participation Program including training in governance, computer and book-keeping training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging the digital divide</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Technology Centres, E-Communities @ Cranebrook Project</td>
<td>Atherton Gardens Reach for the Clouds Project, Community Gateways in Wendouree West and Collingwood</td>
<td>Funding for training and equipment through Community Renewal program</td>
<td>Easy Computing Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Linkages Program funding for computer facility Bega, Allawah and Currong complexes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training program coordination with local employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community jobs program</td>
<td>Community Jobs Program</td>
<td>Community Jobs Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 United States

The development of linked housing and employment measures has been a feature of US housing policy and broader social policy since the 1980s (Fishman et al., 2000:8). In the mid 1990s this linking became even more pronounced as a part of a broader set of social policy changes often described as ‘welfare reform’. This section focuses on the main measures that have been developed since the 1990s. It does this by identifying measures at a program level and then goes on to discuss more generally how they relate to the broad categories of intervention set out in the typology. This section also places these main measures in the context of broader ‘welfare reform’ social policy change and developments in the US housing and labour markets. This placing in context is important when assessing measures in other countries so that more informed judgements can be made about applicability elsewhere.

3.2.1 Main Measures

The words ‘main measures’ are used deliberately in this discussion of the US because of the diversity and complexity of program arrangements. The main federal government agency, HUD, lists 104 current programs (Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2005). Further, within US Federalism arrangements state governments have considerable discretion within federal block grant programs which increases the number and complexity of program arrangements. For example, in the area of mobility programs alone, there are as Goetz (2003:56) notes, more than 50 programs in 35 metropolitan areas. Consequently only the main program measures that HUD (Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2005, Fishman et al., 2000) identifies as being related to employment and training are listed in Table 3.2. The same situation exists in the area of employment programs ‘where the federal government mandates programs but then cedes responsibility for implementation to the states’ (Considine, 2001:16).

Table 3.2: Main US housing/urban programs linked to employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Main purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency Program (ROSS)</td>
<td>Public housing authority (PHA) supportive services, resident empowerment activities, and employment and training services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Investment Centres (FIC)</td>
<td>PHA construction of service centres for public tenant education and employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS)</td>
<td>Local strategies to coordinate public and private resources that help Housing Choice Voucher Program participants and public housing tenants obtain employment that will assist families achieve economic independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE VI)</td>
<td>Public housing estate redevelopment and some funding for community and social services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs-Plus and Neighbourhood Jobs Initiative (NJI)</td>
<td>Demonstration programs aimed at testing the impact of intensive and integrated employment and support services for welfare recipients making the welfare to work transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to Opportunity</td>
<td>Demonstration program combining rental assistance with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration (MTO)</td>
<td>housing counselling to help low-income families move to low-poverty neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to Work Demonstration (MTW)</td>
<td>Demonstration program supporting public housing authorities to test new approaches to (a) achieving greater cost effectiveness (b) giving work incentives (c) increasing low income family housing choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act (QHWRA)</td>
<td>Strengthen the role and responsibility of PHAs in addressing poverty and resident self-sufficiency issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Networks (NN)</td>
<td>Community-based resource and computer learning centres in privately owned, HUD insured and assisted housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>HUD Act requirement to direct economic opportunities generated by HUD funding to residents of low-income communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-Up</td>
<td>Skills training and pre-apprenticeship on-the-job-training and support for taking up apprenticeships for low-income residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Apprenticeship Program (YAP)</td>
<td>Demonstration program for young residents of public and assisted housing with skills training, paid job experience, and job placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthbuild</td>
<td>Education and on-the-job-training for 16 – 24 year-old public housing residents who have dropped out of school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP)</td>
<td>PHAs address problems of drug abuse and crime in public housing developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Communities (RC)</td>
<td>Tax incentives for renewal of economically disadvantaged areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities (EZ/ECs)</td>
<td>Grants and tax incentives to locate businesses in, and hire residents of, economically disadvantaged areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review using the typology indicates measures across the continuum of direct employment of housing assistance recipients to social development support. A summary version of is presented in Table 3.3 and fuller discussion follows.

**Table 3.3: Continuum of US forms of employment assistance to housing assistance recipients**

| Direct employment opportunities or requirements | Funding directed towards residents of low-income communities receiving housing assistance for their training, employment, and contracting opportunities (Section 3, Step-Up, YAP, Youthbuild) |
| Nearby or adjacent economic development initiatives | Forms of assistance aimed at generating economic activity and employment in designated areas near households who are receiving housing assistance either as public tenants or private tenants (RC, EZ/ECs) |
| Employment incentive or requirement included in the landlord/tenant relation | Saving extra earnt income in an ‘Escrow account’ available at end of contract period (FSS) and reduced rent (Jobs-Plus) |
| | Requirement to move out of an area of concentrated poverty linked to financial assistance and services (Section 8, MTO) |
| | Proportion of public tenants required to ‘disperse’ and leave public housing estates and reduce the concentration of poverty (HOPE VI) |
| Asset planning and | Estate and stock redevelopment resulting in new mixed income |
### 3.2.2 Direct Employment Required or Supported by Housing Agencies

Direct employment requirements or support by housing agencies has been limited in the US to three programs. This reflects the broader policy settings in the US which see the private labour market as the source of jobs and do not support direct public sector job creation. Nevertheless, three initiatives can be identified: Section 3, Step-Up, Youth Apprenticeship Program (YAP) and Youthbuild.

The most significant is Section 3 of the 1968 HUD Act that ‘now mandates that to the greatest extent feasible, economic opportunities created by HUD funding for the operation, development, and modernization of public housing be steered to low—and very low—income people, especially public housing residents’. These opportunities take the form of training and employment services for residents or contracting preferences for businesses that employ residents or are owned by residents (Bailey et al., 1996:3). Section 3 has been a long standing provision of the HUD Act, however its significance increased considerably with the introduction of ‘welfare reform’ in 1996 that capped the time that citizens could receive welfare assistance.

Fishman et.al (2000:33-37) provide some insight into how residents are connected to employment through the use of Section 3. In Los Angeles, for example, the housing authority developed and administers a public construction company, Kumbaya. About 40 percent of the workers at the housing authority’s construction company were resident apprentices. Further, contracts with resident management corporation businesses to provide services at developments, including security require training and employment of tenants. In Baltimore and Boston the Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) referred residents to housing authority contractors when jobs became available. In San Antonio, another PHA operated a program that trains residents for jobs within the housing authority including clerks and typists for approximately 10 to 12 vacancies each year due to promotions.

Some argue that Section 3 can be used more effectively. For example, Bailey et al (1996:90) have reviewed the provision and concluded that ‘it will be critical for PHAs to find ways to better balance their traditional property management role with their more recent social services function’. Anti poverty advocates have argued more forcefully that Section 3 can be part of an aggressive antipoverty strategy but that it ‘can occur only if HUD takes up the challenge and exercises greater leadership than
it does currently’ (Pollack and Schlossberg, 1999). In the absence of a review of Section 3 it is not possible to say anything about aggregate outcomes.

Whereas Section 3 has an element of job creation the HUD programs Step Up, YAP and Youthbuild are both training programs focusing on apprenticeships. Step Up provides individuals with skills training and a year of pre-apprenticeship on-the-job-training, thereby allowing residents to “step up” into registered apprenticeships and Youthbuild is focused on younger public housing residents who have dropped out of school and funds education and on-the-job-training. Again the only evidence on the performance of these programs are case studies (Fishman et al., 2000:37). For example, in Baltimore the Step-Up program entailed a two-month pre-training period, which focused on job readiness and construction-related issues, followed by one year of on-site training with skilled tradespersons. In this apprenticeship portion each participant was guaranteed rotations in four trades. The Youthbuild programs generally provided one year of hands-on basic carpentry and construction skills training and classroom-based education.

The chief problem associated with these programs it seems is that they overwhelmingly provide jobs for public housing tenants, with some exceptions, in building construction. But this creates a problem where a significant proportion of public tenant households are female single parent households.

Another factor that appears to limit participation in many HUD programs is the nature of the training … heavily focused on construction-related occupations. According to the staff at a number of housing authorities, many single mothers are not attracted to manual labor, while others find it difficult to arrange child care to deal with the long hours and travel requirements of construction work (Fishman et al., 2000:Exec Sum 9).

This is the context for continuing local struggles particularly around Section 3 when poverty alleviation advocates, who support direct employment because of the tangible benefits that flow from on-the-job training and paid work, continue to find difficulty in having its provisions enforced at the local level (Pollack and Schlossberg, 1999).

3.2.3 Nearby or Adjacent Economic Development Initiatives

The area based approach to stimulating economic development by conservative US states followed discussion of the ‘enterprise zone’ idea by Lord Geoffrey Howe in the UK in the late 1970s and was confirmed as a nationally endorsed policy measure by federal government legislation in 1993 (Engberg and Greenbaum, 1999). In summary, Enterprise Zones and Enterprise Communities (EZ/ECs) provide ‘grants and tax incentives to locate businesses in, and hire residents of, economically disadvantaged areas’. It is an application based program where state and local governments have to show that their enterprise zones and enterprise communities meet specified criteria that establish ‘their relative need with respect to poverty, unemployment, and general economic distress’ (Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2005:25). It is based upon four key principles (Hebert et al., 2001:4-5):
• Economic opportunity – in the form of jobs for residents;
• Sustainable community development – coordinated and comprehensive efforts to develop human and physical capital of the community;
• Community-based partnerships – residents, government officials, community groups, social service providers, and the private sector must all work together;
• Strategic visions for change – present a clear picture of what is to be accomplished and how resources are to be coordinated.

Assessing the EZ outcomes is always difficult and program evaluations of this program are no exception. The HUD evaluation, which also examined broader labour market conditions, was that ‘the primary force driving the increases in resident employment was the overall growth in the EZ economies’ (Hebert et al., 2001:v). However, causality was unclear and the authors state that they cannot make ‘a definitive statement about whether the EZ program itself caused these employment growth trends’ (Hebert et al., 2001:ch9-5). When it comes to other outcomes there is a real debate. Hebert et al. are cautiously positive when they state that they ‘found some very promising examples of innovation, collaborative partnerships, leveraging of private and non-profit sector resources, and multi-faceted strategies in the 18 intensive study sites, as well as some early signs of community renewal’ while also noting ‘the EZ/EC sites have made substantial progress in building a foundation for revitalization, but will need continued support and encouragement to capitalize on the groundwork that has been established’. However, there is also criticism (Gittell et al., 1998, Gittell et al., 2001). Gittell et al (2001:100) conclude their study of the program in six cities in the following terms:

The story ultimately describes a familiar failed model – money funnelled into traditional city elites for short-lived programs with limited funds designed by outside program planners for poor communities, disregarding strategies that would enable poor communities to restructure themselves. In short, this research tells the story of an opportunity missed.

Housing provision measures are an element of the program measures on many EZ/EC sites and are described as Community Development. However, the level of housing program activity has been small. On the supply side the program led to 4011 ‘new and rehabilitated housing units’ in the eighteen study sites in the period 1995-2000. On the demand side the beneficiaries have been low-income or first-time buyers and across the study sites 4,447 households were assisted in the same period. This contrasts with the considerably larger numbers assisted through different types of community services. The largest number was in the area of ‘recreation and arts programs’ where 380,601 zone residents were ‘served’ (Hebert et al., 2001:ch9-25).

3.2.4 Employment Incentive or Requirement in the Landlord/Tenant Relation
Changing the landlord/tenant relation so that it encourages, or requires, low income tenants to move into the labour market has at the most general level been
incorporated into the federal legislation. It has also been a focus of four specific programs in the era of 'welfare reform'. This focus on changing the landlord/tenant relation applies to both public housing tenants and private tenants receiving assistance.

The 1998 legislation, Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act (QHWRA), reframed the policy within which PHAs operated by encouraging housing agencies to support unemployed residents to find work and working families to remain in public housing. Specifically it enabled PHAs to give preference to families on waiting lists that are moving from welfare to work; house higher income households; establish rent policies that help attract and retain working families, eliminate work disincentives; and preserve the financial stability of properties (Fishman et al., 2000:13). However, there is considerable evidence that the policy has been poorly implemented. As Fishman et al (2000) note, there is considerable variation in implementation and PHAs are sometimes not well informed. Also there is considerable hesitancy about implementing new rent policies. Under the new policy, housing authorities are required to disregard all increases in income from employment for an initial 12 months and 50 percent of increased income for a subsequent 12-month period. Some PHAs fear that by disregarding income increases for the purpose of rent setting that they will further undermine the financial viability of an already precarious public housing system (Fishman et al., 2000:ES11).

The first program, Moving to Work (MTW), predates QHWRA by several years but in many ways prefigures this legislation. It was established as a demonstration program supporting public housing authorities to test new approaches to (a) achieving greater cost effectiveness (b) giving work incentives (c) increasing low income family housing choices. Based on a combination of HUD funding streams it led to 24 PHAs establishing a ‘unique combination of actions, activities, policies or procedures’ (Abravanel et al., 2004:3). As a part of this process the PHAs developed systems that rewarded employment and income growth by moderating rents and penalised unemployment by maintaining rent levels. However, they did so in different ways and using different mixes and balances of incentives and penalties (Abravanel et al., 2004:10-11).

The results are at best ambiguous because there is no clear relationship between policy change and increased employment and income. During the period of the demonstration program employment and income levels rose substantially. However, causality is difficult to determine because labour markets in most MTW areas were buoyant and strong punitive welfare reform measures were being implemented which makes it impossible to determine whether MTW had an independent effect (Abravanel et al., 2004:28).

The second program is an incentive to benefit from income increases resulting from labour market participation. This is done through a provision of the Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) program, which enables tenants to fund a savings account, or
‘escrow account’, in lieu of making higher rent payments as a result of increases in earned income. While the household is in the program these funds can be used to help pay for college tuition or for other purposes consistent with increased labour market participation. After completing the program, a participant can use it for any purpose. This arrangement is part of a contract that the participant signs with the PHA specifying what steps both the family and the PHA will take to promote the family’s financial independence (Fishman et al., 2000). Sitting behind this arrangement is the broader provision that families, since the 1996 ‘welfare reform’ policy change, only have a life time entitlement to assistance of five years (Gastley, 2004, Karger, 2003). In other words families are offered an incentive to enter into this contractual arrangement. Also they are compelled to enter into this arrangement as a requirement of the benefit and knowledge that their benefit is time limited.

The third program is an incentive or a requirement to move. This focus on moving low income people is a policy response to the concentration of poverty in many US cities. Further, this concentration has been growing as the number of neighbourhoods in which a majority, or near majority of residents, live below the federal poverty level has increased dramatically over the past three decades. The policy response that has developed in response to this is to ‘deconcentrate’ these neighbourhoods by requiring, or encouraging, some households to move to areas with higher average incomes. It has led to the development of what Goetz (2003:4) describes as ‘mobility programs’. Besides meeting other objectives this dispersal is thought to facilitate employment gains by enabling low income households to be closer to areas of job growth, increase feelings of safety and be closer to potential role models and local networks (Goetz, 2003:80). The move can either be voluntary or compulsory. In both types of moves the key program for accomplishing this is the Section 8 ‘Housing Choice Voucher Program’ which is tenant based assistance that can be linked with counselling programs or be made conditional. Besides this program there is a Welfare to Work Voucher Program (WtWV) that funds 50,000 additional vouchers under similar conditions that is subject to a mandated comprehensive evaluation (Patterson et al., 2004).

Voluntary moves are typically supported by other programs. They include the Gautreaux Program, the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) Program and Cincinnati HOME Program. Their key features are counselling and search assistance that assist tenants to learn about the housing market and to choose a neighbourhood with lower rates of poverty (de Souza Briggs, 1997, Turner, 1998, Popkin et al., 2000). Compulsory moves happen when project based assistance ceases when public housing is demolished or landlord subsidies are withdrawn. It is in this context that tenants are ‘vouchered out’ (Goetz, 2003:57).

The outcomes of voluntary and involuntary mobility programs are now being debated (Rohe and Kleit, 1999, Sard and Lubell, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, Goetz, 2003, Goering et al., 2002). However, it is important to note that Goetz (2003:ch9) has raised a more fundamental challenge to the policy paradigm that makes the geographic concentration of poverty the key problem. The issues that he raises are worth noting.
First, there is what he calls the ‘limits of tenant based assistance’ where he notes the problem of inadequate supply of affordable rental housing outside of poor neighbourhoods, the absence of personal support networks in the suburbs, transport and access problems which come with suburban living and discrimination against movers especially those from minority communities. Second, and relatedly, there is already significant unmet demand for rental housing in the suburbs coming from low income households in the suburbs. Third, there is the ‘creaming’ that has been associated with programs such as the Gautreaux and MTO programs. The success of these programs has in part been based on working with motivated, capable and willing movers. Transferring findings based on this group to residents who do not want to move, do not meet program standards or are unable to find an appropriate dwelling and a willing landlord is therefore fraught with problems. Fourth, there is the issue of scale. Existing mobility programs are small scale and in part they have been successful because they are small scale. It has been possible to move small numbers of poor into the suburbs without provoking a backlash. However, if the program was scaled-up to a level where it significantly deconcentrated the inner city urban poor the citizens of the suburbs, especially the white ones, are likely to organise and defeat mobility programs. Fifth, involuntary dispersal from assisted public housing or assisted private rental is likely to have little effect on the concentration of poverty. Involuntary movers notionally have full choice about where they locate. The experience so far is that counselling programs have little effect in directing them to the suburbs and that they overwhelmingly move to other parts of the same neighbourhood. Sixth, mobility programs that assist the motivated, capable and willing movers results in neighbourhoods that concentrate disadvantage even more. In sum, the argument that emerges from this critique is that the geographic concentration of poverty is an overly narrow definition of the problem facing the inner areas of US cities.

Similarly Galster and Zobel (1998) raise a fundamental challenge to the underlying assumption by looking again at whether dispersal of people does reduce socially dysfunctional behaviours. Their conclusion is there is little evidence that dispersal achieves this. Consequently they conclude that:

the US now faces the unenviable situation of having adopted a major housing strategy with only a shred of evidence to suggest what effect it might have on social problems like violence and crime, non participation in the labour market and dropping out of secondary school.

3.2.5 Asset Planning and (Re)development of Social Housing Stock

In the US asset planning and redevelopment of public housing is driven by two issues. First, there is the deteriorating condition of the public housing stock. By the late 1980s this became an issue and led to Congress establishing the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing in 1989. It concluded that about 86,000 dwellings, or 6 percent of the 1.3 million public housing units, were severely distressed and that a redevelopment program was required. Second there is the
contribution that public housing estates make to the concentration of poverty
‘problem’ of US inner cities. Because public housing had been targeted to low
income households these estates became a key element in the concentration of
poverty in inner city areas. This is the context for the Housing Opportunities for
People Everywhere (HOPE VI) program that provided federal resources for
redevelopment and improved management. However, two other key measures
accompanied the introduction of HOPE VI that fundamentally shaped the nature of
replacement developments. First, the ‘one for one’ rule was abolished. This rule
required the same number of public housing units to be provided after
redevelopment to equal the number provided prior to redevelopment. Second, PHAs
no longer had to target all public housing to low income households. They were able
to rent dwellings to households across the income range (Goetz, 2003, Popkin et al.,
2004).

The outcome has been a large scale redevelopment program. In the period 1992 –
2003 there have been 446 HOPE VI grants in 166 cities resulting in the demolition of
63,100 distressed dwelling units with another 20,300 listed for redevelopment
(Popkin et al., 2004). The acknowledged benefits that have come out of the program
are the demolition of poor quality housing; the provision of new high quality housing;
some public housing tenants supported by vouchers have been able to relocate to
better neighbourhoods; there have been broader benefits for the neighbourhoods
surrounding the distressed public housing. However, there have been significant
problems including, original residents were poorly supported in their enforced move;
a proportion of residents are having considerable difficulty in obtaining affordable
and secure housing in the private rental market; there has been no provision of
supported housing for ‘hard to house’ households. For example in Chicago the
housing authority is reported as adopting ‘an especially stringent, arbitrary, and in
part impermissible set of tenant screening criteria, including minimum work
requirements …many displaced families have little hope of return to the limited
number of units being rebuilt’ (Wilens, 2004:515). Beyond this HOPE VI has led to a
decline in the total stock of public housing in a context of insufficient supply of low
income rental housing (Popkin et al., 2004).

3.2.6 Service System Agreements between Housing Agencies and Others

In this section five programs that seek to link low income tenants with jobs through
services systems are described. Three of these are what are described as
demonstration programs: Jobs-Plus, Neighbourhood Jobs Initiative (NJI) and Bridges
to Work (BTW). In the US these are generally limited time programs supported by
both government and private charitable foundations. Often a key feature of their
development and implementation is an accompanying research evaluation program.
All of them are program responses to the new circumstances that followed the
‘welfare reform’ arrangements introduced by legislation in 1996. The other two
programs are longer term relatively small scale HUD funded programs for public
housing developments.
Jobs-Plus, or to give the program its full name, Jobs-Plus Community Revitalisation Initiative for Public Housing Families, began in 1998. It can be described as the most comprehensive and well resourced program that has sought to link public housing tenants to services and through these to employment. This claim is made for two reasons. First, it is a ‘saturation-level’ initiative where all working-age residents of housing developments in the demonstration were eligible. As of June 2001 over half the targeted working age residents across the sites had officially attached themselves to Jobs-Plus. Second, it became a program that developed collaborative arrangements between the housing authority, residents, and other local service providers. However, it is important to note that it was also only a demonstration project, funded jointly by three federal government agencies and nine foundations, not a nation wide universal program.

Operating on seven sites in six cities this demonstration program sought to significantly raise the employment levels and earnings of all working-age non-disabled residents living in low-work, high-welfare public housing developments. It did this by seeking ‘to infuse an entire housing development with its ‘employment message’ and engage a high proportion of residents in its work promoting services and activities’ (Kato, 2003).

Three program elements were developed. One of them is a type of measure, already discussed above, where a financial incentive in the public housing rent rules allowed tenants to reduce the extent to which higher income is offset by increases in rent. The second component was employment-related services that helped residents secure and retain employment, including job search instruction, education programs, vocational training, and support services such as child care and transportation assistance. The third was community support for work, which sought to strengthen social ties and activities among residents that supported their job preparation and work efforts.

The labour market position of the residents in the program was first analysed through a base-line survey in 1999. In summary, this survey showed (Martinez, 2002):

- Respondents were connected to the labour market with about 56% of respondents working at the time and 90 percent had worked at some point in their lives;
- Jobs held by residents tended to be low paid and without fringe benefits;
- Amongst the employed the low paid were most likely to be engaging in job search suggesting they were looking for better quality jobs;
- There was no consistent demographic between demographic characteristics, in particular race/ethnicity and marital status, and recent employment;
- Health related characteristics were consistently related to employment status and job search efforts by unemployed.
It should be noted that this survey was undertaken near the peak of the economic expansion that reduced unemployment to near post WWII lows.

One of the key conclusions drawn from evaluation was that it was important to assist residents that were already in poor quality low paid jobs to obtain better higher paid as well as assist the unemployed into jobs. The evaluators argue that real self sufficiency comes with higher quality jobs and better rates of pay (Martinez, 2002).

The NJI was a companion demonstration program to Jobs-Plus that ran between 1998 and 2001 although more limited in terms of time and resources. It focused on three high poverty inner city neighbourhoods while Job-Plus focuses on public housing developments. Like Jobs-Plus it was funded by government and foundations but in this case only one government department and two foundations. Its elements were employment and training services; collaboration with other non-profit organisations and with public agencies engaged in workforce development; organising and mobilising residents to promote and support work. NJI was significantly different from Jobs-Plus in that it was not able to provide rent incentives. The tone of the reports on this program (Molina and Nelson, 2001, 2003) clearly indicate that this was a program that struggled. For example

Community-based organizations with little prior experience in workforce development faced a steep learning curve. The process of finding local partners and establishing viable collaborations took time; it was not easy to focus resources and attention on the specified neighbourhoods; staff turnover was high. (Molina and Nelson, 2001:ii)

In terms of jobs the outcome was very modest. The year 2001 is the only year for which figures for job placement are provided and across the three sites they were 418, 233 and 452 (Molina and Howard, 2003). Subsequently the program ceased operations and the final chapter of its report puts forward an argument for the development of Work Support Centres (WSC) and linked to Neighbourhood Work Support Centres (NWSC). Together they would develop and deliver a formal program model combining employment retention and advancement services and financial work supports. At the local level NWCSs would take a ‘saturation’ approach at a neighbourhood level in their provision of employment retention and advancement services and financial work supports.

The focus of the BTW demonstration program was the spatial mismatch in five cities between unemployed workers in poor inner city areas and jobs in the suburbs. BTW was designed to test whether information, job placement assistance and transportation could connect job-ready inner-city workers to suburban employment’ (Elliott et al., 1999:2). The program did provide services. However, those providing the services found that the difficulties were considerable. There were logistical problems, in the absence of a public transport system that did not provide an adequate service, in transporting workers from the inner city to the suburbs who had different start times. Further, it was found that transport alone does little to connect inner city residents to suburban jobs. Additional employment support services were
required. Beyond this program success is influenced by broader labour market conditions. In a tight labour market inner city residents wanting to work in the suburbs are harder to find. In a slack labour market employers in the suburbs are less willing to hire inner city residents (Elliott et al., 1999). Another multi site analysis of commuting focussed on the outcomes and found that the benefits to those subsidised to commute to the suburbs for jobs were quite small relative to the estimate of disadvantage associated with living so far from jobs (Martin, 2001).

Apart from these three demonstration programs there are two small scale programs that assist public tenant groups. The general all purpose one is the Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency Program (ROSS) that provides grants intended to strengthen public tenant organisations’ capacity to increase resident involvement in their housing developments, and to help residents obtain employment training or to set up their own businesses. Funds may also be used for facility improvement for centres providing self-sufficiency related services and activities. Within the public housing system they are targeted to developments where more than half the residents receive welfare benefits that are now capped. The second program is Neighbourhood Networks that supports, on a matching dollar and time limited basis, community-based resource and computer learning centres. The goal is to increase residents’ employment opportunities, improve educational performance of children, empower residents, and decrease residents’ dependency on federal welfare assistance. The programs they offer are computer access and training, internet access, job readiness support, health care and social services, adult education classes, and youth services.

3.2.7 Indirect Support for Economic Participation

There are only two national programs that come under this more general heading. The first is Family Investment Centres (FIC), now discontinued, that provided seed money to PHAs for the construction of service centres in which education and employment services could be provided. The second is the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP) described as a ‘barrier amelioration’ program because drug use is viewed as a barrier to employment. The program provides resources for control and prevention of drug use, drug trafficking, and drug-related crime. Money from PHDEP grants is put to a variety of uses, including law enforcement, security improvements, treatment and prevention programs.

3.2.8 Main Measures in Context

Reference was made in the previous section to recent policy change and programs. In particular it was noted that US working age citizens are increasingly compelled to participate in the labour market and to limit their use of welfare payments. During the course of this policy shift housing programs have also been harnessed to support this policy change. Housing programs, particularly for low income households, are increasingly being altered to encourage and require labour market participation. The context for this housing program change is further elaborated upon in this section, because it is important when considering potential domestic program development to
understand the underlying drivers giving rise to initiatives. This elaboration has four parts that centre on the labour market, capping or limiting of welfare, the policy of deconcentrating inner city poverty, and the focus on demand side housing assistance for low income households.

In the US the 19th century philosophy of self in the labour market has been consistently more influential than in Australia. In Australia social liberal ideas based on fairness resulted in a more regulated labour market and a broader sharing of risk. In the US the conception of the risks in the labour market that should be considered ‘social’ and therefore require state intervention and programs has been consistently narrow. In the US this has two key dimensions in relation to the labour market. First, there is a reluctance to intervene and to shape employment conditions. This approach has led to a situation where the US stands out internationally as a country with a large low wage workforce, long average duration of low-paid employment, low rate of exit from poverty and long periods of time in poverty (Esping-Andersen, 1999:156-58). The size of this low wage labour force and the difficulty that many households have in moving out of it is very important in understanding the powerlessness of these households in urban housing markets. The second is reluctance to provide benefits to working age people that might reduce the willingness of working age citizens to seek employment. This has been the policy trend in the US since the 1960s when the first changes were made to the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program in the mid 1960s (Karger, 2003:384).

This policy trend to limit welfare benefits and emphasise labour market participation has now been extended. From the mid 1990s there were changes that resulted in disentitlement to public benefits resulting from two key changes. First, if the funds allocated in the budget were exhausted then benefits can be denied to eligible applicants. Second, a provision of the new legislation, Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act 1996, introduced the idea of a five year lifetime cap which means that the only option for those who go beyond five years is the labour market or penury. The outcome then is a further reduction in social welfare support for poor people and insistence on labour market participation as the only legitimate source of income (Karger, 2003:386). Of course this income in the US, as noted above, for many can only be earned through low paid jobs that do not come with occupational benefits such as health care insurance and has few protections. Further, these jobs typically provide little opportunity for the development of skills that support upward mobility in the labour market.

The capping of welfare benefits, in particular the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program, has had significant implications for housing assistance programs. This primarily stems from the fact that a very large proportion of TANF program beneficiaries also receive housing benefits, primarily in the form of public housing and cash benefits through the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program. As Wood et al (1999:1) note in the HUD publication Welfare to Work:
The impact of these changes on the lives of public housing residents and Section 8 participants is significant because approximately half of all HUD-assisted families with children received welfare benefits in 1996. As public housing agencies assess the effect of welfare reform on their operations and on their residents, HUD is providing them with information, funding, and local policy options to serve their TANF beneficiaries.

The housing program measures discussed above have been the outcome. However, a further point that must be made about these measures is that they rely overwhelmingly on the efficacy of demand side assistance increasingly through the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program. However, this response has been inadequate in two respects both of which are remarkably similar to Australia. First, there has been continuing decline in affordability for low income renter households in the bottom two quintiles. This has occurred against the background of overall improvements in affordability. In other words housing affordability problems have become more concentrated amongst the lowest income households (Quigley and Raphael, 2004). Second, on the supply side new public and assisted private housing construction in the US has declined over the past two decades (Andrews, 1998, Harloe, 1995). As Harloe (1995:421) notes, during the 1980s ‘excluding rural housing programs the fall was dramatic, from 153,000 in 1979 to a mere 9,000 by 1988’. Over the past decade public supply assistance has remained at a miniscule level and there has been no private sector response. In this context the shortage of affordable housing available to these lowest income renters in the period 1990-2000 grew by 15%. Over the nation, in 2000 the 50 states needed at least an additional 4.9 million rental units both affordable and available to the lowest income renter households (Nelson et al., 2004:2).

3.3 United Kingdom

The UK has a very different housing system to Australia and the US which have small public housing sectors (less than 5 percent), large viable private rental markets and mass homeownership markets. The UK although it is also a mass home ownership society has a considerably smaller private rental market and a large social housing sector. Although this social housing sector declined in size it remains a significant. In the 1970s it constituted about 30 percent of households and by the 1990s it was less than 20 percent (Malpass and Murie, 1994:13). However, because of the size of the social housing sector its policy relevance in a context of changing labour markets has been greater. This greater relevance has two aspects.

First, from the mid 1960s public housing in the UK increasingly became the tenure for very low income households, unemployed and the under employed and those out of the workforce. Support for private home ownership became the settled bipartisan policy (Harloe, 1995:288). Then during the 1980s this status as a residual tenure was confirmed by the large scale sales program. This transferred about 1.2 million dwellings by 1990, much of it the better public housing stock, into the home ownership sector. In other words, like in Australia and the US, public housing became a residual tenure and private home ownership the preferred tenure. The
main difference between the UK and Australia and the US is that even in its diminished form social housing still a large sector.

Second, UK labour market change, especially structural unemployment, coupled with the geographic spread of unsold public housing produced a very uneven spatial distribution of worklessness with pronounced concentrations in some localities. The regions where this concentration at the local level is pronounced is in the cities of the North West and North East – Liverpool, Manchester, Middlesbrough, Hartlepool – and some other areas in these regions – Knowsley, and Easington – as well as areas such as the South Wales valleys (HM Treasury and Department for Work and Pensions, 2003:41). This pattern of concentration has coexisted alongside employment growth since the mid 1970s. Strong employment growth and concentrations of ‘worklessness’ sets the context within which there has been considerable new policy and program development and increases in public expenditure aimed at increasing the labour market participation of these neighbourhoods. Further, a target has been set for ‘increasing the employment rate and bringing it closer to the overall national rate for the 30 local authority districts with the poorest initial labour market position (HM Treasury and Department for Work and Pensions, 2003:46). Viewed in terms of welfare regime types it can be seen as another move in the continuing oscillation of UK policy between liberalism and social democracy. In this context it can be seen as something of a move towards a social democratic response.

Table 3.4: Main UK housing/urban programs linked to employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Main purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Deal for Communities</td>
<td>Partnerships bring local communities, service providers and other agencies to tackle the problems in their neighbourhoods in an intensive and co-ordinated way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Renewal Fund</td>
<td>The fund boosts government departmental spending programmes, and gets neighbourhood renewal strategies under way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders</td>
<td>Communities work with local agencies to improve neighbourhood services and quality of life by focusing on local environment issues, community safety, housing, young people and employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Wardens Team</td>
<td>A programme that grants aid for a uniformed semi-official presence in residential and high crime areas with the aim of reducing crime and the fear of crime, improving the environment, quality of life and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise areas</td>
<td>The Government has designated 2000 Enterprise Areas in the most deprived areas of the UK to add to the incentives for small business creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Housing Allowance</td>
<td>Local Housing Allowance is a new way of working out Housing Benefit for private tenants. It is being tested by a number of local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Regeneration Budget</td>
<td>The Single Regeneration Budget programme aims to enhance the employment prospects, education and skills of local people and to tackle the needs of communities in the most deprived areas. It emphasises a partnership led approach to regeneration whereby interested parties come together at the local level to devise a regeneration scheme and seek financial support through an annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bidding.

**Key Worker** Assists some workers, principally those public sector services, to rent and purchase housing in expensive areas at affordable prices in order to overcome labour market shortages in these areas

**Enterprise Zones** Sites for industrial development within older urban areas across GB with relief from paying business rates and relaxed planning restrictions. The last EZs will expire in 2006.

**Local Strategic Partnerships** Local partners working through a LSP are expected to act strategically to deliver decisions and actions which join up the activities of partners across a range of issues, enabling each to meet their own targets and goals and more effectively tackle cross-cutting issues

**Employment zones** Areas where additional money is available to help the long term unemployed into work.

A review using the typology indicates measures across the full continuum of direct employment of the recipients of housing assistance to support for their social development. A summary version is presented in Table 3.5 and a fuller discussion follows.

**Table 3.5: Continuum of UK forms of employment assistance to housing assistance recipients**

| Direct employment opportunities or requirements | Housing associations can and do employ tenants or require tenants to be employed by contractors |
| Nearby or adjacent economic development initiatives | Area based initiatives that support business development in deprived areas, that is areas experiencing economic decline and multiple deprivations. |
| Employment incentive or requirement included in the landlord/tenant relation | Housing Benefit administrative change through LHA being piloted but no major restructure |
| | Key worker assistance |
| | Letting and labour market mobility |
| Asset planning and development of public housing stock | Very extensive redevelopment and upgrading of the social housing stock. |
| Service system agreements | Intensive attempt being made to link social housing tenants to various service systems through Local Strategic Partnerships and floor targets |
| Indirect support for economic participation through community initiatives | Considerable increase in education, health and welfare expenditures, especially in areas with high proportion of ‘workless’ social housing tenants with new coordination mechanisms based on agreements and local participation. |

**3.3.1 Direct Employment Opportunities or Requirements**

Requirements or support for direct employment by housing agencies in the UK is at the discretion of the social housing provider. Central government does not direct social housing providers to employ tenants or have their contractors employ tenants.
However, some providers do ensure that tenants become employees in the construction and management work associated with provision of social housing.

In the mid 1990s the Housing Corporation introduced the Housing Plus approach. Through this housing associations were encouraged to make housing investment more socially sustainable by combining investment in bricks and mortar and wider social and economic measures. An aspect of this was providing employment linked to housing investment and service provision (Evans, 1998). In the late 1990s Housing Action Trusts (HATs) were established as vehicles for regenerating social housing and reducing local authority stock by transfer to housing associations and sale to tenants. They were similarly encouraged to link housing provision with employment. Both initiatives resulted in local labour being employed in construction contracts, providing job and training advice, enterprise support schemes and improvement in childcare and directly recruiting local residents. However, it is not possible to gauge the overall impact on jobs and training because there has been no systematic collection of data about the extent, permanence or quality of Housing Plus and HAT related jobs. All there is are local reports and evaluation studies which nevertheless indicate that jobs were created in many areas and in some of these there were good rates of continuing employment amongst residents after projects were completed (Evans, 1998, 2000).

This linking of housing construction to employment objectives is encouraged by many social housing providers. For example, in the Broadwater Farm public housing provided by Haringey Council encourages a target of 20% local employment with contractors. This partnership is formalised in a negotiated Estate Agreement. The Chingford Hall Community Based Housing Association included local labour clauses in service contracts and met a target of 30% resident employment in 1997/98. They have also funded tenants training in finance, repairs and maintenance, as well as seminars and courses on tenant participation and negotiation at the Chartered Institute of Housing and recruited from amongst trainees (Policy Action Team 5, 1999). The Housing Corporation confirms the scattered nature of action by Housing Associations when it states (The Housing Corporation, 2000:9)

> Many are major local employers in their own right, and are able to directly employ local tenants and residents. Some have developed Resident Service Organisations that employ local people to provide local services. Through their own supply chains, they also have opportunities to use local companies and suppliers as contractors. Some are implementing local labour schemes in the traditional area of construction and in other areas such as environmental projects.

Beyond this there appears to be little systematic consideration about how social housing providers can directly link their housing provision to jobs. It merely extends to a recommendation by the UK Governments Policy Action Team 5 on Housing Management (Policy Action Team 5, 1999) that the Chartered Institute of Housing, the professional body representing housing managers, should consider ‘how, through its programmes, it can improve and widen access routes for tenants and
other types of community activist to become skilled so as to take up employment as housing managers’.

3.3.2 Nearby or Adjacent Economic Development Initiatives

In the UK there is a long history of area based policy initiatives that have supported business development in deprived areas, that is, areas experiencing economic decline and multiple deprivations. They are policies which have a strong spatial and distributional focus where resources have been targeted at particular disadvantaged areas. They have focused on assistance to existing firms with plant and buildings, land and property needs, assistance to start up businesses. The names of these programs over the years include Regional Selective Assistance, Urban Development Corporations, Enterprise Zones, Urban Program, City Challenge, Single Regeneration Budget and Business development in the coalfields. (North et al., 2003)

Alongside these programs there has been ongoing research that has sought to evaluate the outcomes. A key focus of these evaluations have been estimates of ‘additionality’ after allowing for ‘deadweight’ and ‘displacement’ effects and the cost per job created or saved. These evaluations aim to estimate how many additional jobs are created after allowing for some recipients acting in the same way if the support had not been provided (deadweight), and the extent to which gains in employment in one firm are offset by losses in others (displacement). The outcomes for these programs in terms of additional jobs vary. As North et al (2003:ch4) state their outcomes are good in parts.

In a discussion examining the links between housing assistance programs and employment it is also important to consider who has access to these additional jobs. In other words, it should not be assumed that job growth will result in new employees coming from adjoining low income neighbourhoods of social housing tenants. Indeed North et al (2003:72-73) suggest that this has not happened to any great extent. Insofar as the evaluations have considered the proportion of additional jobs which are taken-up by local workers, the evidence indicates that this has been low – typically between 10 and 15%. The majority of jobs that have been generated have therefore ‘leaked’ out, resulting in the wage income being lost to the area. This leads to the conclusion that the focus should be on removing the barriers to local recruitment in the most deprived communities. Also in the thirty nine most deprived neighbourhoods, receiving New Deal for Communities funding, there is little evidence of job creation and business development (Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research (Sheffield Hallam University), 2004:22)

In the area of policy development there has been another recent examination of the problems experienced by those seeking to establish businesses in deprived areas (Policy Action Team 3, 1999). Three areas were identified and were described in terms of the absence of sufficient business support, poor access to finance and better transition arrangements between benefits and self employment in the income security system.
3.3.3 Employment Incentive or Requirement in the Landlord/Tenant Relation

In the UK there are two programs which seek to alter the landlord/tenant relationship in order to encourage labour market participation. One is for low income households in receipt of Housing Benefit and the other is a concession that enables some public sector workers in designated categories to apply for key worker status and receive additional assistance with housing costs. In addition there are plans for increasing the mobility of public housing tenants within the social housing sector as a whole.

Housing Benefit is a means tested benefit provided by the central government Department of Work and Pensions that pays some or all of a tenant’s rent when out of work or on a low income. It is payable to private tenants as well as housing association and local authority tenants. It began as a relatively small demand side subsidy in the 1970s but has grown as capital subsidies have declined. Currently it is the largest subsidy program. For both private and social housing tenants there is evidence that the system discourages low income tenants from seeking and retaining employment. Stephens et al (2005:45) state:

> the system of Housing Benefit introduced in 1988 had two features that may create disincentives to work. First, it pays the whole of the claimant's eligible rent when their income falls to income support levels. Second it has a high rate of withdrawal - as take-home pay rises.

In the social rented sector the Housing Benefit program functions in a context where government policy pushed rents up to near market levels (Giles et al., 1997:50). This had the effect of increasing housing benefit levels in order to maintain affordability but deepened or exaggerated unemployment traps and poverty traps because as incomes rise housing benefit payments are withdrawn. Social housing tenants are in a position to enjoy only small net financial benefits from work. This effect of the Housing Benefit, along with other problems, has been recognised by the government (Department of the Environment Transport and the Regions Department of Social Security, 2000). However, at this stage there has been no move to restructure Housing Benefit arrangements. Instead a number of pilot projects have been established which aim to make the administration of Housing Benefit less onerous on beneficiaries especially around requirements associated with notifying changes in work status and income (Stephens et al., 2005:44).

Key worker housing is a response to difficulties in attracting and retaining skilled public sector workers in such areas as health and education in high demand areas such as London and the South East of England. Over recent years these workers along with other public and private sector workers have found it increasingly difficult to afford housing in areas with rapidly inflating house prices. This has had wider social and economic consequences, notably the difficulty of both public and private sectors in recruiting ‘key’ workers. In some areas of the public sector the politics of shortages has resulted in a program where social housing providers have introduced key worker priority into their allocations. However, the effectiveness of such moves is limited by the overwhelming demands from potential tenants with acute housing needs. There is also a perception that many key workers are better served by low
cost home ownership schemes – which give them access to their preferred tenure. This has led to the development of an equity loan scheme. This program ignores the plight of private sector workers necessary for the functioning of local economies. However, it is clear that there is no intention to similarly subsidise private sector workers. Stephens et al (2005:47) argue that the initiative can be seen primarily as a means for delivering public services in some areas without challenging national pay bargaining in highly unionised sectors.

There are several changes in the way that prospective tenants and tenants can choose and move within the social housing sector that aim to reduce the concentration of worklessness. First, there are plans to reduce the barriers experienced by social housing tenants who want to move within the social housing sector, especially if they are seeking to improve their labour market position. The UK government intends to do this by establishing a Housing and Employment Mobility Service (HEMS) throughout the UK that brings together information on employment, social housing vacancies and transport. Tenants can use this service to try and move closer to a particular job or labour market. However it is acknowledged that because of the short supply of social housing, especially in high-demand areas, that the opportunities to move will be constrained. Second, ‘choice-based letting’ is being introduced. This aims to reduce the concentrations of worklessness in some estates. On the one hand it is starting to result in working tenants moving into some areas with high levels of worklessness. On the other hand there are some areas experiencing low demand where social housing landlords are opening up their stock to non-traditional tenants (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004:85). In many respects this approach is similar to the de-concentration of poverty approach being pursued by US public housing authorities in American inner cities through redevelopment and establishing mixed income developments.

3.3.4 Service System Agreements

The concentrations of unemployment, especially when it is concentrated in neighbourhoods, is viewed in current government policy as a consequence of people living in these areas being unable to compete successfully for jobs. ‘The worst concentrations of worklessness are in very small defined areas and are caused not by a lack of jobs but by the people living in these areas being unable to compete successfully for the vacancies available’ (HM Treasury and Department for Work and Pensions, 2003:46). This has led to large scale service system response with three key features. First, there has been an expansion of services aimed at ‘addressing local barriers to work’. Second, considerable effort has been put into coordinating service provision and designing services arrangements that respond to local circumstances. Third, there is a system of targets against which service providers are being assessed.

In the UK there are now many programs providing support to unemployed people and particularly to those in the most deprived areas. These programs include Action Teams for Jobs, Working Neighbourhoods, Employment Zones, Adviser Discretion
Fund, Job Grant and Rapid Reclaim, New Deal for Communities and New Opportunity fund. Broadly analysed these initiatives are of three types (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004, HM Treasury and Department for Work and Pensions, 2003):

- Providing active, work focussed support to those on Jobseeker Allowance (unemployment benefit) while at the same time requiring beneficiaries to look for work or become active. In other words income support for the unemployed is increasingly being linked to help, encouragement and an obligation to seek employment or prepare for work;
- Ensuring work pays by providing the unemployed with financial incentives to get a job and to stay employed. In effect what has been introduced are various forms of ‘wage subsidies’ which are being used to reinforce the message that it is financially better to move into work and stay in work;
- Reducing barriers to work by targeting assistance such as childcare, rehabilitation, health care, training and education, English language courses and anti-discrimination support to people who experience labour market disadvantage.

Coordination processes have become a major focus for government in its drive to provide assistance to the most deprived neighbourhoods and districts. At the local level this has been done by establishing Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) in eighty-eight local authorities that prepared Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategies (LNRSs). The LSPs are, in effect, a municipal level peak organisation supported by local government that brings together representatives of key service agencies. Their first task is to identify neighbourhoods with the lowest quality of life – in terms of joblessness, crime, educational failure, ill health, poor physical environment and housing. They then seek agreement on the problems of priority neighbourhoods, mapping the resources, agreeing on what should be done and monitoring what is being done. Organisationally they are seen as a means for overcoming the rigidities of traditional service boundaries. A feature of LSPs is support for citizen involvement or community engagement in LSP processes through a Community Empowerment Fund (Russell et al., 2004:31).

There are also new processes within central government that are ‘getting all mainstream departments in England to think spatially and about social deprivation’ (Rhodes et al., 2003). This includes the Whitehall Co-ordination Team within the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit that has a role in bringing together key departments to ensure that the neighbourhood renewal agenda is being implemented across government. Through this process departments are being encouraged to focus mainstream resources more directly on the specific needs of areas, a process referred to as ‘mainstreaming’. However, the evaluation of mainstreaming in relation to the New Deal for Communities program operating in thirty nine of the most deprived neighbourhoods in England are ‘generally ad hoc’ (Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research (Sheffield Hallam University), 2004:38). More
broadly in relation to LSPs, mainstreaming is described as 'more aspirational than achieved' (Russell et al., 2004:55).

A key mechanism being used to drive complex policy initiatives is a system of Public Service Agreements (PSAs) and ‘floor targets’. ‘Floor targets’ is a term used in the UK to describe targets that set a minimum standard for disadvantaged groups or areas, or a narrowing of the gap between them and the rest of the country. The PSA 1 that focuses on deprived neighbourhoods aims to:

Tackle social exclusion and deliver neighbourhood renewal, working with Departments to help them meet their PSA floor targets, in particular narrowing the gap in health, education, crime, worklessness, housing and liveability outcomes between the most deprived areas and the rest of England, with measurable improvements by 2010 (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004).

A set of floor targets have then been set in relation to six ‘key outcome areas’ of health, education, housing, worklessness, crime and liveability. Central government agencies sign on to these through an interdepartmental process. Progress towards each of the targets is then monitored through the use of indicators. In the areas of housing and employment the floor targets state:

By 2010, bring all social housing into a decent condition with most of this improvement taking place in deprived areas, and for vulnerable households in the private sector, including families with children, increase the proportion who live in homes that are in decent condition.

As part of the wider objective of full employment in every region, over the three years to Spring 2008, and taking account of the economic cycle:

- Demonstrate progress on increasing the employment rate, joint with HM Treasury;
- Increase the employment rates of disadvantaged groups (lone parents, ethnic minorities, people aged 50 and over, those with the lowest qualifications and those living in the local authority wards with the poorest initial labour market position);
- Significantly reduce the difference between the employment rates of the disadvantaged groups and the overall rate.

3.3.5 Indirect Support for Economic Participation

Indirect support for economic participation for those receiving housing assistance is extensive in the UK. As noted above PSA 1 relates the areas of health, education, crime, worklessness, housing and liveability outcomes. Two points can be made which suggest that these areas of government activity can be seen as significant support for economic participation. First, there has been considerable service expansion. A measure of this was presented in the introduction in Figure 1.1 which shows the percentage of welfare state expenditure as a percentage of GDP declining during the early 1990s but increasing from 19 to 26.5 percent in the period 1995-
1999. Second, as discussed above considerable effort is being put into establishing greater policy and program coordination through LSPs, PSAs with floor targets. One indicator of the way in which the relationships between these areas has been developed is found in the common use of the term ‘cross-cutting’ themes that seek to relate different service areas to particular groups of disadvantaged people (Russell et al., 2004).

3.3.6 Main Measures in Context

In the UK there is a long history of responding to spatial concentrations of poverty and disadvantage. Typically this has been done through what are broadly described as ‘area-based initiatives’ (ABIs) (Rhodes et al., 2003). The discussion above describes the latest ABI developments. The context for this approach is further elaborated upon in this section. The reason for this elaboration is because it is important when considering overseas initiatives for potential domestic program development to understand the underlying policy drivers that gave rise to the initiatives. This elaboration has three parts centring on labour market change, the broader pattern of housing tenure and employment, and the policy shift towards demand side housing subsidies and away from support for housing supply.

Since the mid 1990s employment has risen and unemployment fallen in every region of the UK. Also the gains have been greatest in the regions with the weakest starting position. However, the spatial concentrations of disadvantage remain (HM Treasury and Department for Work and Pensions, 2003:2)

At the same time, however, the benefits of this improvement have not been felt by all groups or across all areas to the same degree, and, at a local level, there remain severe concentrations of worklessness.

The levels of analysis for assessing concentration are at the regional, local authority and ward level. The pattern that emerges from this, reflecting strong labour market growth during the late 1990s, is that all regions have employment levels above the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average. The exceptions to this are areas concentrated within cities and coastal towns. The concentrations tend to be below local authority level at ward level and even below ward level (HM Treasury and Department for Work and Pensions, 2003:33). The official view is that these small area concentrations of worklessness are caused ‘not by lack of jobs, but by the people living in these areas being unable to compete successfully for the vacancies’ (HM Treasury and Department for Work and Pensions, 2003:46). This paper (ibid 38) notes that in cities ‘a large number of people claiming benefits can co-exist with a high number of jobs and vacancies’. It is this analysis that is driving the increased provision of services through the various ABIs described above. They are services aimed at connecting the workless to the labour market or by preparing them through further education and training. Moreover, there is the ‘target of increasing the employment rate and bringing it closer to the overall national rate for the 30 local authority districts with the poorest initial labour market position’ (HM Treasury and Department for Work and Pensions, 2003:46).
The connection between housing assistance and worklessness, or unemployment, is essentially the same as in Australia and the US. As HM Treasury (2003:31) notes ‘the most disadvantaged are more likely both to be without work and to have access to social housing. A picture, albeit an a-spatial picture, is clearly evident in data relating the employment status of household heads to the social housing and owner occupied housing tenures. Figures 3.1 and 3.2 present the employment status of household heads for these two tenures for 1977-2001. Four key observations can be made:

- Full time employment has declined for owner occupiers but for social renters it has crashed;
- Unemployment has remained low for owner occupiers but for social renters it increased dramatically during the 1980s and then in the late 1990s it has declined but remains greater than for owner occupiers;
- The category ‘other economically inactive’ has remained small in the owner occupied sector but has grown significantly in the social housing sector;
- Part time employment has grown for social housing tenants but not amongst owner-occupiers.

**Figure 3.1: Employment status head of owner occupied households in England and Wales (per cent of total owner occupied households), 1977-2001**

Source: (Holmans, 2005), Data in Table E.1: Employment Status of Household Heads by Tenure
This relationship between tenure and employment, as Stephens et al (2005:44) note, is ‘very striking’. However, they argue against a ‘tenure effect’, that is that the characteristics of any tenure makes people more or less inclined to find employment. Instead they argue that it is the characteristics, such as low skill and poor health, that make social housing tenants vulnerable to worklessness. Instead it is possible to identify four main housing system reasons for the close association between tenure and employment.

First, there are the labour market changes resulting in job decline near social housing. Industry restructuring and rising levels of unemployment resulted in the link between social housing tenants and work in many neighbourhoods being severed (Harloe, 1995:386). Second, during the 1980s and early 1990s the ‘Right to Buy’ policy, that gave local government tenants the opportunity to purchase the dwelling they rented, was responded to disproportionately by employed tenants (Harloe, 1995:429,, Stephens, 2005 #158). Third, the structure of the demand side subsidy payments to tenants, the Housing Benefit, acts as a disincentive for many tenants to become employed. It can penalise a move into work (the unemployment trap) and discourage people in low paid work from increasing their earnings (the poverty trap) (Stephens et al., 2005:44). Fourth, there is a mobility problem associated with social housing which makes it difficult for households to move and increase the match between workers and jobs. Social housing allocation over recent decades has placed most emphasis on providing housing to very low income households with acute needs including homelessness. Because of high continuing local demand movement within the system is very limited (Stephens et al., 2005:45-47).

Finally there is the supply problem. Stephens et al (2005:8) state bluntly that a legacy of past policy, which shifted housing subsidies from the supply side to the demand side, has resulted in an inadequate supply of new housing for the market or the social rented sector. It has also resulted in rapid expansion of the cost of
demand-side subsidies and the private sector has not developed a capacity to supply affordable low and moderate income housing. The extent of the shift in policy is made very clear in the data which indicates that in 1975/76 supply side assistance was 82 percent and demand side assistance 18 percent of the total. By 1999/2000 the mix was more than reversed with 13.5 percent of total assistance going to the supply side and 86.4 percent going to the demand side.

The effect of this switch in supply side and demand side subsidies is evident in the pattern of capital investment. Figure 3.3 shows an overall steady decline in the flow of capital expenditure into the social housing sector in England. Further, much of this investment is going into low demand areas where the emphasis is on the upgrading of the social housing stock. As a consequence there is little investment in high demand areas where there are jobs.

**Figure 3.3: Total capital expenditure on housing by the social sector in England, 1975-2000**

![Graph showing total capital expenditure on housing by the social sector in England, 1975-2000](image)

Source: (Holmans, 2005), Data in Table O.2: Total Capital Expenditure on Housing by the Social Sector

Note: Real terms base year = 1999/2000
4 RESEARCH AND EVALUATION OF HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION MEASURES

There is a considerable body of accompanying research and evaluation in the discussion of policy and program measures in Australia, US and UK which are seeking to link housing assistance and economic participation. This is evident in the many citations of reports and published literature in the previous section. This section presents a more focussed discussion of this research and evaluation by responding to the second aim for this report:

Describe the study designs used in Australian and overseas evaluations of policy initiatives and programs.

Australian research and program evaluation located during the course of this project is discussed first. Five different categories of study design are identified and used to present the account of Australian research and evaluation. In the US and UK there is a more extensive program evaluation and research literature as major programs in each country are more routinely accompanied by program evaluations and other funded research. The quantity of evaluation and research publication is extensive. However, the research designs used to undertake this program evaluation and research are not very different to that used in Australian program evaluation.

The one exception is the US experience in social experiment or random assignment research. This is a form of research that began in the mid 1960s in the US and is continuing to be used to evaluate program interventions in the US and to a much lesser degree in other countries. In Australia there has been no use of this study design in the housing field. When the Fraser Government in the mid 1970s planned to establish the Housing Allowance Voucher Experiment it also decided to evaluate the program using a social experiment study design. However, the program was abolished during the setting up phase and before vouchers began to be paid. More recently a new small program Young People-Purpose-Place-Personal Support-Proof (YP4) to be run by non-government agencies with government support is proposing to use a social experiment study design to investigate the housing and employment outcomes of the program3. This will be the first social experiment in the housing program area.

In this context there is merit in reviewing the experience of social experiment research design in the US. Therefore the final section of this chapter presents an historical overview of social experiment research. This is followed by a discussion of two recent social experiment evaluations. Interestingly these two evaluations each consider a different housing policy response to the problem of low labour market

---

3 YP4 represents young people. The four in superscript represents purpose – a job, place – a home, personal support – the service being offered, and proof – to acknowledge YP4’s status as a trial and convey the importance of its evaluation Coventry, L. (2005) In Transitions and Risk: New Directions in Social Policy Melbourne.
participation by public housing tenants. One experiment seeks to find a solution to low labour market participation outside of public housing in the private rental market. It evaluates the proposition that public tenants will do better if they can express effective demand for rental housing in the private rental market. The other experiment explores whether the labour market participation levels of public housing tenants can be increased through incentives and programs of assistance delivered to public tenants who continue to live in public housing. It therefore assumes a continuing form of supply side assistance.

4.1 Australian Evaluations

In Australia, there has been little evaluation of the impacts and effectiveness of policy initiatives designed to use housing assistance to promote economic participation. The lack of evaluation has been highlighted by various studies (Arthurson, 1998, Hughes, 2004). In comparison, evaluations of initiatives in other countries such as the US and UK have been more extensive and in-depth in nature.

Evaluative projects of Australian initiatives have typically been based on one or more of the following main study designs or methods:

- Before and after comparisons;
- Treatment and control group comparisons;
- Achievement of performance targets;
- Indicators of change from surveys or interviews;
- Cost-benefit analysis.

The most in-depth evaluation of an Australian initiative that this project has uncovered is the Wired High Rise project, a study of the impacts of the RFTC project. The RFTC project is an initiative to establish a wired community in Atherton Gardens, a high-rise public housing estate in Fitzroy, Victoria. The project involves collaboration among the state and local government, not-for-profit organisations and private companies. These include InfoXchange (the primary agency), the Department of Human Services (DHS) including the OoH, City of Yarra, BSL, Outreach Victoria, Jesuit Social Services, Microsoft and Hewlett-Packard (Meredyth et al., 2003a).

Some evaluations employ more than one study design. For example, the urban renewal evaluations by Randolph et al. (2004) employ before and after and treatment and control group comparisons, and the Tenant Employment Project (TEP) evaluation comprise both an assessment of the extent to which performance targets have been achieved and a cost-benefit analysis (NSW DOH, 2000a).

4.1.1 Before and After Comparisons

Randolph et al. (2004) evaluates the impacts of urban renewal in NSW, Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia by comparing outcomes in case study areas before and after urban renewal has been implemented. To do this, the study
employs data from the 1996 and 2001 Census and internal state housing monitoring systems and reports and interviews with focus groups to evaluate outcomes. Of particular interest to this project are comparisons of employment and educational outcomes before and after urban renewal. The study found that jobs were created after urban renewal in Westwood precinct 1, though respondents to the study found difficulty with isolating the impact of economic development work on employment from other factors that might impact upon the employment outcome. In Leichhardt, an increase in school numbers was reported and anecdotal evidence of reduced truancy and increased local school enrolments was found. In Kwinana, an increase in school numbers was recorded.

The Wired High Rise project is a three-year project undertaken by the Institute of Social Research at Swinburne University to evaluate the impacts of the RFTC project on Atherton Gardens’ tenants. The main aims of the project are to:

- Examine the impacts of free domestic access to computer and the RFTC network on low-income persons living in a high-rise public housing estate;
- Identify ways that RFTC can assist low-income persons to use new technologies to derive personal economic and social benefits;
- Assess the extent to which the RFTC network assists service providers to meet client needs;
- Examine the implications of the RFTC network for information and social policy.

The project involves a survey of residents before the computer network is established, to be repeated in two years' time, when the network is well established, to allow for before and after comparisons. The follow-up survey is designed to track changing patterns of computer use among tenants of the Atherton Gardens estate that are linked to social indicators so that impacts of access to technology can be assessed. The survey questionnaire has been designed to be completed by one member of each household, who answers questions about individuals in the household and the household itself. The first survey was undertaken over six weeks from May 2002 (Meredyth et al., 2003a). The survey contains various questions on employment, such as employment status, key uses of the computer (work or education being some of the choices the respondent can choose from), whether the respondent has undertaken training within the last 12 months, reasons not looking for work (for respondents who are not employed and not looking for work) etc (Meredyth et al., 2003b). Findings of the follow-up survey have not been published. Therefore, the impacts of the RFTC are not known yet.

Arthurson (2001, 2002) examines the impacts of public housing redevelopment and tenure mix had on the on the concentrations on of public housing in six case studies areas, that is, Villawood and Waterloo in NSW, Manoora and Inala in Queensland and The Parks and Salisbury North in South Australia, though the studies do not draw direct links between these initiatives and economic participation outcomes such as employment and education. The studies find that in all case studies areas except
Waterloo, the concentrations of public housing fall after redevelopment. For example, the percentage of residents in the area who are in public housing fell from 52% to 20% in Inala. The Waterloo project was an exception as it did not incorporate tenure mix as an objective of the redevelopment at that time.

The Live 'n' Learn Campus Pilot Project is a longitudinal project set up to evaluate a program pilot aimed at providing housing and employment training for unemployed and homeless young people in the suburb of Miller in Liverpool, Western Sydney. The program is based on the foyer model operating in the UK that offers an integrated package of housing and employment assistance to homeless young people. The evaluation methodology involves face-to-face interviews with participants at the beginning and end of their stay at the Campus, or after a fixed period of their stay, to obtain information on attitudes and expectations at the beginning and intentions upon leaving the program (Randolph et al., 2001). Results from the project are currently not yet available.

4.1.2 Treatment and Control Group Comparisons

Randolph et al. (2004) evaluates the impacts of urban renewal in NSW, Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia by comparing outcomes in the treatment group, that is, the urban renewal area, with outcomes in the control group, that is, another similar area not subject to urban renewal. The treatment (T) and control (C) groups selected for evaluation in Randolph et al. (2004) are:

- Lalor Park (T) vs Minto (C) in NSW;
- Leichhardt (T) vs Acacia Ridge (C) in Queensland;
- Westwood Precinct 1 (T) vs Precinct 6 (C) in South Australia;
- Kwinana (T) vs Queens Park (C) in Western Australia.

The study found that unemployment rates in the treatment groups in Queensland and South Australia fell between 1996 and 2001, but remained relatively unchanged in the control areas. In Western Australia, unemployment fell in the treatment group, but increased in the control group over the same period. In NSW, however, unemployment fell at a faster rate in the control group than in the treatment group, though the unemployment rate in the treatment group remained lower than in the control group.

The evaluation of the PTEP in Collingwood and Fitzroy by Street Ryan and Associates Pty Ltd (2004) uses Richmond as a control site, though comparative analysis of employment outcomes is not undertaken. The study notes that there is a higher quality of cleaning and gardening work in the Collingwood and Fitzroy contract than in Richmond, where there is no PTEP contract requirement.

The Wired High Rise project involves analysis of findings from the treatment group, Atherton Gardens, against a control group in the Collingwood public housing estate to provide a basis for comparison. The first stage of research has been conducted and has involved a survey of tenants, both on the Atherton Gardens estate and a
comparable estate in Collingwood, to provide baseline information about the residents in both the treatment and control estates (Meredyth et al., 2003a).

YP4 is an experiment in which 480 young homeless jobseekers aged 18-35 will be randomly assigned to the treatment or control groups. The four key partner organisations that will deliver the trial are Hanover Welfare Services, Melbourne Citymission, BSL and Loddon Mallee Housing Services (Coventry, 2005). The trial will focus on the areas of Greater Bendigo, Melbourne Central Business District and Inner West, Middle South of Metropolitan Melbourne, and Outer South (Horn, 2004). The key outcome objectives of the trial are to:

- Improve participants’ employability and reliance on earned income;
- Improve the housing outcome of participants;
- Improve participants’ health and well-being;
- Assist participants to better integrate into their communities;
- Join up housing, employment and personal support services for participants (Grace, 2005)

YP4 is an experiment in which young homeless jobseekers will be randomly assigned to the treatment or control groups. This proposed program and evaluation will therefore take on some of the key characteristics of US social experiment research. It is a form of research design not used in Australia previously.

The key research question underpinning the YP4 trial is whether or not YP4 assists trial participants to achieve sustainable employment and housing outcomes, and if so, whether these outcomes are sustainable over time. The treatment group will be given a single contact point to address employment, housing, educational and personal support goals in an integrated manner over two years. In contrast, the control group will receive assistance in the standard way, which has been recognised as being fragmented and ineffective for homeless jobseekers (Grace, 2005).

4.1.3 Achievement of Performance Targets

The method of analysing the extent to which performance targets have been achieved works by simply comparing the actual number of tenants who have been assisted into economic participation by an initiative with set targets. Two major NSW Department of Housing evaluations have been based on this method. They are the TEP (NSW DOH, 2000a) and Community Contracts pilots (NSW DOH, 2002b).

The TEP established various indicators of performance and set targets for performance at the outset of the project. Indicators included the number of persons employed through the project, number of persons employed who were long-term unemployed, number of participants receiving formal training etc. Examples of targets for performance included 60 persons employed, 85% of persons employed being persons who have been registered as unemployed for more than a year etc.
Performance targets were also set for each individual project that was implemented under the TEP pilot. The projects included access to positions within the Department, cleaning and grounds maintenance, construction and general building, building relationships with Job Network agencies, small business and the Olympics. Targets were reached or exceeded in the cleaning and grounds maintenance, small business and Olympics projects, but the rest of the projects failed to reach their individual targets.

The Community Contracts pilot established various indicators for performance that were similar to the TEP, including number of persons employed, number of persons employed who were public housing tenants and number of persons receiving training connected to their employment.

The PTEP evaluation in Victoria by Street Ryan and Associates Pty Ltd (2004) evaluates outcomes of against set performance targets. As at December 2003, 14 PTEP workers were employed, therefore exceeding the twelve month target of 8.5 effective full-time workers. The PTEP clause does not specify that the public housing tenants employed under the clause have to be previously unemployed persons. According to the evaluation study, all PTEP participants have had previous work experience, and several had been employed by a previous contractor or engaged in work under the CJPg (Street Ryan and Associates Pty Ltd, 2004). Thus, there is a possibility that there has been little employment gain, and that the PTEP clause has merely re-distributed employment.

4.1.4 Indicators of Change from Surveys or Interviews

The NRS evaluation was undertaken by the Institute for Social Research at Swinburne University of Technology from April 2002 to early 2003 (Salvaris, 2003). The main aims of the project were to:

- Develop indicators of progress and well-being for the pilot NRAs in Latrobe Valley and Wendouree West and the overall NR project in consultation with the DHS, residents and other stakeholders;
- Provide technical and research advice and resources for DHS and NR areas;
- Develop models and guidelines that can be replicated in other NR projects.

Under the evaluation framework, 26 core indicators were developed using qualitative and quantitative data to measure the extent to which the NRS was achieving its key objectives\(^4\). Quantitative data were resourced from administrative information provided by some government departments and qualitative data were collected through a community survey that was implemented by local residents to promote resident empowerment and community-building. The community survey collected

\(^4\) Key objectives were increasing community pride and participation, physical upgrading, lifting employment, training and education opportunities and expanding the local economy, improving safety, health and well-being, and improving access to services and government responsiveness VIC OOH (2002) (Ed, Victoria Office of Housing) Office of Housing, Melbourne...
yearly subjective or perception data using 91 questions similar to the Victorian Population Health Survey and the Local Safety Survey.

The first of two reports on the outcomes of neighbourhood renewal has been made available in 2003 to provide an early indication of the extent to which the NRS has been successful and to recommend adjustments to policy. The second report is expected to be completed at the end of 2005 (VIC OOH, 2002, Salvaris, 2003). Key findings in the first report are based on Latrobe Valley and Wendouree residents’ responses to the community survey, and relate to indicators of perceived current conditions, support for the NRS and changes in key NRS goal areas within the past 12 months. Overall, residents indicated that their support for the NRS goal of lifting employment, education and the local economy was the highest among all the key goals, giving the goal a rating of 9.51 out of a maximum of 10. The goal that received the second highest support was improvement in safety, receiving a rating of 9.48. 24% of residents felt that education and training opportunities had increased in the last 12 months, while 7% felt that opportunities had decreased. 58% stated that there had been no perceived changes in the level of education and training opportunities in the local area. Public transport, too, was perceived to have improved in the last 12 months by 12% of residents, while only 2% felt that it had worsened. The report acknowledged that resident participation as interviewers in the survey process may yield information that is subjective. Therefore, particular emphasis was placed on confidentiality, accuracy and detachment on the part of the interviewers (Salvaris, 2003). However, it is still the case that the information provided by residents who were respondents may be subject to strategic response bias, that is, respondents may give answers that are designed to secure continued assistance through the NRS.

4.1.5 Cost-Benefit Analysis

Stubbs and Storer (1996) and Stubbs and Hardy (2000) conducted cost-benefit analyses of the Neighbourhood Improvement Program (NIP) in the South West Sydney region to evaluate the costs and benefits of the program. The case study area in the Stubbs and Storer (1996) investigation was Airds, while Stubbs and Hardy (2000) undertook evaluation of neighbourhood renewal in three areas, that is, Airds, Proctor Way Claymore and Minto Intensive Management Area.

Stubbs and Storer's (1996) cost-benefit analysis estimated the costs of unemployment amount to an annual figure of $60,000 per person when factors such as lost contribution to gross domestic product, and the direct and indirect costs of benefits, services and administration were accounted for. This represented an annual cost of at least $22 million in Airds. It was estimated that the NIP needed to create 23 permanent jobs to give a return on the annual cost of the investment. Otherwise, 68 jobs needed to be created and maintained over the projected 7-year life of the NIP. Since Stubbs and Storer (1996) conducted the cost-benefit analysis of the NIP in Airds, employment development initiatives have been designed by the NSW Department of Housing, resulting in the employment of approximately 60
tenants on urban renewal activities, of which 12 were employed full-time. Stubbs and Hardy (2000) calculated that the full-time positions represented an annual cost saving (or benefit) of $720,000, and that at least another $720,000 per year could be added if the existing level of casual jobs were maintained. This would potentially create an annual benefit of $1,440,000 or a cost-benefit ratio of 1.4.

The TEP evaluation also included a cost-benefit analysis and showed a net benefit. The total benefit was calculated in terms of the extra rental revenue to the NSW Department of Housing, extra tax revenue to the Commonwealth government and savings on social security payments for the period of employment of each participant. After subtracting the project cost from total benefit, the net benefit was estimated to be $151,534.19 (NSW DOH, 2000a)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy initiative</th>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community contracts (NSW DOH, 2002b)</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Before and after comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Live ‘n’ Learn Campus</td>
<td>Miller, Liverpool, Western Sydney (New South Wales)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Improvement Program (Stubbs, 2000, Stubbs and Storer, 1996)</td>
<td>South West Sydney region (New South Wales)</td>
<td>Treatment and control group comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Tenant Employment Program (Street Ryan and Associates Pty Ltd, 2004)</td>
<td>Collingwood and Fitzroy (Victoria)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Employment Program (NSW DOH, 2000a)</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban renewal (Randolph and Wood, 2003, Randolph et al., 2004)</td>
<td>Lalar Park (New South Wales) Leichhardt (Queensland) Westwood precinct 1 (South Australia) Kwinana (Western Australia)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wired High Rise project (Meredyth et al., 2003a)</td>
<td>Atherton Gardens (Victoria)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YP</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Social Experiments

Social experiments, or random assignment studies as they are sometimes called, are field research studies in which individuals or households, or more rarely firms or organisations are randomly assigned to two or more alternative categories of treatment. The effects or impacts of the treatments are then assessed both in terms of individuals, or households, and broader social and economic outcomes. These types of social experiments have the following key features (Greenberg and Shroder, 1997:4).

- Random assignment creating at least two groups of participants who differ from one another by chance alone
- Policy intervention resulting in different incentives, opportunities or constraints facing the members of the randomly assigned groups in their daily lives
- Follow-up data collection enables the measurement of outcomes for members of each group
- Evaluation through statistical inference and informed judgement about the degree to which the interventions have caused differences in outcomes between groups

Overwhelmingly social experiments have been conducted in the US; few studies have been conducted elsewhere. In the period 1962-1999 Greenberg et al. (1999) found that 217 social experiments had been conducted. Noting that the overall trend line is upwards they suggest that a social experiments industry has developed in the US. Further, this industry is dominated by three large organisations that have been responsible for nearly fifty percent of the studies. Not surprisingly players in this industry argue for the value of this approach to program evaluation and design. For example, Gueron (2000:1) from Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC)\(^5\), one of the three large organisations with a capacity to run social experiments, argues:

> I and many of my MDRC colleagues have fought to implement random assignment in diverse arenas and to show that this approach is feasible, ethical, uniquely convincing, and superior for answering certain questions.

Gueron (2000:2) elaborates on the types of questions random assignment research is best suited to answer and those that it does not when she states:

> Random assignment can answer the important ‘Does it make a difference?’ and ‘For whom?’ questions, but it must be combined with other approaches to get answers to the critical question of ‘Why?’ and ‘Under what conditions?’

---

\(^5\) MDRC is a nonprofit, nonpartisan social policy research organization that developed at the time of the war on poverty social programs with the aim of evaluating social programs and contributing to their ongoing development.
In other words it is a form of research used for evaluating the outcomes of known and easily described program measures\(^6\). However, these program measures are always developed in a context where other things are going on. Therefore, it is important to identify and understand the connections between measures and context. The measured outcomes need to be interpreted. It also means that this type of research is proposed and undertaken in a context that is politically contested. This then requires not only carefully designed research but ‘operational and political skills’ which are used to market the research and interpret and promote the findings (Gueron, 2000:1)

The social experiments industry has also generated a peer review literature that scrutinises and debates the value of social experiments (see for example (Angrist et al., 1996, Raudenbush, 1997, Riccio and Hasenfeld, 1996, Bloom et al., 1999). There is also a literature proposing how social experiment analysis might be extended through using new analytical techniques such as ‘pooling data across experiments’ and using ‘multi-level modelling techniques’ to analyse pooled data and ‘random assignment of groups’ (Riccio and Bloom, 2002).

In the context of welfare reform there have been a number of demonstration programs that have linked housing and labour market assistance and been evaluated through social experiment research. They are broadly of two types that line up with the debate over the efficacy of demand and supply side housing assistance. First, there are those that are seeking to evaluate the outcomes of deconcentration type programs based on demand side rental subsidies. These programs, Gautreaux and MTO, respond to concentration of low income unemployed public housing tenants in American inner cities through programs moving households to the suburbs while supporting them with counselling. Second, there are the MTW and Jobs-Plus programs that are supply side public housing based initiatives that seek to increase employment and earnings of public tenant households while they remain in public housing.

One in each of these two categories has been largely discounted as reliable social experiments. In the case of the Gautreaux program systematic bias was established by the way participants entered the program either through screening by officials or self selection by prospective participants (Rosenbaum and Miller, 1997, McClure, 2004, Goetz, 2003:242, Goering et al., 2002). In the case of the MTW Program, as noted above, the results are at best ambiguous because of the complex interactions of different program measures and broader welfare system changes. As Abravanel et al (2004:4) note, this was a program that encouraged experimentation in ways that did not support impact measurement. However, the MTO and the Jobs-Plus

\(^6\) Most social experiments test programs used by low income and otherwise disadvantaged people. Remarkably few social experiments as Greenberg et al Greenberg, D., Shroder, M. and Onstott, M. (1999) *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13, 157-172. note, have focussed on higher income groups and their use of social programs. Further, they state that ‘the great bulk of interventions have focussed on labour markets’.
programs were designed very deliberately to be evaluated through social experiment research. Consistent with this type of research design random assignment was used to create groups that could be compared.

### 4.2.1 The Moving to Opportunity Demonstration Program

The MTO demonstration program was conducted in five cities: Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York. Public housing developments were selected from among those in census tracts with poverty rates of 40 percent or higher. The experiment was designed to show whether the negative impacts of these neighbourhoods, termed distressed neighbourhoods, can be reversed by offering public-housing families the opportunity to move to a more affluent neighbourhood. The core hypothesis being tested by MTO was that more affluent neighbourhoods will have positive and statistically significant effects on the lives of the experimental-group families when compared with the lives of the in-place control-group members. One of the hypothesised effects was that there would be increases in employment and earnings.

Within the selected developments residents with children were invited to apply to participate in the demonstrations project. In total, across the five sites, 4,608 families were found eligible and randomly assigned by a lottery that resulted in random assignment to one of three groups.

- A Control group that received no new assistance, but continued to be eligible for public housing.
- A Section 8 group that received a traditional Section 8 voucher, without geographic restriction.
- An Experimental group that received a Section 8 voucher and special mobility counselling and must move to a neighbourhood with a low concentration of poverty.
- Within each site approximately 285 HUD vouchers were allocated across groups 2 and 3.

As is usual in social experiment research there were limitations with the research design. In this case they included some differences in the composition of volunteers and non-volunteers in the same public housing estates; a low proportion of households in both groups receiving vouchers were able to use their voucher housing assistance (low ‘lease-up rates’); small sample sizes; differences in the counselling programs across sites; uniqueness of sites and limited comparability and generalisability; limited knowledge of neighbourhood processes that might shape outcomes (Goering, 2003:14). Overall it has been acknowledged that the MTO participants were somewhat different from public housing tenants that did not apply to participate in MTO (Goering, 2003:19).

It has attracted certain types of families with specific characteristics and levels of motivation. Motivation helps set movers apart from those who failed to move and appears to be a key to MTO’s future.
Thus far the results demonstrate that the MTO participants who received vouchers have benefited. They have been able to move and live in neighbourhoods with lower rates of poverty. Also they have experienced some improvement in both mental and physical health. However, there has been no noticeable improvement in employment, earnings and reduced welfare receipts of the experimental group compared to the control group (Goering et al., 2002, Goering, 2003, Kling et al., 2004).

4.2.2 Jobs-Plus Demonstration Program

The Jobs-Plus demonstration program was conducted in six cities that were chosen through a national competition to be Job-Plus study sites: Baltimore, Maryland; Chattanooga, Tennessee; Dayton, Ohio; Los Angeles, California; St. Paul, Minnesota; Seattle, Washington. The central question behind this demonstration project and social experiment evaluation was ‘Can a multi-component employment initiative that is located in public housing developments help residents work, earn more money, and improve their quality of life?’

This was answered by establishing two groups within each city, what is referred to above as ‘random assignment of groups’ (Riccio and Bloom, 2002).

- One housing development was randomly selected (through a type of lottery) from a matched pair or triplet of eligible public housing developments to operate Jobs-Plus
- One or two other developments were assigned to a comparison group.

Data on residents’ work and welfare receipt in both the Jobs-Plus and the comparison developments were used to examine the program impacts on residents and on their housing developments. These data were obtained from administrative records of government agencies for up to six years before and six years after Jobs-Plus was launched in 1998. Review of the base line data indicated that good matches between Jobs-Plus sites and comparison sites were established.

As discussed in the previous chapter three program elements were established in the randomly selected Jobs-Plus site: moderation of rent increases as a consequence of increases in earned income; extra employment-related services; strengthening social ties through community development. Across the six sites the program was implemented at different levels of intensity. In two sites it was not fully implemented and in one the program stopped early when the site was redeveloped under the HOPE IV redevelopment program.

Nevertheless, the results of the Jobs-Plus social experiment evaluation are significant. The MDRC evaluation (Bloom et al., 2005) found

For all sites combined, Jobs-Plus produced positive impacts on residents’ earnings, whether or not the residents continued living in their developments.

In the stronger implementation sites, Jobs-Plus had positive earnings impacts for many different types of residents, striking earnings effects for immigrant men,
positive but smaller impacts on residents' employment rates, and no impact on residents' welfare receipt (because rates were dropping precipitously among all welfare recipients).

Of course it is difficult to discern from the research evidence what contribution each of the three Job-Plus components made to this outcome. However, it is argued that ‘patterns in the data suggest that the Jobs-Plus rent incentives [moderation of rent increases] were a crucial ingredient in the program’s effects on earnings' (ibid:158). This incentive served as a type of ‘hook’ which was used to draw public tenants into the program and link them with employment-related services and community development processes.

These results do, as the evaluation noted, stand in contrast to the results of the MTO demonstration program, which evaluated the results of public housing tenants moving into the private rental sector in less poor neighbourhoods (Bloom et al., 2005:155).

The effectiveness of Jobs-Plus stands in marked contrast to the absence of labor market effects (at least in the short term) from an alternative approach that sought to improve public housing residents' self-sufficiency through residential mobility strategies — that is, by offering residents special rent vouchers to subsidize their rent in the private housing market in low-poverty neighborhoods.

Whether the recent findings of the MTO and Jobs-Plus become influential in a broader public policy debate about the efficacy of supply side and demand side forms of housing assistance remains to be seen. At the time of writing the Job-Plus evaluation (Bloom et al., 2005) had only just been published.
5 FUTURE RESEARCH FOR PROGRAM AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

This report has presented evidence that there are strong connections between the growth in unemployment, precarious employment and changes in housing outcomes for Australian households. Working age public housing tenants are the tenure group that stands out as having experienced the greatest increase in labour market disadvantage over the past three decades measured in terms of full-time employment, unemployment and not-in-the-labour-force growth. In recent years this labour market disadvantage has become a policy focus for both federal and state governments and a range of program initiatives have been developed by each of the state and territory housing authorities.

In both the USA and UK similar processes have led to a concentration of low income precariously employed and unemployed working age people in social housing. Similarly in both these countries there have been many policy and program responses that have sought to increase the economic participation level of public housing tenants. This conclusion draws together this discussion of policy and program responses in two parts. First, it highlights the differences and similarities characterising Australian, USA and UK policy and program responses. Second, it considers what aspects of the international experience might be useful for the further development of the Australian policy and program response to the low level of economic participation of public housing tenants.

5.1.1 Australia, USA and UK compared

A six-part typology of policy and program measures was developed as a means for simplifying the mass of program and policy initiatives for all three countries. This typology also aids comparison of what has happened in the three countries. A summary of the main policy and program directions in each of the three countries is presented in Table 5.1. This comparison reveals both similarities and differences across the three countries.

The approach to direct employment is where there is great similarity. In all three countries there have been initiatives that have led to tenants being employed. However, the overall outcomes are difficult to assess. In all three countries there is no attempt to monitor the overall outcomes of this type of employment. There is some data on the number of jobs traineeships provided but it is contained in many different reports and program evaluations and it is not possible to provide an overall assessment. However, it seems that the number employed in this way in all three countries is not great. Possibly the reason for this is the mismatch between the skills required by social housing providers and contractors and the skill levels of tenants.

In the area of landlord/tenant relations the USA stands out. Public housing authorities through federal funding have become players in the implementation of post 1996 ‘welfare reform’ which is seeking to force more low income and low skilled working age people into the low wage work force and at the same time reduce the
concentration of low income tenants in inner city public housing estates. The exception to this policy approach is found in the Jobs-Plus social experiment. Australia and the UK are similar in that rent setting arrangements discourage low skilled low income tenants from increasing labour market income. In both countries tenants who begin to increase their income in the labour market experience high effective marginal rates of taxation. In Australia most state and territory housing authorities recognise this effect and are delaying rent increases for a few months following income increases. At this stage there has been no evaluation of the extent of the take up of this concession or its long-term impact on rates of economic participation by tenants. In the UK there is no prospective policy change in the Housing Benefit payment system.

Table 5.1: Responding to unemployed social housing tenants: a comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct employment</td>
<td>Some direct employment and employment by contractors</td>
<td>Some direct employment and employment by contractors</td>
<td>Some direct employment and employment by contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby economic development initiatives</td>
<td>No history of enterprise zones</td>
<td>History of support for enterprise zones in areas near public housing areas</td>
<td>Area based initiatives support business development in deprived areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord/tenant relation</td>
<td>Rent formulae discourages increased earned income – poverty traps Delay rent increases for tenants moving into employment</td>
<td>‘Welfare reform’ policy ‘problems’ • welfare dependency • concentration of poverty Require tenants to • leave welfare for low wage labour • disperse</td>
<td>Housing Benefit formula discourages increased earned income – poverty traps No significant change in Housing Benefit system likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assets and supply</td>
<td>Asset renewal, reducing total supply and no new supply in strong labour market areas</td>
<td>Asset renewal, reducing total supply and no new supply in strong labour market areas</td>
<td>Asset renewal, stable total supply and some new supply in strong labour market areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment services development</td>
<td>Locality based initiatives with emphasis on partnerships</td>
<td>Limited and fragmentary</td>
<td>Service expansion with performance targets and new forms of coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community initiatives</td>
<td>Support for formation of groups and local enterprises</td>
<td>Support largely limited to facility provision and ameliorating effects of drug use</td>
<td>Strong support for community development and say in service planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Australia there is no history of designating areas and then providing grants and tax concessions and relaxing regulations to firms locating in these areas. However, it has been a public policy and program response to economic decline in some areas in both the USA and UK. Public housing estates, characterised by low levels of economic participation, have been designated in the USA as Enterprise Zones or
Enterprise Communities and in the UK these areas have received Regional Selective Assistance and Urban Development Corporations and Enterprise Zones have been established. In the UK the policy discussion about the efficacy of this approach has been extensive. The conclusion in the UK is that this type of area based initiative does remain an important measure for economic regeneration in some areas. However, the policy discussion is also clear that there is ambiguity about the contribution that these measures make to economic activity over and above what would have happened if there had not been an area based initiative.

A significant proportion of social housing in all three countries is in need of renewal because of the age and location of stock in areas that have experienced significant economic decline. In all three countries renewal programs have been established. However, there is an important difference between the countries. In Australia and the US the existing stock is being renewed. However, in both these countries this renewal is associated with declining overall supply in social housing and no significant change in the spatial distribution of the remaining stock. In other words there is no expansion of supply in areas with strong labour markets. In the UK there is renewal of the existing stock and some provision of new stock in areas with strong labour market demand. Resources for this new stock are being derived from a ‘tax’ on developers of new housing which requires them to contribute to the expansion of the social housing stock. They do this either by paying a levy into a social housing fund or by handing over completed dwellings to social housing providers in new housing estates.

Employment service provision to tenants in Australia and the USA is similar. In both countries arrangements are made at the local level with a great deal of diversity and experimentation in the arrangements. However, there is no overarching framework that systematically links public housing tenants to employment and training service providers. Evidence of outcomes is found in local program evaluations but there is no attempt to present outcomes at an aggregate city or state level. Again in the USA there is an exception in the Jobs-Plus pilot project where public housing tenants were systematically linked to employment and other support services. This general Australian and US picture of diversity and experimentation stands in contrast to the UK where since the mid 1990s there has been a significant expansion of employment services to priority areas. This expansion has been accompanied by new institutional arrangements at the central ministry and locality levels which have aimed to increase the level of coordination between agencies around targets for levels of service provision and employment outcomes. Further, the UK government supports systematic evaluations of these programs by university based research groups. The results of this research are evident in the ongoing policy and program development work led by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Support for community initiatives in the three countries has a similar pattern to employment service provision. In Australia and the USA there is diversity and experimentation but no overarching policy framework that supports community development amongst public housing tenants linked to employment services. This is
in contrast to the UK where the expansion of employment services is closely associated with support for civil society groups. In the UK there is a broad commitment to assisting the formation and capacity building of groups so that they have a capacity to be represented and be active in program development and in the setting of service targets.

### 5.1.2 Further Australian policy and program development

What aspects of the international experience might be useful for the further development of the Australian policy and program response aimed at increasing the economic participation of public housing tenants? The response to this question is again framed against the background of the typology of measures and comes out of a consideration of what further initiatives might be possible. The possibilities are summarised in table 5.2 and discussed below.

**Table 5.2 Summary of possibilities for policy and program development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Australian approach</th>
<th>Possible development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct employment</strong></td>
<td>Some direct employment and employment by contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nearby economic development initiatives</strong></td>
<td>No history of enterprise zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landlord/tenant relation</strong></td>
<td>Rent formulae discourages increased earned income – poverty traps Delay rent increases for tenants moving into employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing assets and supply</strong></td>
<td>Asset renewal, reducing total supply and no new supply in strong labour market areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment services development</strong></td>
<td>Locality based initiatives with emphasis on partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community initiatives</strong></td>
<td>Support for formation of groups and local enterprises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two possible developments suggested by this typology that can be discounted and are not considered any further here. First, there is no history of enterprise zones in Australia and there seems little point in pursuing this idea further. Second, no consideration is given to program development around housing assets and supply issues. There is a debate about the future of social housing supply in Australia. However, significant policy change and institutional development is
required which is not in prospect. Further, the broader issue of housing supply for low income households is considered fully in other housing research.

Instead, the focus should be on two projects. The first is further development of the ways in which state and territory housing authorities directly employ tenants or require their contractors to employ tenants. The evidence presented in this report demonstrates that there is experience in Australia about how employment opportunities can be established. Evaluation reports of particular projects demonstrate real benefits to public housing tenants employed in these ways. There is clearly scope for further evaluation of this program experience and how best practice might be further embedded in the routine operations of the state and territory housing authorities. It may then be possible to set targets for this type of employment practice. This initiative could be developed through a tenant employment best practice project developed in collaboration with state housing authority operational managers. The aim of this project would be to produce a 'Tenant employment best practice manual' and perhaps an accompanying training program.

The second project would be a pilot project with three distinct courses of action indicated in table 5.2: a redesigned rent formula that reduced work disincentives; more systematic linking of public housing tenants to employment and training services; and systematic support for the formation of groups to support tenant engagement with training and employment services. This pilot could have the following elements

- Established in say two or three states and territories and in two or three geographic areas in each of the states and territories resulting in between six and nine pilot project sites;
- Involve federal and state government agencies, through a formal pilot project partnership arrangement, that recognised the shared responsibilities for housing, income support, education and training and community development;
- An explicit cost sharing arrangement between federal and state governments that recognised both the costs, in particular rent foregone by housing authorities, and benefits, such as reduced income security payments; and
- An accompanying evaluation program that would seek to understand the effect of the different measures on the employment outcomes of public housing tenants, which may include the use of control groups in the evaluation design;

In many respects this is a proposal to develop a pilot program similar to the USA Jobs-Plus pilot project, discussed in chapter 3. This pilot project, referred to as a social experiment, was based on the three elements of employment-related services and activities; financial incentives to work, consisting of changes in public housing rent rules; and community support for work. The evidence from the accompanying research was that the program resulted in increased economic participation of tenants.
APPENDIX 1

This appendix offers a detailed description of Australian policies that are designed to use housing assistance to promote economic participation.

A1.1 New South Wales

In recent years, the NSW Department of Housing has initiated a number of employment and training pilot programs to address the lack of economic participation among public housing tenants. Key pilot programs that have been implemented in recent years include:

- TEP;
- Community Contracts;
- WorkiT;
- Handypersons.

The TEP is a one-year employment and training pilot implemented by the NSW Department of Housing, with funding assistance from the Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business (Regional Assistance Program) to establish and evaluate initiatives that assist long-term unemployed tenants into employment. The pilot was introduced in May 1999 by the Department in recognition of the high proportion of unemployed public housing tenants living in public housing estates. The employment and training initiatives established and evaluated under the TEP pilot were:

The employment and training initiatives established and evaluated under the TEP pilot were (NSW DOH, 2000b):

- Improving public housing tenants’ access to entry level positions in the NSW Department of Housing;
- Use of the Department’s cleaning of grounds maintenance contracts to create employment opportunities for tenants through the use of a tenant employment clause in contracts;
- Use of the Department’s construction or general building contracts to create employment opportunities for tenants through the use of a tenant employment clause in contracts;
- Assisting tenants to establish individual or cooperative small businesses;
- Improving tenants’ access to Job Network employment services.

The community contracts pilot project was implemented by the Department, with funding assistance from the Regional Assistance Program, to develop a contracting system through which contracts are selectively tendered to Job Network agencies and not-for-profit organisations with an employment focus that requires these agencies to employ and supervise public housing tenants. The pilot ran from December 2000 to December 2001 and the types of contracts included in the project

...
were lawns and grounds maintenance, landscaping, fencing, painting and cleaning (NSW DOH, 2002b).

The WorkiT program was established in September 2003 to be run over two years. The program has two main aims. First, it awards partner organisations the management of the Department’s service maintenance contracts through a tendering process, requiring the partner organisations to employ public housing tenants to undertake the maintenance work. Second, it provides resources to partner organisations to deliver training and employment opportunities for long-term unemployed public housing residents in defined project locations across NSW (NSW DOH, 2003o). The WorkiT program targets unemployed tenants, especially the long-term unemployed, young people, sole parents and other disadvantaged groups such as Indigenous people and disabled tenants (Hughes, 2004).

The Handypersons program was introduced as a pilot to the Bidwill and Minto estates in 1999 (NSW DOH, 2004a). The Handypersons program provides minor maintenance and repair service for public housing tenants. The goals of the program are to improve the quality of life and customer satisfaction for tenants, improve the look and feel of large housing estates, maintain the value of the Department’s assets by preventing small problems from becoming bigger, provide employment for appropriately skilled public housing residents, and teach interested residents how to handle small repair and maintenance work themselves (NSW DOH, 2003h).

Many initiatives trialled under the pilots continue to operate in regions across NSW beyond the conclusion of the pilot projects. This is supported by the community renewal strategy, Transforming Estates into Communities Strategy, the key aims of which are to (NSW DOH, 2002a):

- Increase the sense of community, pride, trust and social responsibility in estates;
- Promote social inclusion and reduce crime and deprivation;
- Open up employment and training opportunities for tenants and improve access to support services;
- Improve the physical environment on public housing estates.

Other current employment and training initiatives in NSW are described in the remainder of this section.

A1.1.1 Access to State Housing Authority Positions and Traineeships

The NSW Department of Housing undertakes to provide employment opportunities for tenants directly by allowing suitable tenants access to entry level positions and traineeships within the Department. Under the TEP, position types offered included client service officer traineeships, call centre traineeships and temporary clerical officer positions. In particular, recruitment for temporary clerical officer positions was restricted to tenant applications. Key strategies adopted in the implementation of this initiative included providing a workshop on ‘Public Sector Selection and Interview Techniques’ and information sessions on application procedures and eligibility criteria (NSW DOH, 2000a).
A1.1.2 Tenant Employment Requirement in Contracts

The Department actively seeks to provide employment for tenants using its own construction and building contracts and cleaning and ground maintenance contracts. A tenant employment clause inserted in the Department’s tender documents, states that tenderers who are assessed as being able to employ tenants in the works will be given preference over tenderers not committing to employing tenants. Successful tenderers must demonstrate that they are fulfilling the tenant employment requirement by submitting documentary evidence to the Department on a regular basis (NSW DOH, 2000b).

The TEP construction and building contract initiative was piloted in the Bidwill and Cranebrook estates, which were being renewed as part of the Department’s Community Renewal Strategy. The types of work that were contracted out included upgrades to existing properties, damage repair and reorientation of properties. Each contractor was required to employ at least two tenant trainees for the works at existing market rates (NSW DOH, 2000a).

The cleaning and ground maintenance contracts implemented under the TEP pilot were first implemented in the Redfern, Waterloo and Riverwood areas. The contracts contained a provision that successful tenderers must employ tenants for 30% of labour hours of the contract (NSW DOH, 2000a). Cleaning and grounds maintenance contracts in Waterloo continue to contain the 30% tenant employment clause (NSW DOH, 2003l). Current community contracts still provide for the employment of public housing tenants. For example, with the assistance of the Department, the Samaritans Foundations has formed an enterprise called the Two Bishops Trust to seek contracts for lawns and grounds maintenance in East and West Lake Macquarie. This business provides employment for public housing tenants. The Department also contracts out maintenance work to Hotline Employment and Training in Lismore. Hotline Employment and Training in turn employs and supervises residents to do the work and provides informal on-the-job training (Hughes, 2004).

Under the recently implemented WorkiT program, successful tenderers of WorkiT contracts are required to employ tenants for maintenance work such as landscaping, cleaning and lawns maintenance, and assist tenants into work opportunities outside the Department’s contracting system (NSW DOH, 2003r). Current WorkiT project locations include Inner West, Inner City and Eastern suburbs of Sydney, Blacktown Local Government Area (LGA), Parramatta LGA, Campbelltown LGA, Newcastle LGA, Illawarra and Taree (NSW DOH, 2003q).

Successful tenderers of Handypersons contracts are also expected to endeavour to fill the handyperson position with an appropriately skilled tenant to handle minor maintenance and repair works. Tenderers wishing to do otherwise will have to seek the express approval of the Department first (NSW DOH, 2003h)
A1.1.3 Employment Incentives in Rental Rebate Policy

The Tenant Employment Incentive Scheme (TEIS) is embedded in the Rental Rebate Policy as a way of encouraging tenants to seek employment. Tenants now pay 25% of their household income in rent, and the maximum rent paid by tenants is the market rent (NSW DOH, 2004b, SCRCSSP, 2004).

TEIS was established during the TEP pilot period and continues to apply (Carvajal, 2003). Under the TEIS, an unemployed tenant who becomes employed is entitled to a grace period of up to 12 weeks, during which his/her rent is not adjusted to the new income level, provided that the tenant reports the change in income within 28 days of gaining paid employment. A tenant’s partner can also apply for the TEIS if the partner meets all the eligibility criteria and has been part of the tenant’s household for a minimum of six months prior to commencing paid employment (NSW DOH, 2004b, NSW DOH, 2004a).

TEIS is not applicable if the tenant or partner informs the Department of Housing that they have gained employment more than 28 days after the commencement of employment, the household is already paying market rent before the commencement of employment, the change in employment status is from casual, seasonal or part-time employment to full-time employment, or the tenant or partner is receiving a New Enterprise Incentive Scheme (NEIS), or income from the Work for the Dole scheme or Community Development Support Project (NSW DOH, 2004b, NSW DOH, 2004a).

A1.1.4 Transfer/Relocation Rules

Employment is identified as a priority criterion for transfer applications. A tenant who is currently not in full-time employment who has been offered paid employment in a new location can request to be transferred if it is impractical for the tenant to commute between his/her dwelling and new work location. In order to be eligible for a transfer, the tenant must have a letter of offer from the potential employer, the employment secured by the tenant must be of a long-term nature and involve a minimum of three days each week, though this minimum may be reduced to two days for some tenants due to medical conditions or care of dependants (NSW DOH, 2004a).

A1.1.5 Asset Management and Redevelopment

The NSW Department of Housing has developed a public housing redevelopment strategy through the Neighbourhood Improvement Program (NIP). Established in 1994 NIP funds the redevelopment of public housing estates and aims to make them similar in standard and appearance to nearby residential neighbourhoods. It also aims to reduce the concentration of socio-economically disadvantaged tenants in public housing estates and reduce the level of stigma often associated with public housing estates. Estates that have been redeveloped through NIP include the Airds, Macquarie Fields and Waterloo (Hughes, 2004).
Under its current community renewal strategy, Transforming Estates into Communities, the Department of Housing continues to advocate the breaking up of large concentrations of public housing dwelling and encourage social mix. It is doing this by increasing the number of houses for sale to tenants and other homebuyers in communities such as Airds, Bradbury, Goonellabah, Inverell and Macquarie Fields. Again this is being driven by the idea that the stigma associated with living in a public housing community can be reduced by creating a greater social mix through tenure mix at a neighbourhood level (NSW DOH, 2003j, NSW DOH, 2003a, NSW DOH, 2003g, NSW DOH, 2003i).

A1.1.6 Cross-Agency Linkages

It is evident from the above account that cross-agency linkages are important in the Department’s strategy to increase economic participation among tenants. The Department actively engages other agencies to facilitate tenants’ access to employment and training. Such agencies are organisations with an employment focus, such as employment services providers, government departments and education and training providers. Apart from cross-agency linkages mentioned above, several other examples are described below.

During the TEP pilot period, the Department commissioned WorkVentures Ltd., an employment services provider, to develop an employment strategy and establish Job Network services on the Redfern and Waterloo estates (NSW DOH, 2000a). The Department is currently working with Centrelink to enhance linkages among agencies and improve access to employment and training services by tenants at the local level (NSW DOH, 2004a). The Kaylon House of Welcome at the Claymore housing estate was jointly established in 1995 by the Department, St. Vincent de Paul and Good Samaritan Order to work with the community and other agencies to encourage community development. One of the achievements of the Kaylon House of Welcome was the establishment of a tenant-run laundromat project called the Claymore Laundromat Project (Robertson and Claxton, 2003). The Department’s community contracts are also selectively tendered to Job Network agencies and not-for-profit organisations with an employment focus, such as Mission Australia, Riverwood Community Centre, Orana Education Cooperative and Samaritans Foundation (NSW DOH, 2002b). Under the WorkiT program, approved employment-focused partner organisations supervise tenants in the work (NSW DOH, 2003o, NSW DOH, 2003r). It is unlikely that an organisation with no previous experience in employment and training will be successful in applying to be a partner organisation under the WorkiT program (NSW DOH, 2003p). For example, partner organisations of the WorkiT program include the Oasis Youth Support Network, Spectrum Employment Services and Hunter Group Training (HGT) Australia. The Oasis Youth Support Network, the partner organisation in the Inner City, Inner West and Eastern suburbs of Sydney, runs 21 programs for homeless people, including residential programs, job placement and employment and training programs, Reconnect Early Intervention programs, education, counselling, rehabilitation and intensive casework. Spectrum Employment Services, the partner organisation in Campbelltown, is a not-
for-profit community-based organisation that aims to assist jobseekers find ongoing paid employment. HGT Australia, the partner organisation in Newcastle, is a not-for-profit training company that operates a specialised traineeship recruitment service and delivers training to businesses throughout the Hunter Valley and north to the Queensland border (NSW DOH, 2003q). Funding is sourced from other departments or organisations in order to support the Department’s employment and training initiatives. For example, the TEP and Community Contracts pilot project were implemented with funding assistance from the Regional Assistance Program (Commonwealth Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business) (NSW DOH, 2000a, NSW DOH, 2002b). Other departments or organisations that have provided financial support include the Department for Women (NSW DOH, 2003b), the Mercy Foundation and St. Vincent De Paul Society (Robertson and Claxton, 2003). Over the past five years, the Department has run a landscaping traineeship program to provide training and employment opportunities for tenants in public housing estates where community renewal works have been undertaken. The traineeships run for 12 months and are available to ten people each year. The landscaping traineeship is currently run by Mission Australia, but is tendered annually (NSW DOH, 2004a). Public housing communities in which the program has been run include Airds, Bradbury, Bidwill and Cranebrook (NSW DOH, 2003a, NSW DOH, 2003c, NSW DOH, 2003f).

The Department establishes linkages with education and training providers to assist tenants find training and employment. TAFE institutions play an important role in providing training for tenants. For example, during the development of the Claymore Laundromat Project, Macquarie Fields Outreach TAFE assisted tenants learn business skills and even provided child care support for female tenants with children (Robertson and Claxton, 2003). Tenants in West Dubbo recently learnt new skills and were then employed to construct fencing on their estate through a special vocational skills program held by the Western Institute of TAFE (NSW DOH, 2003m). In Windale, a TAFE Outreach program is training parents to become assistant teachers (NSW DOH, 2003n). The Airds Neighbourhood Centre, together with TAFE, has initiated a training and employment access project in which a TAFE tutor teaches local women computer skills, and provides employment support and job readiness training (Stubbs, 2000). The Waterloo-Redfern Community Development Project is the result of a partnership between the Department of Housing, University of NSW, tenants and the Inner Sydney Regional Council for Social Development (Bartolomei et al., 2003). The University of New South Wales has been involved in establishing English classes and youth mentoring projects in Waterloo (NSW DOH, 2003l, Bartolomei et al., 2003) and helping the tenants overcome employment problems (Bartolomei et al., 2003).

A1.1.7 Community Enterprise

The Department encourages community enterprise among tenants by assisting interested tenants to form individual or cooperative small businesses. In 2000, the Department started assisting public housing tenants to complete the administrative
processes necessary for registering cooperatives with the NSW Cooperatives Registrar. Tenants seeking to start small businesses were also introduced to the New Enterprise Incentive Scheme (NSW DOH, 2001). Recently, the Booragul and Bolton Point public housing tenants participated in a course run under the New Enterprise Incentive scheme that teach skills to tenants who want to start their own businesses (NSW DOH, 2003d). The TEP contained as one of its initiatives the establishment of small business opportunities for tenants. Small business management training was provided to interested tenants who have no business management experience in the areas of finance, marketing and small business law and taxation (NSW DOH, 2000b).

Small businesses that are currently receiving support from the Department include:

- Cover-Up Curtains;
- Furniture recycling business in Riverwood;
- Triple C Catering, The Enterprise Project, Dust Devils cleaning business, coffee shop and Laundromat in Claymore; and
- Paint and Play mobile playgroup in the Macarthur area.

Cover-Up Curtains Cooperative was formed in 2000 as part of the TEP. It is a tenant cooperative that manufactures curtains. Members are trained in small business management and sewing. The concept for Triple C Catering was formed during a Claymore community-visioning day in September 2001. Members within the cooperative currently have different levels of experience in food preparation and small business management. Clients of Triple C Catering include the NSW Department of Housing, and public and private sector organisations (Hughes, 2004).

A1.1.8 Community Development Programs

The Department encourages economic participation through support for programs that stimulate community development. Recent initiatives include community greening programs and personal development courses.

The Community Greening initiative was implemented by the NSW Department of Housing and the Royal Botanic Gardens Sydney in 2000. Community Greening provides activities that stimulate community involvement in improving the physical environment of public housing estates. There are over 40 community gardens in NSW and over 1500 public housing residents involved in the initiative. In 2002 the Green Thumb Gardening Competition was launched by the Department and over 800 entries were received (NSW DOH, 2003e).

Tenants are encouraged to participate in a range of personal development courses such as leadership and resume preparation courses. In 2003, the Riverwood Leadership Course was held to teach practical skills such as leadership, community participation and public speaking skills to residents in Riverwood (Gizilis, 2003). The Miller Youth Centre has also recently undertaken a project to provide skills and confidence in video-making to young people (NSW DOH, 2003k).
A1.1.9 Tenant Participation in Local Decision-Making

The Department actively fosters tenant participation through funding support, Housing Communities Assistance Program (HCAP), leadership training, the Public Housing Customer Council (PHCC), conferences, neighbourhood advisory boards and newsletters.

The Department provides funding to groups that facilitate tenant participation in local decision-making. Community Development and Resourcing Grants (CDRGs) provide funds for tenants to work together with tenant organisations, housing providers and various agencies to address housing issues through small, one-off short-term projects (NSW DOH, n.d.). Regional Tenant Resource Services (RTRSs) are services funded by the government to provide advice and support to public housing residents and groups. The eight RTRSs are South Western Sydney Regional Tenants Association, Western Sydney Regional Public Tenants Council, Riverwood Community Centre, Hunter-Central Coast Tenants Advisory Council, Illawarra Forum, Central Riverina Orana Western Regional Tenants Association, Inner Sydney Regional Council for Social Development and the North & North West Community Legal Service (NSW DOH, 2003e). Public Tenant Councils/Tenant Representative Organisations (PTCs/TROs) that have received funding include South Western Sydney Regional Tenants Association, Western Sydney Regional Public Tenants Council, Central Sydney Public Tenants Council, St George Area Tenants Council, Sutherland Area Tenants Council, Hunter-Central Coast Tenants Advisory Council, Central Riverina Orana Western Regional Tenants Association and the Northern Region Social Housing Tenant’s Council. Illawarra Forum have received funding to work with tenants to develop a suitable model of representation for tenants in the South East Region (NSW DOH, n.d.).

The HCAP provides on-going funding for projects managed by non-government organisations that aim to encourage tenant participation in processes that improve their social and physical environment and community development activities that are in line with the Department’s community renewal strategies. There are HCAP projects operating at Bidwill, Cranebrook, Bellambi, Redfern/Waterloo, Riverwood and various other estates (NSW DOH, 2002a).

Training has been provided in Northern NSW to assist people to improve their skills to work in the community, including starting and running a community group, campaigning on behalf of residents and resolving community conflicts. The PHCC is a tenant group comprising members representing the interests of tenants in public and Aboriginal housing. The PHCC was formed in 2001 and meets quarterly to facilitate communication between the Department and tenants. Following discussions with tenants at the 2003 Social Housing Tenants Conference, a draft Tenant Participation Compact has been developed. The Compact is an agreement between the Department and the public housing tenants about what the Department will do to support and encourage tenant participation. Another Social Housing Tenants Conference is scheduled for 2005 (NSW DOH, n.d.). Neighbourhood
advisory boards comprising residents and local agencies are now important agents in local decision-making on estates like Macquarie Fields, Inverell and Bidwill (NSW DOH, 2003c, NSW DOH, 2003i, NSW DOH, 2003j). Residents in Bellambi and Macquarie Fields have also produced their own newsletters (NSW DOH, 2003j, NSW DOH, 2003b).

A1.1.10 Bridging the Digital Divide

The Department is working to bridge the digital divide by improving tenants’ access to IT and computer skills. WorkVentures Connect and the Department are improving tenants’ chances of achieving employment outcomes by providing them with computer access and training and technical skills. In 2001, WorkVentures and the Department set up a pilot NTC on the Macquarie Fields public housing estate. The NTCs are established in central locations within the estates. Tenants are given access to computers to use computer applications, e-mail and the internet, and access job search assistance and referral to Job Network services and skill development pathways (Taylor, 2003). NTCs now operate in several other housing estates in NSW, including Waterloo and Claymore (NSW DOH, 2003e, Taylor, 2003). The Woolloomooloo NTC has benefited from free rent premises from the Department of Housing, software and equipment contributions from Microsoft, operational cost funding for the first year from Microsoft and the Premier’s Department, and a grant from the Westpac Foundation to develop a network of NTCs through Sydney. Future plans of the NSW Department of Housing include the setting up of NTCs on up to fifty public housing estates in NSW and throughout Australia (Hughes, 2004).

In Cranebrook, an internet café was set up by Barnardos Australia with funding from the Department for Women in 2002 (NSW DOH, 2002a). An estimated 100 Cranebrook residents are given access to the internet under an e-communities project jointly undertaken by the Department and the Office of IT (NSW DOH, 2003f). The E-Communities @ Cranebrook Project provides tenants with access to information on employment opportunities, government services and education (NSW DOH, 2002a).

A1.2 Victoria

Key employment and training initiatives have been implemented under the Victorian Office of Housing (OoH) Neighbourhood Renewal Scheme (NRS) to improve economic participation among public housing tenants. The NRS is a whole-of-government initiative to narrow the gap between disadvantaged neighbourhoods and the rest of Victoria. The strategy’s key aims include (VIC OOH, 2004e):

- Increasing pride and participation in the community;
- Increasing employment, training and education opportunities, and expanding local economies;
- Improving personal safety and reducing crime;
- Upgrading housing and the physical environment;
- Promoting health and wellbeing;
- Improving access to services; and
- Improving government responsiveness.

The employment initiatives implemented in Victoria are detailed in the remainder of this section.

**A1.2.1 Access to State Housing Authority Positions and Traineeships**

The OoH directly employs tenants in positions such as concierge, maintenance and administration. Estates that have benefited from this initiative include Collingwood and Fitzroy (VIC OOH, n.d.).

**A1.2.2 Tenant Employment Requirement in Contracts**

The PTEP commencing on 1 July 2003 at the Collingwood and Fitzroy public housing high-rise estates, is the first Victoria program to incorporate a mandatory public tenant employment clause in contracts between the OoH and commercial parties. The PTEP clause was developed by the Leasing and Technical Services Branch of the OoH and the Neighbourhood Renewal Branch.

The PTEP clause requires successful contractors of cleaning and gardening contracts to employ at least 25% effective full-time employees from Collingwood and Atherton Gardens within three months of the commencement of the contract and 35% effective full-time employees from the two estates after 12 months. The contractor is also required to offer two cleaning and one gardening positions as traineeships. The ‘buddy’ approach, which is the teaming up of an experienced worker with a public housing tenant employee, is used to transfer skills to tenant employees. A training program, Certificate Level Traineeship, has been designed and implemented within the PTEP and runs for two hours every four weeks. The PTEP provides a minimum tenant employment requirement, training structure and supportive environment to improve tenants’ skills (Street Ryan and Associates Pty Ltd, 2004).

**A1.2.3 Employment Incentives in Rental Rebate Policy**

Incentives are embedded in existing rental policy to encourage tenants to seek employment. Tenants pay 25% of their household income in rent, and the maximum rent paid by tenants is the market rent (SCRCSSP, 2004).

Under the current rental rebate policy, an increase in a household member’s earned income results in a rent increase from the Sunday following the income change. In order to encourage tenants and residents of NRAs obtain employment, a 16-week grace period pilot program was implemented on 1 December 2002. Under the program, a 16-week rent freeze is provided for tenants and residents of NRAs who gain employment before rent is re-assessed on their new income. This provides an opportunity for newly employed tenants or residents of NRAs to improve their financial circumstance before their rent is increased and also recognises the additional costs that may be incurred when starting employment.
In order to be eligible for the rent freeze, tenants and residents of NRAs must be:

- Tenants of the OoH, Aboriginal Housing, Community Housing and occupiers of movable units in NRAs;
- Unemployed for a minimum of six months in the last 12 months before gaining employment;
- Participate in the CJPg or obtain other employment, including self-employment.

The period of 16 weeks reflects the maximum length of CJPg projects, which are likely to be the main employment option for unemployed tenants or residents of NRAs. Each household member in NRAs is entitled to a maximum of 16 weeks' rent freeze each year, and the 16 weeks may be claimed non-consecutively. Regardless of whether the employment is full-time or part-time, one week of employment is equal grace week (VIC OOH, 2004j).

A1.2.4 Asset Management and Redevelopment

Public housing redevelopment projects are being used throughout Victoria to reduce the proportion of public housing tenants in disadvantaged areas. For example, public housing redevelopment that began in Norlane in 1992 and ended in 1994 reduced the proportion of public housing tenants from 50% to 35% by locating tenants to other areas. Public housing redevelopment that commenced in East Preston in 1992 and ended in 1998 reduced the proportion of public housing tenants from 65% to 35% (Arthurson, 1998).

The NRS commenced in 2000 in disadvantaged neighbourhoods with high proportions of low-income tenants living in old and neglected public housing estates (Hughes, 2004). The strategy is an initiative of the OoH as part of the Victorian state government’s Growing Victoria Together agenda which seeks to reduce the level of polarisation between disadvantaged neighbourhoods and the rest of Victoria (VIC OOH, 2004e). Properties have been upgraded and sold in the Latrobe Valley, which include the NRAs of Morwell, Moe, Churchill and Traralgon (Hughes, 2004).

A1.2.5 Cross-Agency Linkages

Local work opportunities and learning infrastructure support are established under the NRS in partnership with government departments, employment, education and training providers and organisations with an employment focus to provide tenants with better access employment and training programs and services. The OoH has provided funding for 13 local employment and learning coordinators for a 4-year period in NRAs to work with local agencies to improve local education and employment outcomes (VIC OOH, n.d.).

The OoH has developed an engagement framework with Centrelink to support access to Centrelink services (VIC OOH, n.d.). Linkages have been developed between the Neighbourhood Renewal branch and local government departments to recruit residents under the Victorian Jobs for Young People traineeship program (VIC OOH, 2004h). The Victorian government recently held a forum in partnership with the Department of Employment and Workplace Relations, Department of Family
and Community Services and Department of Education, Science and Training at the Parkside public housing estate to develop strategies to enable local service providers to respond appropriately to local issues and barriers that hinder tenants from increasing their level of economic participation (VIC OOH, n.d.).

A Young Parents' Access Program has been established under the NRS in Corio to assist young women to continue or return to education. The relationship with Corio Bay Senior College has enabled the College to develop the Young Parents' Access Program. The Smarter Geelong Local Learning and Employment Network, DHS, and the City of Greater Geelong provide support and child-care services to young parents to enable them to continue their education after the birth of their babies. A project worker has been employed for nine months through the City of Greater Geelong's Parenting Services Program for the project and a permanent child-care service has been established on site at the school (VIC OOH, 2004i). Tenants who are trained and employed to conduct face-to-face interviews with community members are issued certificates by Swinburne University or TAFE acknowledging their interviewing skills (Broad, 2003).

Under the PTEP clause in cleaning and gardening contracts, the contractor must have experience in assisting unemployed people into employment, education and training, demonstrate the capacity to partner with employment or training service providers to provide employment support for tenants, and demonstrate the capacity to access financial support from Commonwealth and State training programs. This requires contractors to adopt a consortium approach in the implementation of the contracts (Street Ryan and Associates Pty Ltd, 2004). For example, the Brotherhood of StLaurence (BSL), a registered training organisation, has been engaged to help residents at Collingwood and Fitzroy access employment and training programs including OoH work and training programs, cleaning and gardening contracts, entry level positions aged care and child care services, and youth traineeships (Temby et al., 2004).

The RFTC project is a partnership between different agencies such as the OoH, not-for-profit agencies and commercial agencies to alleviate the digital divide between public housing tenants and the rest of Victoria by providing computer and internet access to tenants living in the Atherton Gardens high-rise public housing estate. The OoH has provided funding to rewire the buildings; Multimedia Victoria has provided a grant to prepare a Project Initiation Document (PID); the Community Support Fund has given seed funding to support research; the CJPg and Lucent Technologies has helped to employ and train staff; Hewlett Packard has donated personal computers, printers, a digital camera and scanners for training; Microsoft has provide a site licence for Windows and Office ‘97; the BSL and City of Yarra have provided funds to employ a training co-ordinator; Swinburne University has obtained Federal funding to evaluate the project over three years (Meredyth et al., 2002).
A1.2.6 Community Enterprise

Community enterprises have been established in NRAs, providing commercial services such as horticulture, gardening, recycling and fence building on a commercial basis (Broad, 2003).

In the Latrobe Valley, Ballarat, Norlane, Corio, Seymour and Bendigo, community enterprises such as catering, construction, and furniture removal and restoration have been established (VIC OOH, n.d.). In Wendouree, abandoned local shops have been purchased by Uniting Care Outreach and refurbished. Community consultations regarding the shops’ potential are currently on-going, and suggestions include (VIC OOH, 2004n):

- A café with outdoor dinning and BBQ area;
- A community-operated food and produce shop;
- A factory outlet selling second hand clothes and furniture;
- Appliances repair and recycling shop;
- A gymnasium and fitness centre; and
- Offices.

A1.2.7 Community Development Programs

Community development programs that have been implemented in NRAs include adult further education programs, youth development programs, personal development programs, community art and community gardens.

Adults in Doveton and Eumemmerring have opportunities to continue further education through adult learning projects that are supported by the Neighbourhood Renewal branch and delivered through local neighbourhood houses in interest areas such as art and craft, computers, employment and training, self-enrichment and personal development, sport and fitness, and health and well-being. Local neighbourhood houses have received more than 30 computers through the Department of Human Services' (DHS) IT Asset Replacement Program. Additional Adult Community Further Education funding is allocated to local neighbourhood houses to support adult learning (VIC OOH, 2004d). The North Shepparton Community and Learning Centre has established a youth group and developed the ‘Shed’ educational program for young people who are unable to attend school (VIC OOH, 2004i).

Personal development programs that teach skills such as leadership, interviewing and parenting to residents have been established in NRAs. Residents of NRAs are trained and employed to conduct face-to-face interviews and participate in the analysis of community surveys. Swinburne University and the local university or TAFE issued certificates to the residents at Wendouree West and Latrobe Valley acknowledging the skills developed by the interviewers through this type of work. This has directly resulted in Telstra employing five residents in the Latrobe Valley.
providing them with further training (Broad, 2003). A leadership program has been run in Doveton (VIC OOH, 2004d), and regular local parenting programs and anger management programs are provided in Seymour (VIC OOH, 2004k).

A range of community art projects are implemented to improve the skills, capacity and self-esteem of residents of NRAs. Tenants in Collingwood have collaborated with local artists to produce creative art pieces, such as murals and mosaics, for public display across the estate. A disused underground car park is currently being transformed into a cultural arts and activity centre (VIC OOH, 2004c). In Atherton Gardens, a "Theatre Arts Project" has been established, in which residents are involved in producing, writing and performing a community theatre show based on the residents’ lives (VIC OOH, 2004b).

The OoH encourages the creation, development and upgrading of community gardens in public housing estates, and provides funding for their management. Tenants are encouraged to participate in the management of the gardens (VIC OOH, 2004m). For example, the Rosewall Community Garden has been established at Rosewall Primary School to provide a resource for people interested in gardening, a meeting place and encourage students to seek further education and employment in horticulture (VIC OOH, 2004i). Garden support workers visit the gardens weekly to give horticultural advice, supervise garden maintenance and cleanliness, and meet with interested tenants. Various activities have been held at community gardens, including a summer children’s garden project and the establishment of a kitchen garden at Collingwood (VIC OOH, 2004m).

A1.2.8 Tenant Participation in Local Decision-Making

The OoH encourages tenant participation in decision-making by supporting tenant groups that represent public tenant housing estates in their areas. Tenant groups’ activities include providing representation to the OoH on issues of concern, networking, conducting meetings to share information and linking and referring tenants to services. The following are ways in which the OoH has assisted tenant groups:

- Organising training on governance issues, group processes and financial management;
- Providing groups with technological equipment such as computers, printers, fax machines and photocopiers;
- Providing funding to new and existing tenant groups for administrative and minor operating costs; and
- Providing funding to the Victorian Public Tenants Association, which is a statewide organisation that assists new tenant groups to start up and support existing tenant groups.

Tenant groups that are funded by the OoH include Atherton Gardens Residents Association, Carlton Housing Estate Residents Services, North Fitzroy Public Residents Association, Kensington Public Tenants Association, Park Towers Housing Tenants Association, and many others (VIC OOH, 2003).
A key component of the NRS in Victoria is tenant participation. Tenants are encouraged to participate in the neighbourhood renewal process through steering committees, tenant groups, collaborations with community development workers etc. For example, in the Wendouree West renewal process, the Office of Housing launched a comprehensive promotional campaign to draw residents to an information session in June 2001. This resulted in approximately 45 residents participating in committees. A residents group was created, engaging residents in the renewal process. Residents have developed new skills in areas such as planning community events, preparing communication strategies, conducting meetings, producing and delivering newsletters, public speaking and liaising with stakeholders (VIC OOH, 2004n). In the Shepparton renewal process, the neighbourhood renewal steering committee, comprising residents and other stakeholders, has as one of its objectives the development of skills and confidence of residents through participation in decision-making processes. Residents were trained and employed to conduct face-to-face interviews for a community survey in May 2003, and also undertook a leadership and development course (VIC OOH, 2004l). A residents group CRACAS (Community Representatives of Ashburton, Ashwood, Chadstone and Surrounds) has become an incorporated organisation that actively participates in neighbourhood renewal activities (VIC OOH, 2004a). In Seymour, the Residents Action Group (RAG) was established in 2003. Residents were also trained to undertake community surveys. A community development worker was employed in January 2003 to work with residents to develop the community newsletter and other community initiatives (VIC OOH, 2004k).

A1.2.9 Bridging the Digital Divide

Various initiatives have been established and supported by the OoH to alleviate the digital divide between public housing tenants and the rest of Victoria, so that tenants can have access to up-to-date information and services and improve their technological skills. The improvement of these skills is seen as important for increasing their employment prospects.

First, computer and internet access are provided to tenants, who may otherwise lack the financial capacity to purchase and maintain IT equipment. The Community Gateway project in Wendouree West provides residents with a place to learn how to use the internet and other technologies to improve their ability to communicate with Government and one another (VIC OOH, 2004n). Tenants in Collingwood also have free computer and internet access and can also use bilingual computers (VIC OOH, 2004c). The InfoXchange RFTC project at Atherton Gardens aims to facilitate residents’ access to IT through the installation of intranet cabling to all high-rise flats, that is, 800 flats altogether (VIC OOH, 2004b).

Secondly, technological gateways or websites provide tenants with access to recent information and community news and events. Examples include the Wendouree West Community Gateway at http://www.wendoureewest.com (VIC OOH, 2004n). The Collingwood website, http://www.collingwood.grassroots.org.au, was established
in April 2004 to enable residents to find and share information through interactive features such as the news page, trading post and library (VIC OOH, 2004c).

Thirdly, education and training courses are organised for tenants. Tenants at Collingwood have access to regular short computer training courses (VIC OOH, 2004c). The RFTC project aims to establish a self-sustaining network owned and managed by residents. In order to achieve this aim, the InfoXchange has undertaken to provide training and engage IT companies and software developers in providing training to residents. The training has been designed to be accredited by the Federal government. It is hoped that residents will become the eventual workers and trainers on the project (Meredyth et al., 2002).

A1.2.10 Community Jobs Programs

One of the main features of the NRS is encouraging unemployed residents in NRAs into the Victorian state government's CJPg. Under the CJPg, funding is provided to government bodies, or not-for-profit organisations, to employ unemployed people to work on community projects (VIC OOH, 2004j). CJPg participants gain 16 weeks of employment at award wages and accredited training in carpentry, painting, landscaping and in other household renovation skills (VIC OOH, 2004n). A key aim of the CJPg is to have 60% of participants move into further training or employment (VIC OOH, 2004j). Over 730 unemployed people in NRAs and surrounding areas have participated in CJPg programs (VIC OOH, 2004h).

In Seymour, 50 residents were given short-term employment and training through the CJPg in 2002-03. Employment and training opportunities were undertaken through fence-building, landscaping, sports and recreation, office administration and community services. In January 2004 the Shepparton Energy Task Force was launched as a partnership project with the Sustainable Energy Authority of Victoria and Goulburn Murray Group Training to provide 11 short-term jobs to undertake energy efficient audits and retrofits for homes (VIC OOH, 2004l). In February 2004 the Energy Taskforce Project was launched as a partnership between the Sustainable Energy Authority of Victoria (SEAV), the Neighbourhood Renewal branch, Goulburn Murray Group Training (GMGT) and the Department of Victorian Communities CJPg / Jobs and Training. Through the project, residents were employed for 15 weeks to provide energy efficient retrofits to 160 houses (VIC OOH, 2004k). In Moe Heights and Morwell East, residents were employed under the CJPg to renovate properties (VIC OOH, 2004f, VIC OOH, 2004g).

A1.3 Queensland

Unlike other states, which try to integrate physical and social initiatives into one renewal program, the Queensland Department of Housing has two separate but complementary renewal programs targeted at disadvantaged communities, including public housing communities. The Urban Renewal program, introduced in 1993, focuses on asset redevelopment and tenure mix. The more recent Community Renewal program, introduced in 1998, focuses on social and economic development
initiatives, and is part of the state’s crime prevention strategy (Randolph and Wood, 2003). The principal objectives of the Community Renewal program are crime prevention and employment creation (Housing Policy and Research, 2000).

A1.3.1 Tenant Employment Requirement in Contracts

In various Urban Renewal projects, the Department provides employment opportunities for local residents to be employed for construction work. Work is tendered out to not-for-profit organisations and successful tenderers are responsible for employing and managing local residents to undertake works like fencing, landscaping and concreting, and to co-ordinate accredited training through TAFE (QLD DOH, 2004b).

The Department manages the Housing Industry Trade Training (HITT) program and Housing Industry Trade Training Plus (HITT Plus) program. Under these programs group training organisations are contracted to employ apprentices and trainees on public housing projects (QLD DET, 2002). In 2002-03, the Department supported apprenticeships by allocating 212 construction commencements or upgrades through the HITT and HITT Plus programs (QLD DOH, 2003). In 2003-04, another 87 construction commencements or upgrades were allocated through the HITT Plus program (QLD DOH, 2004a).

A1.3.2 Employment Incentives in Rental Rebate Policy

Like other states, the Queensland Department of Housing sets rent at approximately 25% of household income, and rent is capped at the market rate (SCRCSSP, 2004). A tax allowance scale is also applied to earned income so that the amount of tax paid on approximately the first $20,800 per year of earned income is removed before income is assessed for rent payments. Any amount over $20,800 is assessed for rent on the additional gross amount. Public housing rent reviews are conducted once every six months, and rent is adjusted at the time of the review rather than from the time income increases. Thus, tenants have the benefit of increased earnings with no increase in rent payments for a maximum of six months after undertaking paid employment (QLD DOH, 2004b).

A1.3.3 Transfer/Relocation Rules

Employment is a priority criterion for transfer applications. To be considered for priority transfer on the grounds of employment, a tenant must be (QLD DOH, 2004b):

- Currently unemployed and has found long-term employment that is at least half-time, and is not casual or seasonal, in a location that makes travel to and from work impractical; or
- Currently employed and required to transfer to another location to maintain employment.

A1.3.4 Asset Management and Redevelopment

A Housing Improvement Strategy was introduced in the early 1990s to encourage tenure mix through asset redevelopment and integration of public and private housing. In the mid-1990s, the Queensland Department of Housing explicitly stated
that concentrations of public housing in each local area should not exceed 20%. The sale of redeveloped stock to has been used to reduce concentrations of public housing. The Urban Renewal program, introduced in 1993, to address physical issues in areas with high concentrations of public housing, has the following main aims (Randolph and Wood, 2003):

- achieve physical upgrading;
- apply the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) in the upgrading process;
- reduce public housing concentration by offering stock for sale at affordable prices to create a more balanced social mix;
- increase choices in housing by matching housing stock to changing community needs; and
- create employment opportunities for unemployed locals through the capital works program.

The Urban Renewal program has been implemented in disadvantaged areas like Kingston, Manoora, Leichhardt, Inala, Woodridge, Goodna, Eagleby, Rasmussen, Deception Bay and Vincent (QLD DOH, 2004a).

The Department, through its Home Purchase Assistance scheme, has helped low-income persons become homeowners through such measures as housing loans, deposit assistance, special assistance grants and mortgage relief (QLD DOH, 2004a). In Leichhardt, where the Urban Renewal program has been implemented, the proportion of public housing declined from 33% to 25% between 1995 and 2001, and the proportion of homeowners in the area increased from 45% to 56%. In comparison, in Acacia Ridge, where the program had not been implemented, the percentage of homeowners fell from 55% to 52% (Randolph et al., 2004).

A1.3.5 Cross-Agency Linkages

The Department has engaged in collaborations with various organisations to improve employment and training opportunities for tenants. These organisations include other government departments, not-for-profit organisations with an employment focus, and education and training providers.

A life long learning project in Deception Bay was supported by the Queensland Department of Housing and various project partners such as Department of Education, Brisbane North Institute of TAFE, Queensland University of Technology and community organisations from Deception Bay (Delaforce et al., 2003). Vocational education and training (VET) organisations such as TAFE and adult and community education (ACE) organisations have partnered with the Queensland Department of Housing to community development initiatives like Community Access Schools pilots (Delaforce et al., 2003).
A1.3.6 Community Enterprise

The Community Renewal program has provided opportunities for the development of community enterprises. In Deception Bay, new and existing local businesses have been developed, and businesses have been linked with schools through a business, training and employment network (DFACS, 2004).

A1.3.7 Community Development Programs

Under the Community Renewal program, funding has been provided by the Department for various community development projects, including vocational education and training projects, life skills training, learning and literacy projects in primary schools and promotion of school attendance (QLD DOH, 2004b).

The Community Access Schools Pilot Project (CAS) is a Community Renewal initiative that aims to help school communities develop models of practice that strengthen connectedness between schools and the community by through schools developing a role as community hubs and lifelong learning centres. The CAS pilot, commenced in 1998, in schools such as Garbutt State School, Cairns West State School, Goodna State School and Kingston College. Different strategies are used in different schools. For example, Cairns West State School has focused on becoming a place for community learning within Manoora and provided courses like computer training, first aid, nutrition, government and administration skills (Butler and Creamer, 2002). In Kingston, the focus of the pilot has been on encouraging re-entry to education and training of young people who have become disconnected from formal education (Housing Policy and Research, 2000).

The Deception Bay Life Long Learning Project has been introduced in Deception Bay and makes available a range of learning courses, activities and pathways at minimal cost to stimulate interest and participation in learning (Delaforce et al., 2003). In 2003-04, Community Renewal funds were allocated towards expanding the Deception Bay Learning Centre (QLD DOH, 2004a).

A1.3.8 Tenant Participation in Local Decision-Making

The Tenant Participation Program provides opportunities for tenants to access training courses that help them develop skills related to public housing management and community development, such as governance, computer and book-keeping training (QLD DOH, 2004b). Tenants have also developed further skills in decision-making in relation to urban renewal through the Community Action Plan (DFACS, 2004).

A1.3.9 Bridging the Digital Divide

Under the Community Renewal program, funding has been provided by the Department for provision of IT training and equipment in disadvantaged areas (QLD DOH, 2004b).
A1.3.10 Community Jobs Program

The CJPn is a Breaking the Unemployment Cycle initiative that funds organisations to provide full-time employment for three to six months for long-term unemployed persons and persons at risk of become long-term unemployed. The CJPn, implemented in 1998 and administered by the Department of Employment and Training, provides the opportunity for participants to break the cycle of unemployment, restore self-esteem and practise new skills in a work environment. CJPn projects include public works projects, landcare and environmental restoration projects and innovative projects such as community events co-ordinations and website development. Projects that are given priority under the CJPn include projects in areas of high unemployment and Community Renewal areas (QLD DET, 2004).

A1.4 South Australia

The SAHT has, as one of its strategic directions, the development of sustainable communities through community capacity building and addressing the physical, social and economic aspects of public housing areas. Many employment and training initiatives have been undertaken by the SAHT in conjunction with its urban renewal program partners. In large urban renewal projects like Westwood and Salisbury North, the SAHT has employed Economic Development Officers to implement employment and training strategies (SAHT, 2004a). The SAHT’s employment and training initiatives are described below utilising the typology set out previously.

A1.4.1 Tenant Employment Requirement in Contracts

The SAHT utilises its contracting system to create employment and training opportunities for its tenants. The SAHT’s maintenance zone contracts contain a specific requirement for contractors to engage at least one apprentice to do the work. Contractors who have won contracts in excess of $250,000 are required to be registered with Inskill SA, which requires contractors to collect credits through the employment of apprentices, graduates and staff with special needs and provide work placement experience and vocational training for staff (SAHT, 2003a, SAHT, 2004c). Construction contracts are also selectively tendered out to contractors who are willing to employ trainees (Lloyd-Jones, 1998).

A1.4.2 Employment Incentives in Rental Rebate Policy

As with other states or territories, public housing tenants in SA pay a rebated rent up to a maximum of 25% of household income (SAHT, 2004b, SCRCSSP, 2004). However, no further employment incentives have been incorporated so far. In early 2004, the SAHT established a Rents Working Group to address issues relating to its rental system, including links between rents and workforce disincentives. The SAHT has also contributed to the work on developing national rent policy initiatives aimed at overcoming workforce disincentives being undertaken by the Policy Research Working Group (PRWG) of the Housing Minister’s Advisory Committee (HMAC) (SAHT, 2004c).
A1.4.3 Transfer/Relocation Rules

The SAHT is reviewing its Transfer Policy in relation to its impacts on assisting households to gain employment.

A1.4.4 Asset Management and Redevelopment

Public housing redevelopment in SA was initiated under the SAHT’s Urban Renewal Program in 1986. Major aims of the program are to (Randolph, 2002):

- Reduce public housing concentrations and increase tenure mix;
- Address the mismatch of housing types and customer demand;
- Improve the physical, social, economic and community aspects of public housing estates;
- Improve performance of under-utilised assets;
- Generate cash for debt retirement and other capital programs.

To promote tenure mix, many areas with high concentrations of public housing have been targeted for major redevelopment. Examples include the Parks area (Westwood), Lincoln Gardens, Mitchell Park, Whyalla and Salisbury North (SAHT, n.d.-e, SAHT, n.d.-b, SAHT, n.d.-d, SAHT, n.d.-f, SAHT, n.d.-c). Public housing presence in Mitchell Park was reduced from 75% to 30% by the completion of the Mitchell Park redevelopment project in 2003 (SAHT, n.d.-d).

A1.4.5 Cross-Agency Linkages

The SAHT actively fosters collaborations with partner organisations in order to maximise economic participation outcomes for tenants. Partner organisations include organisations with an employment focus such as employment services providers and government departments, and education and training providers.

Under the SAHT’s Westwood urban renewal project, employment and training opportunities were developed for local residents through cross-agency linkages. A Hospitality training program was conducted under the Youth Employment Program of the Office of Employment by the Quality Training Company to teach young people skills in bar, waiting and gaming. An automotive training program was conducted by The Vehicle Technology Centre to give youths aged up to 24 an opportunity to learn mechanical skills and obtain Certificate I in Automotive (SAHT, n.d.-e).

The SAHT strongly supports the Doorways to Construction project in Elizabeth and Whyalla in partnership with TAFE and the Construction Industry Training Board. This project aims to encourage Year 11 and 12 students to contribute to the renovation of Trust properties as a pathway to securing apprenticeships and traineeships and increase incentives to further their studies (SAHT, 2003a, SAHT, 2004c). A construction apprenticeship training project has been developed under the Mitchell Park redevelopment project as a pilot for an on-site approach to apprentice training. Partner organisations with the SAHT include Master Builders Association, Alpine Constructions, the Building Industry Training Scheme, TAFE and the City of Marion. The project is targeted at young unemployed people and new apprentices (Stewart,
The Youth Service Centre in Mount Gambier provides training and educational programs for youths and is a collaboration among many organisations, including the SAHT, Anglican Community Care Incorporated, Mount Gambier City Council, Department of Education, Training and Employment, TAFE, South East Regional Community Health Service, Family and Youth Services and Centrelink (SAHT, 2004a). The Parks IT volunteer group has assisted many people onto further education and paid work through developing partnerships with local businesses in The Parks area, registered training organisations, employment services and TAFE (SAHT, 2004c). In 2003-04, the SAHT provided support to a pilot project in which Work for the Dole participants are engaged to revive the gardens of aged public housing tenants in Elizabeth under the management of Missions Australia (SAHT, 2004a).

A1.4.6 Community Enterprise

The SAHT amended its conditions of tenancy in 2001 to allow tenants to conduct home-based businesses. Due to the amendments in conditions, tenants are now able to operate small businesses from home, subject to written applications and approvals. As part of the community capacity building strategy in Playford, a mature age home maintenance small business training initiative is being developed (SAHT, 2004c). Youth enterprise is encouraged in Salisbury North. Examples include a youth enterprise scheme called the Young Aussie Carwash Scheme and a youth music café which links youths with training in running a café as a business (Lloyd-Jones, 1998). The Handy Hort subgroup in Playford, have produced a brochure on gardening activities, and are currently establishing a community enterprise producing lavender products, called Lavender Blues (Hughes, 2004).

A1.4.7 Community Development Programs

The creation of sustainable communities through community capacity building has been one of the SAHT’s main strategic directions in recent years. In the Salisbury North estate, a community capacity building project called Work Bank has been established to assist disadvantaged jobseekers by providing employment opportunities, increasing their confidence, and making available a mechanism to network with other jobseekers and employer providers. This project emphasises the potential of part-time and volunteer work as pathways back into the workforce (Hughes, 2004). The Playford Community Capacity Building Project was developed through a three-day workshop in 2003 attended by tenants, businesses owners and representatives from government and non-government organisations. The workshop resulted in the inception of several projects that aim to improve vocational skills and gardening knowledge (SAHT, 2004a).

The SAHT has actively supported programs that aim to develop living skills (SAHT, 2003b). With grant funding from the SAHT, the Plaza Youth Centre in Whyalla has started a project called the Educational/Motivational Life Skills program that aims to promote self-confidence and access to services and information and teach life skills such as budgeting and conflict resolution to youths (SAHT, 2004d). The Social
Housing and Community Capacity Building – Community Based Learning project has seen the Housing Trust working in collaboration with the Department of Education and Children’s Services (DECS) to increase the school retention rate for youths who experience homelessness; to re-connect and re-engage youths within the community. The five pilot projects undertaken to date in participating schools have achieved both housing and community capacity building outcomes. The Living Skills Program conducted by United Care Wesley in Salisbury aims to help youths develop skills and strategies to live independently (SAHT, 2004a).

Community art and community gardening are major community development initiatives undertaken by the SAHT in recent years. The SAHT actively encourages students from local schools to create public art for urban renewal projects (SAHT, 2004a). In 2002-03, the SAHT assisted local communities to develop a series of artworks containing Indigenous flora and fauna themes under the Westwood urban renewal project. Stobie pole painting and sheet metal design work were encouraged under the Risdon Grove renewal project. In 2002-03, the SAHT supported the Gathering Tree Gardening Project to develop gardening beds in the Kilburn South renewal project and regularly conducts the Gardening Together competition for all Trust tenants. (SAHT, 2003a).

A1.4.8 Tenant Participation in Local Decision-Making

The SAHT encourages tenants to participate in community issues and stimulate tenant participation in local decision-making through various avenues, including advisory groups, neighbourhood development officers (NDOs), interviews, resident groups, forums etc.

Resident Groups or Tenant Participation Groups are groups of people, usually from the same street, group of flats or neighbourhood who form a group based on common interests and concerns.

Regional Advisory Boards (RABs) are made up of representatives from tenants and act as a reference point for tenants to access information. The RABs are chaired by tenants and partner with the regional offices of SAHT to contribute to the development of policies. RABs have also engaged in other activities that produce economic benefits for tenants, such as establishing garden tool libraries or setting up computer training courses for their communities (SAHT, n.d.-a). For example, in addition to participating in policy committee meetings and local council forums, the Modbury RAB also runs a tool bank for tenants who do not have mowers and have an advisory phone line. (SAHT, 2004d).

The Public Housing Customer Forum allows representatives from regional advisory boards to network and share ideas. The representatives communicate and cooperate with the SAHT on behalf of tenants (SAHT, n.d.-a).

The Operational Policy Advisory Committee contributes to developing and evaluating policies; provide comments and feedback on the impacts of policies on tenants. The committee is made up of tenants, key stakeholders and Trust staff members (SAHT,
n.d.-a). In addition, tenants who are interested in voicing their views about Trust policies or issues can submit their names to be included in the SAHT’s database. These tenants are invited to provide their input through focus groups or interviews.

A NDO has also been employed to cooperate with tenants and local groups to ensure that tenants’ views and needs are taken into account in urban renewal projects in Westwood, Salisbury North and East Gambier (SAHT, n.d.-e, SAHT, n.d.-b, SAHT, 2003a). In East Gambier, the appointment of the NDO in July 2002 has resulted in the formation of the East Gambier Action Group, which in turn has played a major role in the re-development of a community reserve, circulation of a monthly newsletter, formation of a social group for people aged over 50, a parenting group and Neighbourhood Watch (SAHT, 2003a).

As public housing redevelopment takes place under the Urban Renewal Program, tenants and community representatives are invited to form community reference groups to provide comments and voice their concerns(SAHT, n.d.-a). Urban renewal in Westwood and Salisbury North involve tenants in decision-making through a community reference group (SAHT, n.d.-b, SAHT, n.d.-e).

A1.4.9 Bridging the Digital Divide

The SAHT addresses the problem of lack of IT skills among tenants by providing and supporting IT training projects. The Easy Computing Community Centre’s Computer Training project in Elizabeth East provides computer training for local residents in a friendly and non-threatening atmosphere. Skills that are taught include basic computing, computer terminology, purchase and virus protection, word processing, desktop publishing, Microsoft Windows programs, report and letter writing, and resume and budget preparation (Hughes, 2004).

The SAHT has also provided funding to buy computer equipment and set up an office within The Parks Community Centre. The Parks IT Room is now operated and managed by the community. Volunteers, many of which are tenants, provide computer training to other community members in the IT Room (SAHT, 2004c).

A1.4.10 Local Business Engagement

The SAHT improves economic participation opportunities for both local businesses and tenants by coordinating training programs with local employers and liaising with employers seeking staff members in positions that may be suitable for tenants, such as food processing, automotive manufacturing and welding (Hughes, 2004). In Salisbury North, local businesses are engaged to mentor youths and provide advice on pathways they should choose (Lloyd-Jones, 1998). The Business Development Program at Westwood provides one-on-one assistance to local businesses to take advantage of the influx of new residents through the Westwood urban renewal project to expand their businesses through the use of networks and functions (SAHT, n.d.-e).
A1.5 Western Australia

The Western Australia Department of Housing and Works has implemented many policies to encourage economic participation among their tenants in recent years. Not surprisingly, a number of these policies have been targeted at Indigenous people, given the relatively high proportion of Indigenous people in Western Australia compared to other states. In 2001, 3.5% of Western Australia’s population was made up of Indigenous people, which is higher than the national Indigenous proportion of 2.4% (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001). The Indigenous Western Australia population grew by 15% between 1996 and 2001, compared to only 5.6% for the non-Indigenous Western Australia population. Moreover, Indigenous people also exhibit a high level of dependence on public housing, with approximately 20% of the Indigenous Western Australia population living in public housing (2003 Commonwealth State Housing Agreement: Bilateral Agreement Between the Australian Government and the Government of Western Australia July 2003 to June 2008). This strong reliance on public housing has prompted the Western Australia Department of Housing and Works to provide an additional 2,500 properties for allocation only to Indigenous people. In other words this housing is provided separately from the mainstream Homeswest public housing program. However, the additional 2,500 properties are managed according to Homeswest policies (WA DHW, 2004).

A1.5.1 Tenant Employment Requirement in Contracts

The Department actively encourages the employment of Aboriginal persons through their construction contracts. For example, the Department has allocated construction contracts to the Mid West Training Group, the Albany Chamber of Commerce and Industry, West Australian Group Training Inc., subject to the use of Aboriginal apprenticeship labour. Construction contracts created under the Department’s public housing redevelopment strategy, New Living, also stipulate that successful contractors have to employ Aboriginal apprenticeship labour (WA DHW, 2000).

The Remote Areas Essential Services Program (RAESP) was implemented in conjunction with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) under a joint contracted management arrangement to provide repair and maintenance service for power, water and wastewater infrastructure in remote communities. RAESP currently cover over 80 remote Indigenous communities in WA. RAESP assists Indigenous persons into employment and training opportunities by providing training on technical management, maintenance and repair of infrastructure, and plumbing and electrical apprenticeships (Jardine-Orr et al., 2003).

---

7 The proportions of Indigenous people are also higher than 2.4% in the Northern Territory, Tasmania and Queensland, being 28.8%, 3.7% and 3.5% respectively. Indigenous people make up less than 2.4% of the population in other states/territories Australian Bureau of Statistics (2001) Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.
A1.5.2 Employment Incentives in Rental Rebate Policy

Incentives are embedded in the Department’s rental rebate policy in order to encourage tenants to seek employment. Current tenants pay 25% of their household assessable income in rent, and the maximum rent paid by tenants is the market rent (WA DHW, 2002, SCRCSSP, 2004).

Since 1995, tenants who become employed have $30 deducted from their ‘household assessable income’ prior to assessment for rent resulting in a rent reduction of between $6 and $7. For disabled tenants, the working allowance is $50. The working allowance is deducted from gross household assessable income prior to rent assessment, resulting in a decrease in weekly rent of $7.50 and $12.50 for non-disabled and disabled tenants respectively (WA DHW, n.d.-b). The working allowance is used to cushion the financial impact of an increase in rent associated with a higher household income. It is paid throughout the term of the tenancy as long as the tenant continues to work (WA DHW, 2002). The working allowance has been reviewed with some modifications recommended ((Heymans, 2003). As part of the Department’s commitment under the CSHA Bilateral Agreement, the working allowance is due for review in 2004-05 (WA DHW, n.d.-b).

A1.5.3 Asset Management and Redevelopment

The Western Australia Department of Housing and Works launched its major urban renewal program, New Living in 1995 with pilot projects implemented in the suburbs of Kwinana and Lockridge (Jacobs et al., 2004). The New Living program has now been successfully implemented in Kwinana, Lockridge, Langford, Midland/Midvale, Karawara, Coolbellup, Armadale, Balga and Queens Park (Peet and Company, 2004). The aims of the New Living program are (McCotter, 1998):

- Upgrade and refurbish houses;
- Sale of refurbished houses to the public and tenants;
- Establish a ‘whole of suburb’ concept;
- Create a sustainable community that is smooth functioning and where tenants play an active part in local decision-making;
- Encourage homeownership and attract new residents to the community;
- To determine the future use of public open space;
- Provide a balanced social mix;
- Provide added security for tenants;
- Increase property values;
- Relocate tenants with sensitivity;
- Commercial viability;
- Reduce public housing presence to about 12%;
- Reduce social stigma;
- Improve community infrastructure;
• Improve the appearance of streetscapes and parks.

To date, changes are focused on reducing the concentration of public housing in suburbs, improving infrastructure and streetscapes, upgrading stock to be retained and introducing security patrols into local communities (Jacobs et al., 2004).

Tenure mix and social mix are being promoted through relocation of tenants and sale of upgraded properties. As a result of the New Living program, public housing presence fell from 24% to 16% in Kwinana and 52% to 30% in Lockridge between June 1995 and June 1998. 359 dwellings were sold in Kwinana during the same period (McCotter, 1998). Properties were also offered for sale to tenants through the Department’s ‘Goodstart’ and ‘Right to Buy’ schemes. The ‘Goodstart’ scheme is a shared equity scheme, while the ‘Right to Buy’ scheme offers a rebate to tenants interested in purchasing refurbished properties (Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000). While not a direct aim of the program, an indirect outcome of the program is expected to be an increased likelihood of unemployed tenants gaining employment due to influences from new entrants to the community who are more likely to be employed and reduced social stigma.

A1.5.4 Cross-Agency Linkages

The Western Australia Department of Housing and Works has established many cross-agency linkages to draw on collaborations required to link tenants to employment and training opportunities. Employment services providers and organisations with an employment focus that have been in collaborations with the Department to promote economic participation include Job Network providers, Salvation Army Employment Plus and Health Training Australia (WA DHW, 2000).

The Department has fostered partnerships with various other government departments. A pilot proposal has been developed in conjunction with the Department of Training and Employment (DTE), where Job Link offices in the Fremantle area will link tenants to existing DTE programs, develop employment strategies, secure training and skills development opportunities, provide one-on-one assistance with resumes, and assist with job search plans and job search assistance (WA DHW, 2000). The RAESP, which provides training initiatives to Indigenous people in remote communities, was implemented in partnership with ATSIC (Jardine-Orr et al., 2003). Formal traineeships under the Management Support Program (MSP) was established in partnership with the Western Australia Department of Training and Employment and the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business (WA DHW, 2000).

TAFE institutions are the main education and training providers engaged to assist tenants into employment and training (WA DHW, 2000). In 1999, the Department launched the Tenant Employment Program to help unemployed public housing tenants gain employment. Under the scheme, the Department helps tenants identify

---

8 Shortly after the implementation of the Tenant Employment Program, the Department became aware of a Commonwealth pilot project being undertaken to help workless families overcome employment barriers. The pilot was based on similar principles as the Tenant
their employment barriers, and acts as a central coordination point linking them to appropriate agencies for employment assistance, such as the Job Network, Job Link, Centrelink, TAFE etc. Under the program, the Department has co-hosted information sessions for tenants with TAFE colleges in Mirrabooka, Thornlie, Rockingham, Kwinana, South Hedland, Roebourne, Karratha and Newman to help tenants gain a better understanding of TAFE services and provide advice on employment-related issues, such as growth areas of employment, plus courses and TAFE support services (WA DHW, n.d.-a). Fully accredited training programs are provided under the Department’s RAESP using TAFE networks in regional Western Australia to help Indigenous persons in remote communities secure employment and training opportunities (Jardine-Orr et al., 2003).

Western Australia’s public housing redevelopment program, New Living, is strongly based on cross-agency partnerships to promote sustainable outcomes for disadvantaged communities. Under the New Living program in Kwinana, the Department has initiated the idea of a youth forum called ‘Youth Today Striving Toward Tomorrow’ in partnership with the Kwinana Senior High School (McCotter, 1998). The New Living initiative in Queens Park relies on partnerships among the Western Australia Department of Housing and Works, Peet and Company, City of Canning and the community (Peet and Company, 2004).

A1.5.5 Community Development Programs

The Western Australia Department of Housing and Works encourage economic participation through community development programs, including tenancy management programs, personal development programs and community gardening.

The Management Support Program (MSP), established in 1992, aims to help Aboriginal communities self-manage their housing needs. Instead of the Department employing contractors to provide repair and maintenance services, community members are employed to do the work themselves and can also receive accredited training in the process. Formal traineeships have been established with the Western Australia Department of Training and Employment and Commonwealth Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business (WA DHW, 2000).

Various personal development programs have been implemented under the New Living program to improve confidence and skills of the community. The idea of a youth forum called ‘Youth Today Striving Toward Tomorrow’ was initiated by the Department as part of the New Living program in partnership with the Kwinana Senior High School. A popular Western Australian football player, Guy McKenna has been invited to speak to various classes in the high school on leadership, self-esteem and teamwork under the community aspect of the New Living program. The Department also sponsored a seminar conducted by the Volunteer Centre of

\[\text{Employment Program, and it was decided to discontinue the program Heaton, R. (2000) WA Department of Housing and Works, Perth.}\]
Western Australia to provide training to volunteers in community-based not-for-profit management committees and boards (McCotter, 1998).

The Department has initiated a Beautiful Garden competition and also funded a weekly ‘Manage Your Garden’ course in Kwinana to teach gardening skills to tenants (McCotter, 1998).

**A1.6 Tasmania**

The Tasmania government department that oversees and administers housing policy is Housing Tasmania. The current main focus of Housing Tasmania is the Affordable Housing Strategy, a major initiative implemented in 2004 to provide affordable housing for Tasmanians on low incomes. One of the principles underlying this initiative is that housing is the foundation from which individuals are linked with employment, education, health and other services. The main objectives of the Affordable Housing Strategy are (Housing Tasmania, 2003):

- Creation of a sustainable public housing system;
- Expansion in the supply of public and affordable housing through alternative financing and delivery methods, reduced barriers to supply and cost-efficient housing production;
- Provision of housing models that meet a range of housing needs and requirements of local areas;
- Creation of a housing market that encourages economic growth, area vitality, and safe communities through community renewal, employment and training opportunities, community empowerment, environmental sustainability and increased capacity of the building industry.

**A1.6.1 Tenant Employment Requirement in Contracts**

Under the Affordable Housing Strategy, opportunities are provided for public housing residents to gain employment and training through Housing Tasmania contracts. In late 2004, Project Hahn and JAG North engaged in partnership to renovate surplus Housing Tasmania properties in Launceston, providing employment opportunities for residents within Housing Tasmania contractual arrangements (Tasmania Department of Economic Development, 2005).

The Tasmanian Building Group Apprenticeship Scheme (TasBGAS) has been selected through a comprehensive request for tender process as the group training provider to implement the Affordable Housing Strategy group training initiative. 10 apprentices within the building and construction industry and in the trades of plastering, plumbing and painting are engaged from low income and public housing backgrounds. Tenant employment requirements in contracts stipulate that the apprentices are to be employed by contractors working on Housing Tasmania’s Capital Investment Program (CIP). TasBGAS is also given access to Housing Tasmania’s building and construction program timetable and updates on successful tenderers so that TasBGAS can encourage contractors working on the CIP to engage the apprentices. Funding is provided to TasBGAS to subsidise the wages of
the apprentices as an added incentive for contractors to employ the apprentices (Housing Tasmania, 2005a).

A1.6.2 Employment Incentives in Rental Rebate Policy

Like other states, the rent is set at approximately 25% of assessable household income, and the maximum rent paid by tenants is the market rent (Housing Tasmania, 2005c, SCRCSSP, 2004). There are no incentives in the rent setting formula that delays rent increases when tenants increase their earnings from paid employment.

A1.6.3 Asset Management and Redevelopment

Public housing redevelopment has been undertaken in areas with high concentrations of public housing, e.g. Rokeby and Ravenswood (Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000). Social mix is promoted through sale of homes to tenants and private purchasers. Under the Affordable Housing Strategy, the Streets Ahead home purchase incentive provides a flat $6,000 in deposit assistance to successful applicants who purchase public housing stock to assist low-income home purchasers access to public housing properties that are being put up for sale. The lending limit of Home Ownership Assistance Program (HOAP) has also been extended from $80,000 to $120,000. Tenants in public housing areas like Rocherlea have been assisted into homeownership through the programs (Housing Tasmania, 2004). BURP, established in 1996, has also supported a home purchase program for public housing tenants (Downie, 2001).

A1.6.4 Cross-Agency Linkages

Housing Tasmania works closely with partner organisations to encourage economic participation among tenants. Organisations with an employment focus, training providers and not-for-profit organisations that have been in collaborations with Housing Tasmania include Project Hahn, TasBGAS, Mission Australia, Colony 47, local councils and TAFE.

Challenging Tomorrow Together is an employment creation program managed through a partnership between Housing Tasmania and Project Hahn, a not-for-profit organisation. Participants in this program complete 12 months of work experience and on-the-job training and are awarded a Certificate II in Horticulture upon successful completion of the program. The type of work they are engaged in include fencing, paving, creation of retaining walls and other landscaping. They are also linked to on-going employment opportunities and other community programs (Tasmania Department of Economic Development, 2003). An extension of the Challenging Tomorrow Together program has been implemented in Rokeby under the Affordable Housing Strategy to engage the long-term unemployed and public housing tenants in external works and landscaping employment and traineeship. Participants are sourced from the local area or public housing estates as much as possible (Housing Tasmania, 2005a). In 2001-02, Housing Tasmania partnered with Mission Australia to create traineeships opportunities for unemployed Tasmanians
who live in or close to areas with a high concentration of public housing (DFACS, 2003).

Housing Tasmania’s urban renewal programs have also relied on cross-agency linkages between all levels of government and the local community. The board of management of BURP, a successful community development project, consists of representatives from Housing Tasmania, Brighton Council, Bridgewater High School, Tasmania Police and local businesses to guide the project (Downie, 2001). The Making a Difference-Initiatives for the Rejuvenation of the ‘Radburn’ Areas-Rokeby project involved a partnership between Housing Tasmania, the Commonwealth government and Colony 47, a registered training provider (Downie, 1998).

TAFE has offered re-engagement with learning in broad acre public housing estates such as Windsor Park, Eastport and Hillside. TAFE Tasmania has offered Certificate II Community Services (Children’s Services) in Windsor Park through a visiting tutor, a Return to Study program in Eastport and computer classes for single parents on welfare in Hillside (Millar and Kilpatrick, 2004).

A1.6.5 Community Development Programs

Community development programs supported by Housing Tasmania include various projects that promote education and learning, community greening, and early starts for children. BURP is a successful development project that has brought about implementations of computer training, adult literacy classes, surfing classes, tenant gardening projects and tree planting programs in the Bridgewater/Gagebrook area. In 2000, BURP won the Best Community Development Project Award by the Tasmanian Local Government Association (Downie, 2001). In 2001-02, Housing Tasmania also the Good Beginnings Project and the Chances for Children project to encourage early starts for children (DFACS, 2003).

A1.6.6 Tenant Participation in Local Decision-Making

Key tenant groups in Tasmania include (Housing Tasmania, 2005b):

- BURP;
- Bedford Street Residents Group;
- Clarendonvale Connect;
- Dover Street Tenant Group;
- Ravenswood Walk Tall Association;
- Rocherlea Residents Action Group;
- Shorewell Park Enhancement Group;
- Stainforth Court Residents Action Group.

Tenant participation groups in Tasmania have succeeded in securing improvements to their public housing estates that promote economic participation, including training sessions, food co-operatives, tool co-operatives and activities for youths (Housing Tasmania, n.d.). Under BURP, tenants and community groups are encouraged to co-
ordinate the management of services. A proactive approach to problem-solving at the local level is encouraged. For example, BURP recently obtained $30,000 of funding through the Community Support Levy Scheme to develop a Home Ownership Education Project (Jacobs et al., 2004).

A1.6.7 Bridging the Digital Divide

BURP is a successful development project that has supported computer training in the Bridgewater/Gagebrook area (Downie, 2001).

A1.7 Northern Territory

The government department responsible for overseeing housing issues and implementing housing policies in the Northern Territory is the Department of Community Development, Sports and Cultural Affairs (DCDSCA). The recently released Home Territory 2010 Strategy that, which establishes objectives and key focus areas for the coming years, contains the following among its key focus areas (DCDSCA, 2004):

- Maximise sustainable employment and training opportunities in remote communities through construction and housing-related programs;
- Promote Indigenous employment through housing-related programs in remote communities;
- Establish social enterprise and employment projects in collaboration with communities and community housing organisations.

A1.7.1 Employment Incentives in Rental Rebate Policy

The rent of public housing tenants is set at 23% of assessable household income (Territory Housing, 2004). The maximum rent paid by public housing tenants is market rent (SCRCSSP, 2004). The Employment Incentive Scheme was introduced in February 2002 to increase the workforce participation of public housing tenants and household members. The scheme facilitates stepped rent increases over the first six months of employment when a tenant gains employment. The purpose of the scheme is to gradually increase the household’s rent to the market rate when the normal consequence of the rise in income would be a requirement to pay market rent immediately.

To be eligible for the Employment Incentive Scheme, households must gain a minimum gross wage of $200 per week. If a new member enters the household, but has already commenced employment prior to joining the household, this will not make the household eligible for the scheme. Each household is eligible to access the Scheme once a year (Territory Housing, 2004).

A1.7.2 Asset Management and Redevelopment

Unlike the other states, with the exception of the ACT, public housing in the Northern Territory is not characterised by large-scale estates. Small-scale redevelopment of public housing has been undertaken, but it has been aimed at improving the physical
environment for tenants only (Jacobs et al., 2004). The promotion of social mix is generally not used in the DCDSCA’s economic participation strategies (Whitehead, 2005).

A1.7.3 Cross-Agency Linkages

Community agencies and workers are engaged to provide support for tenant youths to assist them in maintaining their tenancy, allowing them to pursue on-going education (Heintjes, 2004).

A1.7.4 Community Development Programs

The DCDSCA has two models for assisting tenant youths in continuing their education. Under the first model, tenant youths receive support and advice from external community agencies as sole residents to maintain their tenancy while allowing on-going education. This includes support and advice to ensure regular rent payments, maintain a budget and maintain the dwelling. Under the second model, tenant youths reside in a group house with a community worker who provide assistance in tenancy maintenance through on-going support (Heintjes, 2004).

A1.8 Australian Capital Territory

The Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services (DHCS) is the department responsible for developing and implementing housing policies in the ACT. Unlike most Australian states, the ACT does not have a large public housing stock. Hence, the DHCS does not have a wide range of initiatives that encourage economic participation among tenant. Most existing initiatives are implemented under the Community Linkages Program (CLP).

A1.8.1 Employment Incentives in Rental Rebate Policy

Public housing tenant pay no more than 25% of gross assessable household income in rent, and rent is capped at market rate (DHCS, 2004a, SCRCSSP, 2004). There are no incentives in the rent setting formula that delays rent increases when tenants increase their earnings from paid employment.

A1.8.2 Asset Management and Redevelopment

Despite the small public housing stock in the ACT, social and physical problems associated with public housing estates do exist. Therefore, small-scale estate regeneration has been undertaken in the ACT to improve physical design and reduce public housing presence in certain suburbs (Jacobs et al., 2004). The DHCS’s strategic asset management plans are guided by the principles of creating sustainable communities through integration with surrounding communities and mixed ownership (DHCS, 2003).

A1.8.3 Cross-Agency Linkages

Under its strategic theme of building better community partnerships, the DHCS is aiming to develop partnerships with community organisations in recognition of the importance of the community sector in delivering services in collaboration with the
DHCS (DHCS, 2004d). The CLP was implemented by the DHCS in 2001-02 to develop and maintain sustainable communities. The program has received funding of approximately $2 million over four years from 2001-02 to 2004-05. The initial aim of the program was to link public housing tenants to a range of community and support services, though it was recently expanded to include community housing tenants as well (Jacobs et al., 2004). The major aims of the program include developing (DHCS, 2004b):

- Safer living environments;
- Sustainable tenancies;
- Enhanced social interaction within housing communities;
- Enhanced social interaction between community and public housing tenants and the broader community;
- Linking community and public housing tenants to employment opportunities, community services and support services;
- Decline in poverty for tenants.

Under the CLP, various organisations have received funding to employ community development workers to work with public housing tenants in organising activities. For example, Southside Community Service has received funding to employ a community development worker in the Red Hill. Community development workers also have been employed by the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA) to work with public housing tenants in organising activities in areas such as Inner North, Inner South and Woden. YWCA has also received funding in 2002-03 to provide training services in curtain-making for tenants at the Bega, Allawah and Currong (BAC) flat complex (DHCS, 2003).

**A1.8.4 Community Development Programs**

Under the CLP, various organisations have received funding to employ community development workers to work with public housing tenants in organising activities. Community development projects that have been implemented under the program include community gardens, youth advocacy, playgroup sessions, art classes, music workshops and courses on cooking on a budget. Financial counselling workshops aim to assist tenants in financial management. A ‘Mobile Mediation’ service enables tenants to develop conflict resolution skills (Jacobs et al., 2004).

**A1.8.5 Tenant Participation in Local Decision-Making**

Under its strategic theme of building better community partnerships, the DHCS encourages the involvement of the community and their representative organisations in decision-making in relation to policy and service delivery. The DHCS actively supports forums, committees, advisory groups and public consultations (DHCS, n.d.).

In 2003, the DHCS started developing a tenant participation program in conjunction with ACT Shelter and the Tenants Union to ensure that tenant participation is a
fundamental component of policy development and service delivery. The aims of the program are to:

- Encourage tenant participation in policy and decision-making;
- Engage tenants in a partnership with the DHCS;
- Improve service delivery and increase client satisfaction;
- Reduce anti-social behaviour and address problems at flat complexes;
- Improve public perception of the DHCS’s management of flat complexes (DHCS, 2004c).

**A1.8.6 Bridging the Digital Divide**

Under the CLP, funding has been allocated to develop a computer facility for tenants at the BAC flat complex. The YWCA received funding under this program to provide information technology training services for tenants at this complex (DHCS, 2003).
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