

**Queensland Department of Housing
and Department of Communities**

Supported Accommodation
Assistance Program (SAAP) &
Crisis Accommodation
Program (CAP) Program
Management Arrangements
Review
Consultation Summary Report

April 2008
This report contains 22 pages

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Context of the review	3
1.2	Regional stakeholder forums	4
1.3	Responses to the discussions paper	1
1.4	Purpose of this report	1
1.5	Structure of this report	2
2	Summary of forum discussions and responses	3
2.1	Strengths of current arrangements	3
2.2	Issues and challenges with current arrangements	5
2.3	Regional variations	9
2.4	Opportunities for improvement	10
2.5	Potential impact of improvements	13
3	Summary	15
A	Stakeholders	16

Disclaimer

The materials presented in this publication were prepared by KPMG for the Department of Housing and Department of Communities, based on information provided by various stakeholders and the Queensland Department of Housing and Department of Communities, and are distributed by the Queensland Government as an information source only.

The findings in this publication are based on a qualitative study. The State of Queensland, acting through the Department of Housing and Department of Communities and KPMG make[s] no statement, representation or warranty about the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of this publication, and any use of this publication is at the user's own risk.

The State of Queensland and KPMG disclaim[s] all responsibility and all liability (including, without limitation, liability in negligence) for all expenses, losses, damages and costs anyone may incur as a result of reliance upon the information contained in this publication for any reason or as a result of the information being inaccurate, incomplete or unsuitable for any purpose.

Despite best efforts being made, the State of Queensland, acting through the Department of Housing and Department of Communities, makes no warranty or representation that the information in this publication is free of infection by computer viruses or other contamination and the user downloads the information at the user's own risk.

1 Introduction

This summary report has been developed as part of a review of current program management arrangements for the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) and the Crisis Accommodation Program (CAP). This report should be read in conjunction with the SAAP CAP Program Management Arrangements Discussion Paper¹.

The Review is being undertaken in the context of a number of national policy developments, including:

- proposed National Affordable Housing Agreement; and
- changes to Commonwealth – State financing.

This Review is undertaken on behalf of the Department of Communities (DoC) and the Department of Housing (DoH).

1.1 Context of the review

The need for a review of program management arrangements has been identified through recent reviews that identified the need to improve the effectiveness of current program management arrangements to deliver more integrated and coordinated service for clients. These reviews are:

- A Service Delivery and Performance Management Review of the Department of Housing (September 2007) which found that more needs to be done to effectively manage the two programs across the two government agencies².
- The mid-term review of *Responding to Homelessness*, (September 2007) which recommended strengthening the policy coordination components of the Response and addressing confusion about the relative roles of the administering agencies³.

The outcome of the review will be the identification of options for the program management of SAAP and CAP to support a more responsive, coherent, strategic and cost effective response to the changing demography and context of homelessness in Queensland.

The options and recommendations for improvements to program management arrangements will be informed by:

- consultations with key DoH and DoC stakeholders;

¹ 'Support Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) and Crisis Accommodation Program (CAP) Program Management Arrangements Discussion Paper 2008, report fro Department of Housing and Department of Communities, Queensland

² Service Delivery and Performance Commission (2007) *Report on the Service Delivery and Performance Management Review of the Department of Housing* Brisbane: Queensland Government pp 6, 21. Sourced from http://www.thepremier.qld.gov.au/sdpc/reviews/review_housing.shtm on 5th March 2008

³ Seelig, T., Phillips, R., Thompson, A. (2007) 'Mid Term Review of The Queensland Government's Response to Homelessness: Final Report'. Canberra: Housing Policy Research Program, UQ Social Research Centre, The University of Queensland. Not yet published. pp 37, 53.

- consultations with key regional stakeholders from SAAP, CAP and other relevant service providers and Peak Bodies;
- consultations with other jurisdictions to explore how these programs are administered elsewhere;
- submissions and responses to the Discussion Paper (see below) developed during the review process; and
- analysis and interpretation of documentation and previous reviews relating to SAAP and CAP program management.

Discussion paper

As part of the review, a Discussion Paper⁴ was developed, based on information provided during initial consultations with Departmental stakeholders, peak bodies and a number of SAAP service providers. The discussion paper was structured around five thematic areas of program management:

- strategy and policy development;
- planning and needs assessment;
- funding and resource allocation and purchasing arrangements;
- contract management; and
- performance management and reporting.

The Discussion Paper sets the context for the review and outlines the context of the SAAP and CAP programs as a response to homelessness. It provides a discussion on the current identified strengths, weakness and areas of opportunity to improve program management arrangements for the two programs.

The Discussion Paper was made available to stakeholders and responses were sought on issues presented in the paper over a four week time period. Consultations with regional stakeholders and other jurisdictions were also informed by the Paper.

1.2 Regional stakeholder forums

Consultations with regional SAAP and CAP providers and other stakeholders were conducted between 17th and 20th March 2008 through forums in a number of locations:

⁴ Discussion Paper 2008, op. cit.

- Cairns
- Townsville
- Rockhampton
- Brisbane
- Ipswich
- Caboolture
- Gold Coast
- Remote and rural communities (by teleconference)

A list of the organisations involved in the forums and teleconference can be found in the appendix A.

Guided by the findings presented in the Discussion Paper, forum participants were asked to identify strengths and weaknesses and to explore opportunities for improvements relating to current program management arrangements in each of the five thematic areas. Most importantly, forum participants were asked to consider what would be different for service providers and for clients for each suggested improvement.

A nominated participant from each forum verified the forums notes to ensure they accurately captured the discussion at each forum.

1.3 Responses to the discussions paper

Eighteen written responses were received from over 30 organisations, responding either individually or as part of a network of service providers. A list of these organisations is included in appendix A.

1.4 Purpose of this report

This report summarises findings and feedback from the regional stakeholders forums and teleconference and from written responses. The purpose of this report is to:

- summarise the key points of discussions/submissions and opportunities for improvement across the sector;
- identify any regional variations in program management across the State that may impact on options for future program management arrangements;
- establish a shared understanding, across all Government and non-government stakeholders, of the key issues and concerns related to current and future program management arrangements; and
- inform the development of options and recommendations to improve the current SAAP and CAP program management arrangements.

Details about current program management arrangements are provided in the Discussions Paper and are not reiterated in this Consultation Summary Report.

1.5 Structure of this report

This report is structured as follows:

- **Section 2:** Presents key findings and feedback regarding the strengths and areas for improvement of the current SAAP and CAP program management arrangements and identifies where there are regional variations in the consultation feedback.
- **Section 3:** Summarises the key themes arising from the forums and provides an overview of considerations for improvements to program management arrangements.

2 Summary of forum discussions and responses

This section summarises the feedback and discussions from participants through the forums, teleconference and the written responses to the Discussion Paper.

The feedback is structured based on the program management arrangements in the five thematic areas. This section presents overall themes of the discussions and responses in terms of:

- strengths of the current SAAP and CAP program management arrangements;
- issues and challenges with current arrangements;
- opportunities for improvement and the possible impact of these; and
- regional variations in forum discussions.

2.1 Strengths of current arrangements

Stakeholders identified the following elements as key strengths of the current program management arrangements of the SAAP and CAP programs.

2.1.1 Understanding the sector

A number of stakeholders reported that there is a recognition and understanding by both departments of the challenges associated with providing supported accommodation to a wide ranging client group with complex and changing needs.

2.1.2 Core business expertise

Stakeholders recognised that each department has strong and clearly delineated expertise in their 'core business' which supports the effective management of the different elements of the two programs. The DoH were recognised as having strong expertise in managing capital purchasing programs and managing stock and infrastructure. The DoC were recognised as having strong expertise in managing support programs and supporting and building capacity in Non-Government Organisations (NGOs).

It was reported that both of these areas of skill and expertise are fundamental in providing a response to people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. The majority of forum participants felt that a key strength of the current arrangements is the separation of these functions and areas of expertise.

2.1.3 Linked programs enables a broad response

It was felt that the fact that SAAP and CAP are tied programs is a considerable strength. Tying support to properties for people who are in crisis is reported to be critical in addressing a person's needs, to support them into long-term, stable accommodation. Providing support

services with accommodation that is targeted at individuals and families who are in crisis is equally important. Stakeholders expressed the view that, under current arrangements, SAAP is seen as the driver in the response to homelessness, with CAP providing the critical infrastructure support, in the form of housing and maintenance and that functional arrangement works well.

2.1.4 Regional relationships with departments

A number of examples were discussed where good relationships in the regions, between both or either of the departments and service providers, contributed to effective working relationships.

In some regions, good relationships were fostered between individual departmental staff and providers. This was particularly the case where there was stability in departmental staffing, with a low turnover of new staff. In other regions, strong SAAP networks (or a strong focus on SAAP in other networks, such as the Regional Housing Council) were considered to facilitate good relationships. These networks were also reported to provide a forum for feedback from the sector to the department.

Examples were given of good relationships between providers and both departments. However, it was reported that, where it worked well, the DoC's Community Service Officers (CSOs) role was significant in creating and maintaining good relationships with service providers, supporting them and providing a regional access point for negotiation and discussions.

Good relationships were considered to be those where there was open, two-way, regular communication between providers, either individually or as part of a network, and the department(s). This led to a perception that the department(s) had a better understanding of the services being provided and were more able to support providers in service delivery. Providers also felt more informed with regard to initiatives and policy directions regarding SAAP and CAP and the wider housing system.

2.1.5 Good outcomes for clients

The majority of stakeholders reported that, despite opportunities for improvement in program management arrangements, services were still delivering good outcomes to clients. It was felt that, in the main, any problems with program management arrangements were not significantly impacting direct service provision. A number of examples were given where service providers at a local level worked together to share information, plan and make decisions to ensure that service delivery continued to meet the needs of clients, regardless of relatively limited formal protocols and systems with the departments.

2.1.6 Supporting complex clients

Some stakeholders identified that links with specialist areas such as disability services and domestic violence were a strength. These links were considered important in supporting specific

groups of clients who have multiple needs but who are provided an initial response through the SAAP system.

2.1.7 Management and reporting processes

A number of stakeholders reported that existing processes regarding service agreements (contracts) for both programs provide strong accountability, which was seen as a strength. Reporting through the National Data Collection Agency (NDCA)⁵ was also seen to be a strength, as it provides a single source of data collection and reporting. The introduction of the new needs analysis and planning tools by both departments was seen as a strength, although there was a perception that the impacts of these have yet to be observed at a practical, service provision level.

2.2 Issues and challenges with current arrangements

While recognising that there are a number of strengths in the current program management arrangements that could be enhanced, stakeholders identified a number of issues and challenges with the current arrangements.

A number of areas for improvement were identified through consultations that need consideration despite not being strictly related to program management arrangements. These are discussed below.

2.2.1 Consultation and feedback

It was perceived that there is currently limited formal consultation with the sector regarding issues and initiatives that impact on SAAP and CAP providers and their clients. It was reported that consultation that does occur is seen as tokenistic and is undertaken more to inform the sector, rather than to consult with them. Stakeholders gave examples of recent consultations relating to both OSHS (led by DoH) and Strengthening NGOs (led by DOC). It was felt that these consultations provided the sector with information, but did not provide an opportunity to inform the development of these initiatives, or to properly explore what the initiatives meant for the sector and for service provision.

There is a perceived lack of transparency about how decisions are made, and on what basis, with limited feedback provided to the sector on decision-making processes. This is seen to hamper the development of strong and effective working relationships between the sector and the respective departments. It was reported that there is also limited feedback on performance of service providers, either individually or collectively. This is perceived to restrict effective continuous improvement for service delivery.

Increasingly therefore, relationships with departmental staff in the regions are important, as this is perceived as the only way in which the sector's voice can be heard. However, it was reported that there is inconsistency in the presence and effectiveness of structures for regional input into

⁵ Managed by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW), the NDCA is the national database for SAAP reporting.

policy development. Stakeholders perceived that there are limited opportunities for non-government stakeholders to feed information to Director General or Ministerial level.

2.2.2 Communication

With a few exceptions, it was reported that communication between the departments regarding SAAP and CAP is perceived as being inadequate. As a result of this, there was a reported perception that the departments do not fully understand the respective roles and responsibilities, which leads to a lack of clarity when working with the sector and with each other.

Stakeholders reported that, at a regional level, departmental staff are not always fully informed about key policy directions and initiatives of the respective department that have an impact on SAAP and CAP. Examples were given where departmental staff heard about respective departmental policies through service providers, rather than through the department. As such, departmental staff who are in contact with providers are not always well positioned to provide appropriate support and direction to providers.

2.2.3 Different regional structures in departments

In the main, positive feedback was provided about the local CSO role in supporting service providers and providing a link between the sector and the DoC. It was reported that the lack of a corresponding position in the regional DoH offices created problems. The problems were identified as insufficient communication to and from central DoH (and between the DoH and the DoC) and a perception that DoH was not familiar with local issues concerning providers and clients.

Some stakeholders also reported a lack of clarity regarding where to seek information and advice regarding the two programs and how to escalate concerns if required.

2.2.4 Maintaining relationships

The presence and effectiveness of local networks and forums for SAAP and CAP varied across regions. The strength of relationships and effectiveness of networks was reported as highly dependent on individuals rather than formalised structures and processes.

High staff turnover was reported as having a significant impact on both the maintenance and sustainability of effective working relationships. This was seen to be particularly difficult for regions where there were few networks or less formal structures.

A number of key areas for improvement were identified against the thematic areas of program management. While these are discussed under separate headings, it is worth noting that many overlap across the program management elements.

2.2.5 Strategy and policy development

Stakeholders identified a lack of coordination across departments in developing policy and strategy. SAAP and CAP program objectives are not seen to be well aligned and there is no understood common driver for joint planning and development for both programs.

Without this alignment at a strategy and policy level there were concerns raised that the departments are working towards two different sets of goals. This was felt to significantly reduce the effectiveness of SAAP and CAP strategies for clients.

There is a perception that the departments have different views about the definition of homelessness and the most appropriate response to people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Concerns were raised that this difference could cause challenges when it comes to aligning SAAP and CAP and establishing common goals.

The limited understanding and connection of policy drivers and linkages across government was seen as a barrier to achieving a well coordinated whole of government response to homelessness.

Stakeholders felt that strategy and policy objectives and directions for both departments are not consistently filtered down or translated to departmental staff in regions, or to staff from other government agencies. This results in no common understanding as to the relationship of SAAP and CAP to the broader policy agenda.

It was reported that there are limited structures and processes in place for regions and service providers to contribute to the strategy and policy development process.

2.2.6 Needs assessment and planning

Stakeholders indicated that current needs assessment and planning processes are not transparent, leading to a perception that formal planning regarding SAAP and CAP development does not exist.

As an example of this, the sector report being unclear as to what information is used to inform needs assessment and what rationale is used to underpin planning and decision-making. In part, this is attributed to limited consultation and feedback with the sector.

There were concerns that local information is not being considered appropriately in needs assessment and planning, or that the information that is used is not comprehensive or sufficiently accurate to provide a robust understanding of local needs. Therefore, there was a perception that often planning decisions are made without a comprehensive understanding of service provision. This was particularly reported for CAP programs, as there are often no formal relationship at a regional level between providers and DoH staff.

A further concern from stakeholders was that the departments do not use a common data set applicable to both programs to assess needs and inform decisions with regard to service provision. This again impacts on the robustness of the information underpinning planning decisions.

2.2.7 Funding, resource allocation and purchasing

The most common feedback relating to funding and resource allocation was the mismatch in funding between SAAP and CAP. There were concerns that the growth in CAP properties was being impacted by the limited availability of new SAAP funding.

Stakeholders report being unclear as to how funding and resource allocation decisions are made, and on what basis. A common perception was that performance management and reporting information was not fed into decision-making processes regarding funding and resource allocation.

It was felt that decisions were not primarily based on information regarding the client and that this can lead to inappropriate decisions and a primary focus on assets. For example, it was indicated that decisions about CAP funding and resources should also consider client support needs. There was a reported perception that the DoH was not aware of what properties were utilised by specific providers, evidenced by the frequent requests of providers for information on stock.

It was reported that many SAAP services are funded on long-term contracts, based on historical arrangements that may not adequately reflect current client need. This was seen to impact on the ability to respond more effectively to service demand and changing needs as a sector.

Stakeholders therefore highlighted the importance of ensuring that funding and resourcing decisions are made on accurate, comprehensive data and underpinned by needs assessment. The importance of clearly communicating decisions and their rationale to the sector was also noted.

A number of stakeholders considered that the current tendering processes for new services (including non-recurrent SAAP funding) are time consuming and create unnecessary competition in the sector. It was identified that these processes could be better managed to encourage collaboration and cooperation between services to deliver benefits to clients. Delays in responding to tenders or requests for new properties and support funding were identified as frustrating and detrimental to relationships between providers and the departments.

2.2.8 Contract management

Some stakeholders felt that the current contract management arrangements focus too much on compliance and do not sufficiently encourage a focus on partnerships, collaboration and sector development. This was particularly the case with CAP services, where there is limited contact between the CAP provider and the DoH. A number of stakeholders also expressed a level of confusion regarding their responsibilities under different legislative requirements for both programs.

Stakeholders expressed concerns over a lack of flexibility within contracting and compliance arrangements, for example how rental income can be expended for CAP. It was felt that this restricted opportunities to provide the most appropriate support to clients.

There was a perception that monitoring of CAP programs is primarily driven by quotas for clients in houses, rather than on whether the properties are being used in the best way to benefit

clients. An example given was where there are vacant rooms in a property to enable staff to provide an appropriate level of support to the tenants already in the property.

2.2.9 Performance management and reporting

Stakeholders identified some duplication in reporting requirements across the two programs, in particular for financial reports.

Some concerns were highlighted regarding the relevance and comprehensiveness of data that is captured for SAAP clients. Some stakeholders felt that, while the NDCA data was a good, single source of information, it should not be used as the sole data source to inform performance management and planning.

Service providers reported that they have limited involvement with the DoH in relation to performance management and reporting. Providers of both programs comment that feedback from the departments on reporting and performance management is limited and that there is little positive feedback on good performance.

2.3 Regional variations

There were a number of variations in feedback related to program management arrangements from stakeholders in different regions.

The most significant difference was the reported strength of relationships that providers have with department staff across the regions. In some areas there were reportedly strong relationships between the sector and the DoH. In other areas, providers reported having a better relationship with the DoC.

The strength of the relationship was determined by a number of factors:

- how long the individuals had been in their position (i.e. limited staff turnover, both in the department(s) and in the sector);
- the presence of effective local networking or forum structures that enable relationships to form and develop regardless of staff turnover; and
- the skill and experience of departmental staff in engaging with the sector.

Regions that reported having effective local forums felt that these structures provided an opportunity to share information regarding policy and local issues and to be involved in planning and solutions to address these issues. Effective examples include a sector led SAAP forum or a Regional Housing Council with a focus on SAAP and CAP.

A number of rural and remote communities report having strong local service partnerships which can be used to address local service issues. This is important in these regions, as services are often located a considerable distance away from department offices, or report to department

staff in different regions. This makes it difficult to establish a working relationship between providers and departments.

There was a correlation between the strength and supportiveness of department-provider relationships and the perception of the effectiveness of SAAP and CAP program management arrangements. In most cases, in regions where there were better relationships between the sector and the departments, there were reported greater levels of understanding about respective roles and responsibilities and a stronger sense that the sector was professionally respected and 'heard'.

2.4 Opportunities for improvement

This section highlights the key opportunities for improvement that were identified by stakeholders at the regional forums. The opportunities fall under three broad categories:

- improved communication and feedback;
- improved coordination of programs; and
- streamlined and integrated processes.

2.4.1 Improved communication and feedback

Communication and information sharing: Improving communication and information sharing at all levels was identified as a priority. As well as improving communication between the departments and sector there was an identified need to improve communication between the two departments. It was recommended that structured, regular, formal communication mechanisms are established between the departments. The main goals of improved communication and information sharing were seen to be:

- a better awareness across departments of the programs and factors impacting on the programs; and
- an improvement in the transparency of processes at all levels and across all stakeholder groups.

Consultation: Stakeholders felt strongly that consistent, genuine engagement of the sector by government is of paramount importance to developing a sector that can be responsive to client need. Robust consultation is required to create and maintain good relationships between government and the sector and to foster a culture of mutual, professional respect. Consultation was also considered to be an important part of decision-making around new initiatives and changes to the SAAP CAP sector.

A number of stakeholders identified the need for consultation with management and Board members of NGOs, as well as with team members and front line workers.

Structured regional networks: Structured, regular joint forums were seen as important. These forums would not only provide a means for consultation and communication, but would also:

- establish relationships and create support for providers;
- provide a forum for discussion and information sharing between providers and between the sector and departments;
- provide a forum for setting and maintaining standards of service delivery and identifying opportunities for improvements;
- ensuring all stakeholders are aware of and familiar with relevant policy directions and changing initiatives that impact on SAAP and CAP;
- ensure collaboration and joint working between the programs at a local level to achieve shared local goals for clients; and
- inform and get feedback from planning processes.

As well as establishing (or support existing) regional networks, stakeholders consider it necessary for the DoH to have a strong regional presence in relation to SAAP and CAP.

Regional advisory group: This group is seen as an important mechanism to enable the sector to contribute to strategy and policy development and program planning. The advisory group would provide an opportunity to feed into other government levels and processes.

2.4.2 Improved coordination of programs

Common clients, shared outcomes: There is an opportunity to improve collaboration at a policy and strategy level and to articulate this clearly to drive better collaboration between the programs at a service delivery level. Stakeholders identified the need for the cross-government homelessness agenda to have more explicit objectives and intended outcomes and to be extended beyond the *Responding to Homelessness Strategy*, which focuses on new services. .

Stakeholders felt strongly that greater recognition of the shared clients between the programs is required to focus on the best interests of clients. This requires greater alignment of program objectives and the development of cross program outcomes.

Consistent language and common definitions regarding clients and homelessness would support this process.

Coordinated planning: The establishment of common assessment processes would support more effective needs assessment, planning and resource allocation. Shared information with regard to accommodation options and availability, client need and effective service responses would maximise the ability to establish the right accommodation and support response for clients and communities.

Whole of government approach: There is a need to create stronger links to other government agencies and community sectors to facilitate a holistic response for clients who have multiple and/or complex needs. Examples include creating stronger links with justice, mental health and disability and domestic violence sectors. Creating a cross government focus and aligning policy and planning for homelessness was considered important for prevention and early intervention to break the cycle of homelessness.

2.4.3 Streamlined and integrated processes

A number of opportunities were discussed to create more streamlined and integrated processes for the two programs to make things clearer and simpler for both government and service providers.

Stakeholders recommended that improvements should be considered in line with any wider government initiatives to respond to the recent Auditor General's report, *Results of Performance Management Systems Audit of Management of Funding to Non-Government Organisations*⁶. This report called for greater collaboration and congruence across government in funding and managing relationships with the NGO sector⁷.

Contracting arrangements: For providers who have contracting arrangements with both DoH and DoC, consideration should be given to the capacity to develop joint contracting arrangements, either through a single contract, or through dual contracts managed by a single point of contact. Negotiations for SAAP and CAP contracts could also be better aligned to reduce the resources required in separate negotiations and to enable transparency and collaboration across the two programs. Opportunities were also identified to encourage providers to jointly bid to deliver services, through removing the competitive tendering process and seeking select tenders.

Service level agreements, as part of contract management, could be improved to include reporting against common objectives and outcomes.

Stakeholder also identified an opportunity to develop standards and benchmarks to improve consistency regarding compliance and consequences for non-compliance.

Joint, flexible funding: There is capacity to improve the current funding mechanisms for joint CAP and SAAP providers to enable greater flexibility in how funding can be utilised to respond to changing client needs. This should be accompanied by improvements in the funding allocation model, to ensure that funding decisions are made that are reflective of current needs, rather than being based on historical arrangements. It was also felt that aligned funding cycles for both programs would facilitate more effective long term planning.

Data collection and reporting: Stakeholders felt that opportunities exist to create a common data set to underpin both planning and reporting requirements. This included the need to capture both qualitative and quantitative data to reflect the broad range of needs and service provision to

⁶ State of Queensland (2007) *Results of Performance Management Systems Audit of Management of Funding to Non-Government Organisations*. Brisbane: Queensland Audit Office

⁷ Ibid. pg 7.

clients. It was suggested that the NDCA data collection be used, with discussion with AIHW to expand the data set to meet the needs of both programs. Clear definitions of required data and the purpose of data collected are required.

Reporting could be standardised to minimise the number of different reports that are required. This would include aligning financial and accounts reports for providers who manage both SAAP and CAP services. An alignment of service provision reporting would not only reduce the burden of reporting, but would also ensure that information related to service effectiveness and client outcomes would be available to both programs to inform planning. The alignment of reporting timeframes was also proposed.

Policies and procedures: The need to streamline and standardise policies and procedures across the two programs was identified. This would create consistency in practice across the sector and reduce the need for providers to develop their own policies and procedures. Alignment or integration of policies and procedures would support coordination between the two programs.

Performance management: There is capacity to develop a common performance management process that measures performance against shared objectives and outcomes and informs planning and development at a sector wide level. It was suggested that outcome measures be developed to reflect the goals of individual programs, aligned to whole sector, client focused outcomes.

Stakeholders recommended that programs be subject to a robust evaluation process, conducted by independent evaluators. It was felt that this would enable performance to be compared across services and to encourage consistently high standards of service provision. Results from evaluations would also provide valuable information in planning and decision making to improve responses to homelessness.

2.5 Potential impact of improvements

Stakeholders were able to identify some positive benefits for service providers and clients that could result from improvements to program management arrangements, as described in section 2.4. These are:

Clients

- More comprehensive, shared data, with input from the regions to inform joint needs assessment and planning, will lead to developing a sector that can be more responsive to emerging and changing client needs.
- Better alignment to OSHS, without removing the focus of SAAP and CAP on crisis accommodation and support, will improve exit points from crisis and transitional housing into long-term, secure housing.
- With a whole of government approach and links with other service sectors, there will be a better response to client with complex needs.

Service providers

- More streamlined processes would reduce administrative burden and enable more efficient use of resources. This would provide more time for supporting clients.
- Relationship management would be simpler if there was one point of contact for both services, with a single contract. This would lead to a greater understanding, across both programs, of challenges faced by providers.
- There would be greater clarity and consistency of practice across the sector, driven by shared understanding, common policies and procedures, joint planning and assessment processes and performance measurement.
- Shared, common outcomes for clients would improve joint working between providers and programs.

3 Summary

Stakeholders were able to identify a number of strengths of the current program management arrangements. There were variations between regions, largely dependent on the depth and strength of professional relationships between the departments and the sector in each region.

Stakeholders reported that, in managing the SAAP and CAP programs, each department has different core expertise and strengths. It was felt that combining these strengths and expertise, but recognising them as distinct skills, was important to effectively manage the necessary elements of support, tenancy management and property management. There was also recognition that some of the processes currently in place for both programs provide good stability and structure for providers.

A number of areas for improvement were identified, specifically a focus on improved communication and consultation, greater integration and coordination and a more streamlined approach to processes and function. However, stakeholders felt that service provision is not directly impacted by current program management arrangements. Services deliver effective responses to clients, regardless of any perceived challenges with current arrangements. It was felt that this would continue to be the case if changes to arrangements were made at the central agency level.

Regardless of what program management changes are made, it is important that improvements take place at all tiers, from central agency through to regional operational levels. Clearer lines of communication between government and the sector must be established to ensure that the programs can develop to better meet the needs of all people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Stakeholders strongly voiced the view that future improvements to the program management arrangements must take account of national priorities and directions as well as State priorities, such as OSHS. There was also strong support for exploring good practice in program management from other areas, in particular other jurisdictions that manage SAAP and CAP programs.

A Stakeholders

Representatives from the following organisations were involved in the regional forums and teleconference.

- ACRO
- Anglicare North Queensland
- BABI Youth and Family Support ~
- Anglicare CQ-FSAS^
- Anglicare CQ-RAIS^
- Banana Shire Support Centre^
- BAYS
- Blair Athol Accommodation and Support Program
- Breakthrough
- Brisbane Youth Service
- Bundaberg Women's Domestic Violence Service
- Burdekin Community Association
- Caboolture Family Haven
- Cabundra Focus
- Care Housing – Churches of Christ~
- Centacare Homelessness Service
- Central Queensland SAAP and CAP providers network~
- Central North SAAP Network~
- Charleville and District Community Support Association
- Chisholm Inc
- CHRW – CG
- CHRWPWBB
- City Life Branch
- Clermont Community Housing and Other Services Inc. (CCHAOS)^
- Community Accommodation and Support Association Inc. (CASA)^
- Cooloola Youth Service
- CQRTA
- Darumbal Community Youth Service
- Dysart Community Support Group Inc.^
- ELAM Inc
- Emergency and Long-Term Accommodation Moranbah Inc. (ELAM)^
- FEAT
- Fraser Coast Housing Services
- FSG Australia
- GCYS~
- Gladstone Regional Council Community Advisory Service^
- Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre
- Housing Roma
- Immigrant Women's Support Service
- Inala Family Accommodation
- Inala Youth Service
- Integrated Family and Youth Service
- Ipswich Independent Youth Service Inc
- Kalyan Youth Services Inc.^
- Koongoora Inc
- Kyabra Community Association
- Laidley Crisis Care and Accommodation
- Lifeline Families Plus
- Lions Emergency Accommodation Centre
- Lowanna House Inc.^
- Mackay Regional Council for Social Development
- Macleod Accommodation Support Service
- MICAH Projects~
- MRCF
- Najidah
- Near North and Tenant Advice Advocacy Service
- Nth Qld Community Housing Regional Council~
- North Queensland Regional Indigenous Housing Co-op Ltd
- North West Youth Accommodation Service~
- OzCare Homeless Men's Hostel^

- Ozcare Transitional Housing
- QCOSS~
- QDHC
- QLD Shelter~
- Queensland Community Housing Coalition
- Queensland Department of Communities
- Queensland Department of Housing~
- Queensland Disability Housing Coalition~
- Queensland Youth Housing Coalition
- REACH
- Red Cross
- Riverbed Action Group
- Rockhampton and Environs Affordable Housing Ltd^
- Rockhampton Women's Shelter^
- Rural and Isolated Accommodation Service Anglicare~
- Roseberry Community Service^
- Ruth's Women's Shelter
- Salvation Army
- Salvation Army Noosa Accommodation
- Salvation Army's Samaritan House ^
- SAND
- Sera's Shelter
- Sharehouse Youth Accommodation Program
- Shelter Housing Action Cairns
- Silky Oaks, Family Care and Support Program~
- South Burnett CTC Inc
- Southside Community Care
- Spiritus
- St Leonards- ICYS
- St Vincent de Paul^
- Tableland Women's Centre
- Tenant Advice and Advocacy Service- Inner North~
- The Women's Centre
- Umpi Korumba Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing
- United Synergies
- Whitsunday Women's Services Inc.^
- YFS Housing Women's House
- Youth and Family Service, Logan City~
- Youth Emergency Services
- Youth Link
- Yumba Meta Housing
- 139 Club Inc

Key:

~ Submitted a response to the Discussions paper

^ submitted a response to the Discussions paper as part of a network of service providers