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Micah Projects Inc. is a not-for-profit organization based in the local community of South Brisbane and providing services to the greater Brisbane Metropolitan Area. Micah Projects Inc is ISO accredited and is committed to the provision of quality, people-centred services. The organizational vision and mission are as follows:

Vision
To create justice and respond to injustice at the personal, social and structural levels in church, society, government, business and society.

Mission
To respond to people who experience exclusion, poverty, injustice and social isolation so that they may experience inclusion, economic wellbeing, justice and connection within their community of choice.

Micah Projects’ core business is a commitment, focus and determination to advocate and deliver on its social justice mandate through key service areas:

- Homelessness Services: Lead agency for the Brisbane Homelessness Service Centre; Street to Home – Outreach; Homelessness to Home - Family Homelessness; Home Front – Sustaining tenancies for people with disabilities; and the Reach Consortium – Early Intervention and Prevention Service;

- Young Mothers for Young Women: Peer Support, Education and Advocacy, Family Support and Early Childhood Program

- Esther Centre: A service for people who have experienced abuse in church and state care, faith communities or human services (Forgotten Australians);

- Mental Health and Disability Services: residents of boarding houses, privately owned supported accommodation facilities, affordable community housing and public housing providing personal care, community linking and tenancy support.

Micah Projects Inc is a member of Homelessness Australia, Queensland Council of Social Services, Australian Council of Social Services and Australian Common Ground Alliance.
Micah Projects Inc has been providing services to homeless people for over ten years. Initially, in this period, the main emphasis was on responding to the immediate needs of individuals and families who presented as homeless or at risk of homelessness – a crisis response. This reflected largely the programmatic approach within government funding bodies. While this was a necessary part of responding to homelessness, it did not allow service providers to do much more than respond to crisis situations in a fragmented and poorly integrated service system.

A more strategic approach, incorporating early intervention and prevention interventions and support for sustaining vulnerable tenancies, was required if real outcomes were to be achieved in breaking the cycle of homelessness.

The State Government’s 2005-2006 Budget Responding to Homelessness initiatives heralded the beginning of a more strategic approach.

Working from across the whole of government, this budgetary initiative brought together government and non-government services to address homelessness through more investment in mental health, family, public space and assessment and referral services. While more work needs to be done, especially in joining up services in a more integrated service system, the key elements of a continuum of support for homeless people was put in place.

Micah Projects continues to be part of working with all stakeholders in improving the service system in responding to homelessness. The organization is seeking to incorporate into its practice “grounded” policy research which reflects the key characteristics of “modernized” policy making especially building upon sound evidence. The project Journeys Through Homelessness was commissioned for this reason as part of the Systems Advocacy funded through the Prevention and Early Intervention of Homelessness funding. It was designed to inform the policy community about how the service system is working now, in the post-Responding to Homelessness era, and how it might work better to achieve the lasting outcomes the State Government is seeking from its investment. This report clearly demonstrates the cost effectiveness of prevention and early intervention and the high cost that comes with simply managing homelessness.

Carolyn Mason, Partnering Works with Walter Robb, Analyse Australia, were contracted to undertake a project on the current homelessness service system, particularly in the greater Brisbane region. The consultants had worked on another project around people with disability in the criminal justice system, developing an innovative methodology for reviewing and reframing policy and program responses.

This innovative approach has been applied in this report to homelessness and covers the elements of:

- **pathways analysis** to understand the issues through the lived experience of clients and the practical implementation knowledge of service providers;
- **issues analysis** to identify the areas requiring reframing in homelessness policy and program terms;
- **cost analysis** to develop an understanding of the net benefits for government in resource allocation processes derived from specific policy and program choices.

---


2 Carolyn Mason and Walter Robb are coauthors of the Queensland Advocacy Incorporated report prepared for the Department of Premier and Cabinet entitled, *Pathways for People with a Disability in the Criminal Justice System: Using a Benefit Cost Analysis to Reframe the Approach to Policies and Programs*, November 2007. The report is yet to be released publicly.
During the life of this project the Australian Government released its Green Paper on Homelessness, *Which Way Home? A new approach to homelessness*. The text of this report and its findings were presented as part of Micah Projects’ submission to the Green Paper. I hope that the findings of this report will assist the policy community to continuously improve its response to homelessness and invigorate discussion on the challenges before us in recognizing that it is both a cost benefit to government and society and it makes sense for each person who is homeless to focus investment on ending homelessness and not simply managing it so as to restore to each person their dignity and human rights as citizens within a home that is safe, supportive, secure and affordable.

Karyn Walsh  
*Coordinator*  
Micah Projects Inc
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1. Summary of the Project

1.1 Scope

The project was to review the current homelessness service system, particularly in the greater Brisbane region. It was to build on the work of the Southside Homelessness Action Network (SHAN) and the continuum of support framework it developed to guide its work. It was to understand the complexity and integration of responses required at a local area level in responding to homelessness. The SHAN’s framework highlighted the concepts of level and duration of service interventions, the personal capacity of clients to manage their situation and the need for locally based coordination and planning.

This framework places an appropriate focus on the individual client and client families within a continuum of support. It is this experience of the client and their pathway through the homelessness service system that provides the frame of reference for the methodology used in this project and for the project’s objectives to:

- review service provision models for understanding pathways in a homelessness service system
- use case studies to map the pathways and review the relevance of these models
- identify costs associated with the pathways as borne by the State Government
- undertake a cost analysis of the pathways for scenarios associated with early intervention of services
- identify key areas for systems advocacy within the homelessness service sector.

This project uses the evidence base of the practical implementation knowledge of clients and their service providers to map the pathways through homelessness or being at risk of homelessness. This knowledge was obtained using a case study approach. While the project

---

1 The authors gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Lyndal Hunter Robb, Analyse Australia, Karyn Walsh, Director Micah Projects, the Micah Project workers and other workers who attended the Workshop described in Appendix 5, and to Lisa, Vida and Albert who told their story.

was limited to three case studies, they are representative of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, and were from three different project areas of Micah Projects as follows:

- **Case Study 1** is a client under the intensive family support approach developed under the initiative *Homelessness to Home*, Micah Projects’ Demonstration Project under the National Homelessness Strategy.

- **Case Study 2** is a client family of the prevention and early intervention pilot program under the Queensland Government’s *Responding to Homelessness Strategy*, where Micah Projects is the auspice body for the program at 6 locations in Greater Brisbane.

- **Case Study 3** is a chronically homeless indigenous man who is a client of the Brisbane Homelessness Service Centre.

The pathway analysis provides specific insights into the homelessness service system from the knowledge generated about how responses are working in practice. The following section presents the project’s findings in terms of seven key areas.

### 1.2 Findings on a Homelessness Service System

#### 1.2.1 Evidence Base

A pathway analysis demonstrates the importance of using practical implementation knowledge as an evidence base to review a homelessness service system. This knowledge reveals:

- the extent to which existing policy and program settings can address the complexity of client need
- the shortcomings of service responses in terms of a whole-of-system context, and a whole-of-life context with ongoing patterns of demand on government services.

This evidence base needs to be systematically incorporated into the review of policy and program settings.

#### 1.2.2 Continuum of Support Interventions

The practical implementation knowledge presented from a pathway analysis supports the continuum of support framework in service delivery. It highlights how the resource constraints and time limits on interventions do not address the complexity of some clients’ needs over time. It indicates service delivery responses need to take account of:

- personal capacity of the clients for management of their situation
- clarity in the intensity of interventions required to be effective and achieve a lasting result for the client
- understanding of required intensity of interventions to be incorporated in the intensity of case management
- appropriate levels of funding to deliver effective case management
- duration of intervention required to counter the experience of people who cycle in and out of the service system without an exit into stable housing, particularly from a whole of life context.

#### 1.2.3 Linkages in Service Delivery

The pathway analysis provides evidence to understand the complexity of the linkages and networks that operate in the homelessness service system. These indicate the need for:

- developing inter-agency accountabilities and protocols from an integrated service delivery perspective that can ‘follow the client’
- information systems across agencies that support this, and provide complete and accurate records on clients so that the burden of cost to government as a whole is not hidden
• unpacking the terminology used around what is variously described as cooperation, co-ordination or collaboration between SAAP services, the mainstream service system and the funders as part of a homelessness service system
• residential tenancy and domestic violence legislation to allow tenancies to be established with conditions around continuing provision of support services
• early warning ‘flags’ in the system when rent arrears start or breach notices start to be issued so this timely information can be provided by the property managers to support workers
• government agencies to understand how their system fits together from the client’s perspective: the impact on the client when moved across the government’s service regions to where accommodation can be provided requires the allocation of a whole new set of service providers and case workers from government agencies.

A pathway analysis provides an understanding of the structural and attitudinal barriers in the existing linkages and networks among the ‘multi-stakeholders’ in the current service system. A pathway analysis focuses attention on the touch points among the service system providers from a client and service provider perspective, and the frequency of these touch points when taken from a systems perspective.

1.2.4 Case for Early Intervention
The case for early intervention is based on the clear indication from the scenarios developed for each case study that the following proposition can be demonstrated:
The costs to Government of providing services to respond to the needs of homeless people under the current service responses is greater than the cost of introducing or increasing the prevention and early intervention services available for the homeless and those at risk of homelessness.

The development of goals and targets in the next phase of policy and program settings for responding to homelessness should be informed by this proposition.

In this project, the scenarios developed for early intervention demonstrate:
• the importance of identifying points where an effective intervention can be made ‘early’ in the pathway of homeless people
• the concept of ‘early’ is a relative when taken from the perspective of a whole-of-life requirement for services
• the considerable personal, social and community benefits to be gained as well as economic ones.

These findings are particularly pertinent in view of the Prevention and Early Intervention Incentives Pool funding announced in the State Budget.

1.2.5 Chronic Homelessness
Chronic homelessness is demonstrated by the experience of case study three. The significance of this case study is that intervention is still justified on economic grounds on a whole of life basis, and is still a relatively ‘early’ intervention given the life expectancy of this individual. This provides some direction in terms of resource allocation for responses to homelessness.

1.2.6 Housing First
The case studies have indicated that policy and program settings need to be reviewed to move from the traditional shelter model towards a housing first model. Case studies one and two provide support for a housing first model from different perspectives. Case study one indicates that every attempt was made to maintain the public housing component, but the lack of a case management response at a critical point has led to very significant increases in complexity and expense of service provision required over a very long time. Case study two indicates that the
‘housing’ does not need to be provided by the government. However, the point in common is that the timing for an intervention is critical and will be most effective if applied when the form of housing is not within the definition of homelessness.

1.2.7 Indicative Costing Analysis

A pathway analysis demonstrates the complexity of the data collection required to provide a relatively accurate costing analysis for decision making around interventions that will have the biggest impact for budget funds. This project used the scenario approach to introduce an indicative costing analysis of the pathways with specific interventions. It demonstrates that:

- the cumulative costs of not intervening mount quickly once people require high cost services such as hospital, police, court or prison services
- budget funds are better viewed from a holistic perspective, because significant savings can be made in one program area of public spending by judicious investment in another
- indicative results indicate that this is particularly the case where this investment is in early intervention and prevention as it leads to longer term gains throughout a person’s life course
- whole-of-life costs must be built into funding models as demonstrated by the pathway analysis methodology.

A pathways costing framework, as demonstrated by this project, is a key building block for the development of a robust resource allocation methodology for investment in a homelessness service system that can achieve enduring benefits.
2. Understanding & Addressing Homelessness

2.1 Overview

Homelessness is a longstanding and pervasive reality and for years governments have sought to address it through various program interventions. A significant response to homelessness in Australia was made just over twenty years ago when the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) and the Crisis Accommodation Program (CAP) were developed as joint Commonwealth – State programs. Since then, this programmatic response has been the main strategy for addressing homelessness.

However, in recent years, there has been a growing recognition within governments and in the community services sector that the SAAP-CAP response has not kept up with the changing face of homelessness and the flow-on effects that homelessness has on people’s lives. This recognition has also been reflected internationally where the goal of “ending” homelessness has driven responses. Conceptual frameworks underpinning this change of focus are discussed in (3) of this report.

Appendix 1 outlines recent new initiatives at a Commonwealth and State Government level to address homelessness.

Significantly, the Rudd Government will soon release its White Paper on homelessness, following the recent Green Paper\(^5\) process, and this is likely to bring further change to the ways in which homelessness is addressed in Australia.

This project was undertaken in the context of an emerging new direction in addressing homelessness.

2.2 Definitions of Homelessness

Two definitions of ‘homelessness’ are used in the project. The first definition is the one developed by Chris Chamberlain and David MacKenzie in 1992\(^6\) and used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). This definition of homelessness is called a ‘cultural definition’ because it describes a minimum community standard for housing, and those below this standard are considered homeless falling under three categories:

- **Primary homelessness** – this equates with ‘rooflessness’, people without conventional accommodation (eg sleeping in parks or on the street, squatting, living in cars or improvised dwellings);
- **Secondary homelessness** – moving frequently from one form of temporary accommodation to another (eg refuges, emergency hostel accommodation or finding temporary space at the homes of family or friends);
- **Tertiary homelessness** – living in boarding houses on a medium to long-term basis (includes those who live in caravan parks because they cannot afford or find alternative accommodation).

The second definition is the one used in the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP), the program under which many services receive funds and report their activities.

---

\(^5\) Which Way Home? A new approach to homelessness (The Green Paper)

The SAAP definition is found under Section 4 of the SAAP Act 1994 and establishes criteria for the provision of services and assistance to clients as follows:

1. For the purposes of this Act, a person is homeless if, and only if, he or she has inadequate access to safe and secure housing.

Inadequate access to safe and secure housing

2. For the purposes of this Act, a person is taken to have inadequate access to safe and secure housing if the only housing to which the person has access:

   (a) damages, or is likely to damage, the person’s health; or
   (b) threatens the person’s safety; or
   (c) marginalises the person through failing to provide access to:
      (i) adequate personal amenities; or
      (ii) the economic and social supports that a home normally affords; or
   (d) places the person in circumstances which threaten or adversely affect the adequacy, safety, security and affordability of that housing.

This definition gives some dimension to the range of services required from the SAAP services.

2.3 Causes of Homelessness

There are many causes of homelessness and while they intersect this project will refer to them on four levels:

- First, structural inequalities, covering issues such as lack of access to affordable housing, inadequate income support, unemployment and poverty.
- Second, breakdown of family and social networks, with family and domestic violence and relationship breakdowns as key factors.
- Third, personal factors, where social exclusion and discrimination occur because of individual issues, such as mental illness, intellectual disability, health status and substance abuse.
- Fourth, cultural causes because of the provision of culturally inappropriate housing or support services to indigenous and cultural and linguistically diverse communities.

These are different to the three categories of socio-economic factors; social exclusion; and, individual issues used in the Green Paper. The above four categories are considered in reference to the case studies.


3. Conceptual Framework

3.1 Homelessness Service System

A homelessness service system is a concept used as the basis of a policy and program response to homelessness. It needs to provide pathways out of homelessness that do not result in the ‘revolving door’ for the homeless or those at risk of homelessness. The use of the term ‘system’ is important and takes account of:

- the service providers and their services, including the providers of funds
- the linkages, networks and relationships among services, and the strengths of these linkages
- the purpose and objectives for the system, and the extent to which these are shared among providers.

A homelessness service system, conceptually, moves beyond the SAAP if SAAP is a policy and program response to homelessness that is “conceived as and continues to be a last resort safety-net for homeless Australians or those at risk of homelessness”. This is elaborated upon through a consideration of the following four elements:

- **service delivery models**: models for service provision for the homeless and those at risk of homelessness
- **linkages and networks**: frameworks to understand the significance of linkages and networks among service providers required to deliver a ‘joined-up approach’
- **evidence base**: use of an evidence base from the practical implementation knowledge of clients and their service providers through the journeys of homelessness or their diversion from homelessness
- **indicative costing analysis**: an indicative costing analysis of the pathways and early intervention scenarios

3.2 Homelessness Service Provision Models

3.2.1 Continuum of Support Framework

The work of a service provider network in the inner city of Brisbane, the Southside Homelessness Action Network (SHAN), used a continuum of support framework to guide its work in responding to homelessness at a very localized level. The framework was to understand the complexity and integration of responses required from service providers if there was to be a comprehensive response to homelessness. The framework highlighted that support of homeless people involves service intervention levels from low to high considered with a person’s capacity for self-determination from crisis management to self-management.

The important concepts for consideration from this framework are:

- the intensity of intervention required
- the person’s capacity, which homelessness and its causes will affect
- by implication, the length of time required for the intervention, and
- the range of services required both specific and not for service providers.

---


11 A set of interacting or interdependent entities, real or abstract, forming an integrated whole. The concept of an ‘integrated whole’ can also be stated in terms of a system embodying a set of relationships...[Hu]man systems normally have a certain purpose (and), set of objectives. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/System](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/System)

FIG 1. Continuum of Support Framework

The case studies are used to reflect on these elements, and what they mean for how SAAP is currently conceptualized and what might be needed as a systemic response.

3.2.2 Shelter Model

The approach taken to addressing homelessness that has dominated policy and program responses can be called the Shelter Model. The SAAP V objectives and priorities and its program logic hierarchy diagram can be considered as representing this model through the service provision expected of the States and Territories with its pathways through accommodation types represented by the arrows at the tops of the diagram:

![Shelter Model Diagram](http://www.facs.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/0/3A0798F0C1624B72CAE258F50014C5C2)

FIG 2. Shelter Model

However, it is recognized that the program logic represents:

> *the primary linkages between program interventions and client outcomes only. It is acknowledged that a multitude of secondary interconnections within the SAAP program exist and that achievement of many of the identified outcomes in the Program Logic will be influenced by factors outside the control of SAAP.*

Therefore the arrows at top of the diagram are based on the assumptions that:

- services are available to a client as required under the Continuum of Support Framework
- housing supply is available in each of the accommodation types.

Evidence would suggest that these assumptions are not met.

---

14 SAAP V Agreement paragraph 4.3.2
16 [Permanent Housing integrated into community](http://www.facts.gov.au/internet/factsinterna.nsf/0/3A0798F0C1624B72CAE258F50014C5C2)
17 The Green Paper’s references would suggest this as well as [Carolyn Mason’s Report of 360° Review of HART 4000 a homeless persons’ service hub, conducted for the Project Management Committee, October 2007, report not publicly released](http://www.facts.gov.au/internet/factsinterna.nsf/0/3A0798F0C1624B72CAE258F50014C5C2)
3.2.3 Housing First Model

There has been considerable attention to an alternative model for addressing homelessness called the Housing First Model. It is based on “an immediate and primary focus on helping [individuals and] families quickly access and then sustain housing – put simply, housing comes first, then services”, and this model is represented in the diagram below:\(^{18}\):

![Housing First Model Diagram](image)

The Executive Director of the US Interagency Council on Homelessness, on a recent visit to Australia, said that more than 65 studies in the US all showed it was more cost-effective to house the homeless rather than allow them to circulate through shelters, hospital emergency rooms, courts and jails. He is quoted as saying it was up to $US100,000 ($106,000) cheaper per person per annum to provide homeless people with a place to live and the social services to support their tenancies than to “manage” them in the system\(^{19}\). This is based on the evidence from research, projects and plans outlined and referenced on the Council’s website\(^ {20}\). Some of these studies have been used to provide the categories of cost used in the Cost Menu and in the usage rates as applied to the case studies.

In Australia, there is growing support for a Housing First Model, and South Australia is the first State to invest in this approach\(^ {21}\) under the guidance of the founder of the highly successful model in New York, Common Ground. However, caution is required around importing the model without understanding and adapting to the Australian context around philanthropy and tax law. The model will be considered in reflecting on the pathways of participants in the case studies.

3.3 Linkages and Networks

3.3.1 Linkages

The social problem of homelessness is a highly complex one for governments to address, and it cuts across many policy and service delivery areas. It presents a challenge to government in the linkages and networks required among the various service players who provide the continuums of support and intervention for homelessness. Yet it is these very linkages that are required in what the Green Paper describes as the “joined-up approach”.

---


\(^{19}\) George W. Bush’s guru is here to tackle homelessness, Lauren Wilson May 14, 2008. The Australian


\(^{21}\) [http://www.commonground.org/?page_id=75](http://www.commonground.org/?page_id=75)
Researchers have identified the use of horizontal integration arrangements for linkages, but called for clarity in defining the linkages required in the coming together of providers to work to achieve common goals. One model that has been developed identifies three forms of integration: co-operation, co-ordination and collaboration, differentiated by their level of connection and its intensity, and its presented below\(^2\).

![Horizontal Integration Continuum](image)

**FIG 4. Horizontal Integration Continuum**

The concept of the connections and their intensity of linkages among players need to be applied to homelessness. The case studies provide important insights to better understand how these linkages are operating in practice, and how they need to operate to be effective.

The importance of this point was made recently in the findings of the Mid-term Review of the Queensland Government’s Strategy\(^3\). The Strategy was acknowledged as a bold and ambitious initiative that has introduced new services and enhanced existing services for homeless people in the target locations. With regard to it being a coordinated response to homelessness, this was assessed as being less successful, and the Government has recognised that it “will look at issues in relation to collaboration, regional and service delivery coordination and engaging the non-government sector”. Attention to, and a shared meaning around, these terms needs to be developed.

### 3.3.2 Network Structures

The concept of a horizontal integration continuum can be taken further and applied to the mapping of organizational arrangements among the players. When linkages are required to address the ‘wicked problems’ such as homelessness, attention to organizational arrangements that can really start to address these problems is required. Researchers have introduced the concept of a network structure, clearly differentiating it from the more commonly used term for arrangements of networks:\(^2\)

\[\text{Networks occur when links among a number of organizations or individuals become formalized... Network structures occur when working separately - even while maintaining links with each other - is not enough... a network structure is typified by a broad mission and joint, strategically interdependent action. There is a strong commitment to overriding goals, and members agree to commit significant resources over a long period of time.}\]

The concept of network exists very much in the homelessness field. In Brisbane, the Inner City Homelessness and Affordable Housing Network (ICAHN) covers 25 different networks with membership from the three levels of government and the community sector. The complexity of the homelessness system is well demonstrated in the Network’s attempt to map itself as part of its recent review of its operation to enhance its effectiveness, with ‘tiers’ from the operational to the strategic level. A modified representation of the network presented in the following diagram indicates the extent of this complexity:\(^2\)

---


\(^{25}\) This section is based on a meeting and email communication between Carolyn Mason and Steve Faoagali of the Department of Communities, Service Delivery Directorate, Greater Brisbane Area, 15 April 2008
The challenges with moving to a network structure from the networks would be around:

- the complexity in the number and level of connectivity of the linkages
- the extent of shared objectives and priorities
- the allocation of resources to supporting it given the scarcity of resources for front line service delivery
- commitment over time in this sector.

Shared meaning around the concept of a network, and a commitment to implement them in a real way is required if this organizational arrangement is to be effective in a homelessness service system.

3.4 Evidence Base

3.4.1 Whose Evidence?

Reference is made in government and academia to ‘evidence-based policy’ to support the public sector’s concern for efficiency and effectiveness in resource allocation. Head\(^{26}\) proposes that the evidence used for addressing complex policy issues (and homelessness is surely one) must be critically examined and that ‘evidence’ can be considered from three ‘lenses’, each working in their different ways with different constraints. They are:

- Political knowledge
- Scientific (research-based) knowledge
- Practical implementation knowledge.

He argues that significant challenges come from the “large difference between a technical problem-solving approach to knowledge, and a broader relational and systemic approach to knowledge that is located in multi-stakeholder networks”\(^{27}\). These challenges are:

- the political and values-based nature of policy debate and decision-making
- the fact that information is perceived and used in different ways depending on the ‘lens’ being used, so shared perspectives are difficult to attain
- the complexity of the networks, partnerships and collaborative governance arrangements involved in policy and program development, and their diversity of lived experience and evidence\(^{28}\).

This project purposefully adopts a methodology to generate practical implementation knowledge developed from case studies involving “multi-stakeholder networks”. The purpose is to use this ‘lens’ and advocate for its place in a context of political policy making and budget decision making.

---


\(^{27}\) Footnote above, page 9

\(^{28}\) Ditto footnote above
3.4.2 Pathway Analysis: A Case Study Approach

The case study approach can bring to life the lived experience of people currently within the homelessness service system and examine their pathways. The participants and their service providers are the source of practical implementation knowledge. This knowledge is used to consider:

- the cause of homelessness
- differences in personal capacity to deal with the situation
- the range of need for support services
- the intensity and length of intervention required
- the relevance of homelessness service provision models
- the importance of linkages and networks among providers.

The scope of this project is limited and so only three case studies were undertaken. However, to represent the range of responses to homelessness and those at risk of homelessness the participants were chosen from three different project areas of Micah Projects as follows:

- **Homelessness to Home** was funded by the Australian Government Department of Families, Communities and Indigenous Affairs as a Demonstration Project under the National Homelessness Strategy. *Homelessness to Home* sought to demonstrate through intensive intervention the outcome of ending family homelessness for very vulnerable families. While the Project has formally ended, the team and the method are still in operation and are being applied to Case Study 1.

- The REACH program is a prevention and early intervention pilot under the State Government’s *Responding to Homelessness Strategy*, and Micah Projects if the auspice body for services at 6 locations around Greater Brisbane. Case Study 2 is a client family under this pilot program.

- Micah Projects operates one of the two Homeless Persons’ Hubs in Brisbane from the Brisbane Homelessness Service Centre with co-located services. Case Study 3 is based on an indigenous client of the Hub’s assessment and referral team, and represents a chronically homeless person for the purpose of developing the costs and the scenarios.

---

29 The Queensland Government will provide $10 million in 2008-09 and $20 million a year from 2009-10 to establish a prevention and early intervention incentives pool to fund innovative, new or untested pilot projects, principally in the human services and justice areas.


31 Pinkney S & Ewing S (2006), *Costs and pathways of homelessness: Developing policy relevant economic analysis for the Australian homelessness service system*, p. 105, (Institute of Social Research, Swinburne University of Technology), Department of Family and Community Services, Commonwealth of Australia.
3.4.3 Early Intervention Scenarios

In line with the priorities of SAAP V and the Queensland Government’s Strategy and recognition in the recent budget of the importance of early intervention in human services\(^{30}\), the pathway analysis has developed scenarios that represent an early intervention approach that could have been applied with two of the three case studies. The other case study, early intervention was the approach, and the scenario developed is the ‘what if’ scenario if this had not been available.

3.5 Costing Homelessness

3.5.1 Approach to Cost Analysis

The purpose of the cost analysis of the pathways for the three case studies is based on the following proposition:

_The lived experience costs to Government for providing services to support the pathways of homeless people through homelessness is likely to be greater than the cost of introducing or increasing the prevention and early intervention services available for the homeless and those at risk of homelessness._

As outlined in the chart on the following page by Pinkney and Ewings (2006)\(^{32}\), there are a number of approaches to costing pathways. This report primarily uses in-depth interview methods to develop individual costings for a small number of case studies. In one case study, the individual information was supplemented with composite information from similar cases based on frontline workers’ experiences.

In applying the cost analysis to the case studies, three elements have been required:

- identifying the range of government programs and services to be covered in the cost analysis
- developing understanding around usage of services
- developing a Cost Menu to apply to the pathway analysis.

*FIG 7. Options for development of pathways costing frameworks*

*Source: Pinkney S & Ewing S (2006)\(^{32}\)*

These elements are considered in the next sections.

---

\(^{30}\) Based on work for a government agency undertaken by Walter Robb and Dr Khosresh Alam, on behalf of Eidos.
3.5.2 Government Programs and Services

Government provides a significant range and number of services through direct delivery of services or the provision of funds for these services and the infrastructure they require. The SAAP V Agreement and the contribution from the State Government under strategies and priorities in its budget process are the resource allocation frameworks for homelessness. The roles for Government in ensuring adequate human services are:

- **Governance**: including legislation, regulation, policy development, strategy, planning, coordination across agencies/service providers, research & evaluation, advocacy and service innovation;
- **Support for service providers**: in direct provision of services such as for counseling, case management, personal skills development activity, information resources, employment activity, employment skills training, financial support, community education, recreational activity; supported accommodation; capacity building; infrastructure, and professional development and training - through contractual arrangements;
- **Services for individuals**: in assessment and referral and directly through client centred brokerages arrangements for care packages; public infrastructure and services.
- **Support for communities**: in community development, planning, engagement and participation, information resources and community infrastructure.

In applying this categorization to homelessness, the issues are:

- the description of services is a work in progress and needs to be undertaken in conjunction with agencies
- services can fall across all four areas, but for practical purposes around access to information the support for service providers is the main area considered
- refinement in the definition of services is important for improving the accuracy of the cost menu items and the resultant cost analysis.

Further work would ideally take into account all areas for completeness.

3.5.3 Usage of Services

The cost analysis requires estimates of the usage of services by the case study participants through their pathways. The usage of services by homeless people, and those at risk of homelessness, can become very high, particularly in specific groups of the homeless population. One main group with high usage of services is the chronically homeless. As research on this group in the United States says about them:

> While they account for a relatively small proportion of the homeless population—probably no more than 10 or 15 percent—their demands on hospital emergency rooms, drug clinics, shelters, ambulances, paramedics, psychiatric facilities, police, jails, prisons, and other public social services exert an enormous drain on the system at great expense to local, state, and federal treasuries. Experts posit that this group of troubled individuals consumes a hugely disproportionate percentage of the resources devoted to homelessness.33

For this reason, the case study on the rough sleeper has used this understanding to develop the usage patterns in the pathway. However, the difficulty in developing accurate usage patterns arises from factors such as:

- a lack of complete and accurate records of individuals, arising from their reluctance or inability to recall information over time
- Absence of a case manager with knowledge of all services used by the client
- privacy requirements and the sharing of information across agencies.

The significance of these issues is that they serve to hide the burden of cost on the State Government. For this reason, usage of services has been developed with the practical knowledge of the service providers, rather than the direct reporting of the case study participants. It is only through more information on usage will the quantum of cost be revealed for government, and so the net benefits of early intervention scenarios will be under-valued.

3.5.4 The Cost Menu

This project focuses on long term cost savings for state government, particularly on the operational costs of agencies. Some attempt is made to estimate capital costs because of its importance in the provision of housing in the addressing of homelessness. The pathway analysis for each case study (see Appendices) does identify the type of costs and the usage. It is important to recognize that many groups will bear the cost of homelessness\(^34\). The burden falls on many groups who bear a cost, but those costs which are not estimated here are:

- the homeless: adult and children
- family and friends
- victims of crime
- Federal and local governments
- employers
- the community.

A Cost Menu is provided at Appendix 2. It details the costs of a range of services that have been accessed in the case studies as well as the categories referred to in research. These categories are:

- Intervention and Support Services
  - community sector providers
  - case management
  - support programs
- government providers
  - police services
  - child safety services
  - health services
  - drug and alcohol services
  - mental health services
- Housing
  - Accommodation: Infrastructure
  - Property management
  - Department of Housing
  - Community provider
- Court System
- Detention and Corrections.

Calculations and sources of data are shown. The Cost Menu provides a limited range of cost estimates based on degree of intensity of the service provided. The costs do not include any program costs of general agency administration, although case management is included.

---

\(^34\) This point was very well made in the report The Cost of Domestic Violence to the Australian Economy: Parts 1 and 2, for the Australian Government by Access Economics in the reports released in 2004

\(^35\) The workshop was held on 11 June 2008, and details are provided in Appendix 5
The Cost Menu was tested by undertaking a workshop with frontline service delivery staff. Each case study was reviewed for completeness of services and specific costs were obtained from service providers. For example, the range of health services used by certain cases was provided by health care professionals and the cost of eviction and repairs of housing was provided by a community housing agency.

As each case study has a level of complexity and variation from others, there is a need to apply average costs where individual costs are not specifically provided. The resultant menu extends to the limit of available information at this time.

3.6 Triangulation

Information collected on the case studies will be validated by the following steps:
- direct information through interviews with case study participants
- workshop review of the case studies with representatives of the service providers
- information from case files
- reference to the appropriate literature and studies.
4. Pathway Analysis: Three Case Studies

4.1 Pathway Analysis

The pathway analysis is used to follow participants in three case studies through their journeys of homelessness and being at risk of homelessness. The detailed format used to describe these journeys in Appendices two, three and four is based around:

- a time frame that identifies their key pathway events
- the service provision obtained from the homelessness service system in terms of:
  - intervention and support services
  - housing services
  - estimates of usage of these services
  - estimates of costs for services
- the introduction of scenarios for alternative pathways at key points.

Participants were approached by their support workers about the project and provided with an information sheet and a consent form. The interviews were conducted by Carolyn Mason and two took place in the participant’s place of residence with a support worker present, and one at the Brisbane Homelessness Service Centre, with no worker present. Their names have been changed as well as some details of their pathways to assist with anonymity.

A very specific part of the consent process agreed with participants was the ability to obtain information directly from their support workers. Information was provided from case files, but no files were sighted by the researcher, and from interviews and the workshop with support workers and program managers as presented in Appendix 5.
4.2 Case Study 1  Lisa

4.2.1 Introduction
Case study 1 has been called Lisa. She is currently 29 years old and has four of her 6 children in care with the Department of Child Safety. These children are all fathered by the man she first met when she was 12 years old, and who she consequently married in her mid twenties. Of the other two children, one child lives with their paternal grandparents, and Lisa knows she could have contact, while the other child is with Lisa’s mother and their exact whereabouts are not known to Lisa at this time.

4.2.2 Causes of Homelessness
Lisa’s causes of homelessness arise from family breakdown at an early age with domestic violence in the home. The violence then became a pattern in her own domestic relationships. The violence of her long term partner then husband is the reason for her debts to the Department of Housing and a housing provider. The level of domestic violence escalated against her and then against her eldest child, and is the reason for her children being in the care of the Department of Child Safety.

4.2.3 Pathway Elements
The details of Lisa’s pathway are presented in Appendix 3.
The key elements in Lisa’s pathway are:

**Domestic Violence**
- Lisa made attempts to leave her violent partner but lack of support and the cycle of domestic violence mitigated against that being successful
- Lisa’s debt to both the Department of Housing and the community housing provider are largely damages caused by her violent partner
- Lisa requires a favourable review by the Department of Housing regarding the debt before being eligible for public housing.

**Continuum of Support**
- Lisa’s low level of literacy and lack of personal capacity are a result of her early life and causes of homelessness that have left her with little ability to self manage her situation, although Lisa demonstrates a determination that is some cause for hope
- Lisa requires a high degree of intervention to be sustained over a long period of time using a range of services if she is to have any chance of establishing a family household with her four children returned from care
- intensive support from a range of housing and generic services supports the Homeless to Home service model based on high level of family support intervention but relies on the capacity of community agencies to meet Lisa’s need for support over the long term.

**Service Linkages**
- Lisa’s pathway demonstrates the potential danger workers can be placed in without some level of communication and linkage across agencies. A significant instance is when the Department of Housing officers attended the premises unaware that it was within an hour after the Police Service and Child Safety Officers had attended the house due to complaints. The officers considered that it was only the fact that they had built up a rapport with them over some time that a serious incident was avoided.
- The lack of protocols between the community housing provider and Lisa’s support workers at Micah Projects around early warnings of problems with the tenancy resulted in the escalation of problems until the tenancy was effectively abandoned by Lisa, leaving significant debts from her violent partner’s damages
- The movement across government service delivery regions because of the location of available accommodation has potentially negative and certainly disruptive impact on service delivery for complex case clients such as Lisa.
4.2.4 Intervention Scenarios
The purpose of the pathway analysis and the two scenarios developed for Lisa is to demonstrate points of intervention where intensive case management was indicated but not available. It is suggested that the very first point of intervention would be identification of Lisa as being ‘at-risk’ when presenting with under-age pregnancies. However, the scenarios considered are based at key points where an integrated service delivery response with an appropriate level of intensity of support was required to break the deterioration of Lisa’s circumstances. Key issues in both scenarios involve:

- the application of residential tenancies legislation to both domestic violence situations and the conditions of establishing a tenancy
- the development of protocols between property managers and support agencies so privacy issues do not continue as barriers to communications to the detriment of clients and their homelessness.

4.2.5 Costing Analysis
It is estimated that Lisa has cost the State Government over $100,000 from 2002 to 2006 for a range of services, particularly police, housing and child safety. In scenario 1, if an early intervention had been made during this period, it is estimated that costs to the state government would have been about $15,500 per annum and then reducing, instead of escalating. Even at the second intervention point, the annual costs would have been $26,500 per annum. Instead they climb after children have been taken into care, where the costs are estimated to be significantly higher at $153,000 in 2007 and $150,000 in 2008, and then potentially reducing back to $25,000 in 2009 for intensive intervention.

The costs of the interventions and ongoing maintenance are small in comparison to costs incurred when children are in care.

4.2.6 Conclusion
This case study shows there were clear signs of an inexorable worsening of events if no integrated or intensive response was made, given the involvement of numerous government and community agencies with the Police Service, Child Safety, Housing Department, and a women’s shelter six years ago. This was a situation where it was the violence of the partner that was the basic cause of the problems. The case study demonstrates there were two intervention points where support through a ‘housing first’ model would have been appropriate with intensive support to the family. This would have saved the state government very considerable expense, and the family members saved the trauma of having four children taken into care. These points are both considered ‘early’ when compared with the length of time the journey out of homelessness for this family will now take.
4.3 Case Study 2  Vida

4.3.1 Introduction
One of the initiatives in the Queensland Governments Responding to Homelessness Strategy is for homelessness early intervention services. In the Greater Brisbane area a consortium of non-government agencies with Micah Projects as the lead agency are delivering the services in six selected locations. The target group for these services varies, and only two have families as their target population, one of which is sponsored by a Tenancy Advice and Advocacy Service Queensland. Case study two is a participant family in the early intervention service.

This family comprises Vida who is 42 years and her three daughters. Vida is the head of the household and its main provider, with her two eldest daughters on support pensions and with issues of their own. These two daughters have children of their own, aged 2 years old and a few months old. Vida’s youngest daughter is in primary school, and she receives no child support from the father.

4.3.2 Risk of Homelessness
The family was at risk of homelessness because Vida, as head of the household, became ill and could not work for some time. She consequently lost her job coming into the Christmas period. With the eldest daughters both being on pensions and dealing with their own issues, the situation became financially difficult very quickly.

4.3.3 Pathway Elements
The details of Vida’s pathway are presented in Appendix 4, with the key elements in Vida’s pathway being:

Early Intervention
A key reason the family escaped homelessness was because they happened to be in the catchment area of the early intervention pilot program that is one of only two locations for the six services with a target population of families. This service provides a case management approach, which was essential in the hearing in the Small Claims Tribunal. The result was the family being put on a payment plan rather than immediate eviction as the landlord was demanding. Furthermore, the case worker assisted them with strategies to meet the plan. One example is stopping the rental payments for household appliances of $72 per week and replacing the goods with second hand appliances. When money had to go on rent and not food, emergency relief was obtained to feed the family by the worker.

It can only be described as serendipity that the family could demonstrate its capacity to pay off the rent arrears in full in a short time because the youngest daughter was due to receive her baby bonus payment.

Personal Capacity and Intervention
Vida has no history of requiring support services or housing services and demonstrated a personal capacity to deal with her situation under ordinary circumstances. This personal capacity means she will be able to self manage at the end of the case management period. Vida now understands that she needs to be more active in assisting her eldest daughters to address their situations and issues and strengthen their personal capacity. It may transpire that one or both daughters establish their own households and become clients of the early intervention service because they are identified as being at some risk of homelessness.

Housing First
Vida is now employed as a skilled blue collar worker, and in the current labour market has every prospect of maintaining her employment. The fact that Vida continued to be housed demonstrating a ‘housing first’ model was fundamental to Vida’s capacity to obtain employment, and obviously is fundamental to her maintaining it.
4.3.4 Homelessness Scenario
The scenario developed for this family is the decent into homelessness if the pathway elements above had not come together for them. It demonstrates how quickly a family could become homeless due to structural causes, and initiate costs for all concerned and impact on life chances.

4.3.5 Costing Analysis
In this case study, a likely scenario has been costed if housing was not available at a key point in time. It is estimated that it would have cost $24,000 if this scenario had come to bear. Vida was placed in accommodation through a pilot scheme at a cost of $4,450 and these costs were avoided.

4.3.6 Conclusion
With this case study, it is a totally clear cut case of the value of providing an intensive and client focused case management service at an early intervention point. Case management over 13 weeks is a ‘cheap’ early intervention response and at a fraction of the social and economic cost of having families descend into homelessness. Maintaining the family in stable accommodation was a key point in the intervention.
4.4 Case Study 3  *Alfred*

4.4.1 Introduction
Case study three is an indigenous man of 41 years old who has been homeless for many years and is a classic chronic homeless person. The interviewer formed a lay person’s assessment from his presentation at interview that he had indicators of acquired brain injury as a result of violence and alcohol and drug use.

4.4.2 Causes of Homelessness
Alfred’s homelessness has evolved from the breakdown of family and social networks together with cultural factors. His response has been to retreat to drug and alcohol abuse that further entrenches his homelessness.

4.4.3 Pathway Elements
The details of his pathway, such as they were able to be obtained, are presented in Appendix 5. The key elements reflect the issues for the chronically homeless who cycle through the whole range of services as discussed by the support workers at the workshop described in Appendix 6 they are as follows.

*Personal Capacity and Continuum of Support*
The years of homelessness and likely acquired brain injury has resulted in a diminished personal capacity to ever manage without ongoing support. The chronic homeless have a high usage of services, but the rates and the costs are ‘hidden’ as they use a wide number of services and are known to workers, but no central case manager records their actual usage rates. The usage rates increase without addressing their housing as their health deteriorates as a result of their homelessness. It is considered a reality that a housing first intervention would require ongoing support without any time limitation at some level for the tenancy to continue to be sustained.

4.4.4 Intervention Scenarios
The case for intervention for rough sleepers is based on an intervention that tries to prevent them becoming chronically homeless. This could be built up around a client being identified early based on a set of social indicators at key points such as release from prison or from a stay in a hospital or mental health facility and placed in an intervention program.

The cost to government of providing a housing option with the required high intensity of support over a sustained period, if not ongoing, is very real. The scenario that is costed is based on the chronic rough sleeper being identified for a re-housing service with intensive support.

This scenario is supported by the research conducted in the United States where there is an economic argument for a ‘housing first’ approach with ongoing intensive support over a long period of time for the chronically homeless.

4.4.5 Costing Analysis
Based on detailed knowledge of this case and other similar cases, the ongoing profile of services required to sustain a rough sleeper is estimated to be about $40,000 per annum. This means that over the preceding 10 years for this case study, up to $400,000 may have been spent by government on accident and emergency services, hospital, policing and remand. The intervention scenario results in a reduction of annual costs to $25,000, an ongoing saving of $15,000 per annum.

4.4.6 Conclusions
With case study three, the intervention points would have been in the criminal justice system, with initiatives such as a Homeless Persons’ Court case management program, or with a post-release program after imprisonment or remand. Case study three demonstrates that intervention even with a chronically homeless person is cost effective.
4.5 Case Study Conclusions

The conclusions for the case studies demonstrated the importance of the key elements presented in the conceptual framework and highlight the need to reframe policy and program responses around:

- using an evidence base of practical implementation knowledge
- resourcing continuum of support interventions with appropriate time and intensity
- having linkages across agencies providing these interventions working effectively
- delivering services at early intervention points
- addressing chronic homelessness from a whole of life perspective
- introducing Housing First as a model for housing supply and service delivery
- developing a costing framework for homelessness to make decisions on the net benefits of resource allocations.
National Homelessness Strategy

The National Homelessness Strategy was initiated in 1999 with the themes of prevention, early intervention, crisis transition and support, and working together. The current aims are to:

- Provide a strategic framework that will improve collaboration and linkages between existing programmes and services, to improve outcomes for clients and reduce the incidence of homelessness;
- Identify best practice models, which can be promoted and replicated, that will enhance existing homelessness policies and programmes;
- Build the capacity of the community sector to improve linkages and networks; and
- Raise awareness of the issue of homelessness throughout all areas and levels of government and in the community.

The Strategy supports funding initiatives which meet the aims of the Strategy through a series of demonstration projects, and Micah Projects received funding for such an initiative in 2006 called Homeless to Home and have reported on the results. The approach taken is being applied to the client described in Case Study 1, called Lisa.

SAAP V and the Green Paper

The Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) V Multilateral Agreement prescribes the funding arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States and Territories and is described in the Green Paper, Which Way Home? A new approach to homelessness, as:

"Australia’s primary policy and program response to homelessness… [and] was conceived as and continues to be a last resort safety-net for homeless Australians or those at risk of homelessness."

The current Agreement, SAAP V operates from 1 October 2005 to 30 June 2010. The objectives of this Agreement are about:

- providing or arranging for the provision of support services and supported accommodation; and
- assisting people who are homeless to obtain long term, secure and affordable housing and support services.

The strategic priorities for SAAP V are to:

- increase involvement in early intervention and prevention strategies;
- provide better assistance to people who have a number of support needs; and
- provide ongoing assistance to ensure stability for clients post-crisis.

---

39 SAAP V Agreement Paragraph 3.1.3
40 SAAP V Agreement Paragraph 3.2.1
The Green Paper has an important focus on the SAAP and a third of the consultation questions are specifically about the Program and its reform.

Queensland Government Strategy for Homelessness

The Queensland Government’s Strategy, Responding to Homelessness Strategy (R2H)\(^1\) funded a range of initiatives in the 2005-06 budget with funds of $235.52 million over four years to address homelessness. The funding areas articulated in the Strategy provide the implicit priorities for the Government, namely:

- providing more accommodation and support options for people affected by homelessness
- connecting people with services
- responding to issues surrounding the use of public space
- targeting mental health issues in the community
- responding to the legal needs of people affected by homelessness
- assisting residential services to stay open.

The Strategy introduced new initiatives and funding for a homelessness service system with two of the initiatives being referenced in two of the three case studies in this project.
From the case studies, workshop review process, research and consultations, the relevant services provided by the State Government have been identified. For each of these services an estimated cost for a range of levels of the service has been produced, based on time duration or level of intensity eg intermittent, limited, extensive, and pervasive. The costs exclude capital expenditure but recurrent costs may include depreciation. These costs are indicative only as there are many variations which could occur in delivering an effective service.

All figures are converted to 2007-08 dollars using price deflators from ABS 5206.0, as advised by the Office of Economic and Statistical Research, Queensland Treasury. Because source data were of variable quality, estimates are then rounded for ease of use.

There are no data presented here on the costs to family, extended family, or guardians. Individuals will also provide funds through appropriate Centrelink programs. These funds need to be considered when they are available to purchase interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Service provider</th>
<th>Service level</th>
<th>Cost Estimates 2007-08</th>
<th>Calculations and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERVENTION AND SUPPORT SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY SECTOR PROVIDERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>Based on Micah Projects and similar services providing case management for clients</td>
<td>Pervasive</td>
<td>$25,000 pa</td>
<td>1 visit 7 days a week Workers under the SACS Award rates plus on-costs and car allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>$12,000 pa</td>
<td>1 visit 3-4 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>$5,000 pa</td>
<td>Weekly to fortnightly contact including telephone calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>$2,500 pa</td>
<td>Fortnightly to monthly contact or calls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support Programs**

| Domestic Violence Program Support Services | Brisbane Domestic Violence and Advocacy Service | $5,000 pa | Limited case management |

---

42 This classification is taken from the work of Jackson, R., O’Connor, M., & Chenoweth, L. (2006). Journeys of Exclusion. Brisbane: Community Living Association Inc. While these authors developed it with reference to people with an intellectual disability, the ‘journeys of exclusion’ concept is applicable to the homeless or those at risk of homelessness without specific levels of service intervention. These interventions are intermittent: episodic or short-term in nature, and of high or low intensity at the time of provision; limited: consistency over time, but time-limited; extensive: long-term regular involvement in at least one particular environment; and, pervasive: constant high intensity support across a number of environments, and often life-sustaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Service provider</th>
<th>Service level</th>
<th>Cost Estimates 2007-08</th>
<th>Calculations and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Program</td>
<td>Triple P Program organized through Department of Communities</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>25 effective hours (Est. at PO5 cost level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>15 effective hours (Est. at PO5 cost level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Government Providers

#### Police Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Out to incident:</th>
<th>QPS</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>$570</th>
<th>One car and two police officers, half day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Neighbour disturbance</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>Two cars and four police officers, 1 day to resolve and complete paper work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support Child Safety Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>Assume 5 person days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issuing Warrants and Summons, laying charges:</th>
<th>QPS</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>$1,100</th>
<th>Average police staff cost Qld $86,038 pa 2006-07 (ROGS 2008 Table 6A.3). Assume 2 person days for cleared crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assume 5 person days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Prosecutions: preparation                  |              | $5,500        |                        | Assume 10 person days |

### Child Safety Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification by member of the public:</th>
<th>Dept of Child Safety</th>
<th>$2,000</th>
<th>Estimated 2007-08 cost per intake, including those investigated and those substantiated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• receiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000 pa Estimated 2007-08 cost per child in out of home care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• investigating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 MPS p.15-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctor visits cost</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>$100 per hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurse practitioner</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$100 per hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$75 per hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health visit</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol visit</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Department Public Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44 [http://www19.triplep.net/?pid=42](http://www19.triplep.net/?pid=42)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Service provider</th>
<th>Service level</th>
<th>Cost Estimates 2007-08</th>
<th>Calculations and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission to hospital</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>ROGS 2008, Table 10A.59: Total recurrent cost per casemix-adjusted separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation in residential environment (eg drug and alcohol)</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$34,100pa</td>
<td>Victorian Health Department Costs 2003-04, $28,100 pa.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methadone treatment</td>
<td>Health / Corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,400 per inmate</td>
<td>NH&amp;MRC funded study media release April 200646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health admission &amp; discharge</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>$55 per discharge</td>
<td>One hour of person time at each of admission and discharge to include all records management etc. (j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health institutional care</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$560 per day</td>
<td>Estimated average cost per bed day Qld 2005-06, ROGS 2008, Table 10A.60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Care Assessment</td>
<td>General Practitioner</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>Schedule fees Medicare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Care Assessment</td>
<td>Allied Health Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>Schedule fees Medicare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation: Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rental housing</td>
<td>Department of Housing</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$1,720 per assisted household</td>
<td>Budget papers 2008-09, p3-115.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis housing</td>
<td>Department of Housing</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$1,700 per episode of assistance</td>
<td>Budget papers 2008-09, p3-116.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Accommodation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000 per week</td>
<td>Estimated from NGO Group homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,700 pa</td>
<td>Net recurrent cost per dwelling (2006-07 dollars) $4,457 [ROGS 2008, Table 16A.29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State owned and managed Indigenous housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,700 pa</td>
<td>Net recurrent cost per dwelling (2006-07 dollars) $7,471 [ROGS 2008, Table 16A.18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation support services</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Institutional/ residential settings</td>
<td>$ 300 per week</td>
<td>Government services ($14,785) cost per user Qld, 2005-06 [ROGS 2008 Table 14A.33 Assume 52 weeks per user to give conservative estimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Service provider</th>
<th>Service level</th>
<th>Cost Estimates 2007-08</th>
<th>Calculations and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation support services</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Institutional/residential settings</td>
<td>$450 per week</td>
<td>Government contribution to non-government services ($21,824) cost per user Qld, 2005-06 [ROGS 2008 Table 14A.33] Assume 52 weeks per user to give conservative estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation support services</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Group homes</td>
<td>$3,200 per week</td>
<td>Government services in group homes, Cost per user, Qld, 2005-06= $155,849 [ROGS 2008, Table 14A.33] Assume 52 weeks per user to give conservative estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation support services</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Group homes</td>
<td>$1,000 per week</td>
<td>Government contribution to non-government services in group homes, Cost per user, Qld, 2005-06= $49,121 [ROGS 2008, Table 14A.33] Assume 52 weeks per user to give conservative estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public rental housing</td>
<td>Regional Offices</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$1,100pa</td>
<td>$1,018 pa tenancy and property management administration cost in 2006-07 (Department of Housing, MPS 2007-08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$2,200pa</td>
<td>Complainant handling, arrears management. Assume double general cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional and central office</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>Eviction, including visits to property and repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Provider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property management: houses and complexes</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$1,100pa</td>
<td>$1,018 pa tenancy and property management administration cost in 2006-07 (Department of Housing, MPS 2007-08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and property management</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>$2,500pa</td>
<td>Based on case management level involvement for tenancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Based on case management level involvement for tenancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eviction</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>Includes building repairs and replacement. Estimate of a provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>Service level</td>
<td>Cost Estimates 2007-08</td>
<td>Calculations and assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURT SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid</td>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>High – serious offence, major prosecution</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>Assume 20 days at PO5/2(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$2,875</td>
<td>Assume 5 days at PO5/2(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low - First time and minor offences</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>Assume 1 day at PO5/2(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court determination</td>
<td>Magistrates Court</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$475 per case</td>
<td>Assume additional 50% above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$320 per case</td>
<td>Net real recurrent expenditure per finalisation, criminal 2006-07, Qld (excluding payroll tax) [ROGS 2008, Table 7A.23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$160 per case</td>
<td>Assume 50% of average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **DETENTION AND CORRECTIONS**|                  |                                                   |                        |                              |
| Remand                      | Police           | Watch house                                       | $160 per day           | Assume same as imprisonment (below) |
| Community correction order  | Corrections      | Average                                           | $10.00 per day         | Community corrections, Real recurrent cost per offender day Qld, 2006-07 (ROGS 2008, Table 8A.11) |
| Remand/Imprisonment         | Corrections      | Average                                           | $160 per day           | Custodial corrections, Real recurrent cost per offender day Qld, 2006-07 (ROGS 2008, Table 8A.9) |

**Salary Assumptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Officer level</th>
<th>As at 1 July 07</th>
<th>Plus 27% salary on costs</th>
<th>Rounded</th>
<th>Plus 25% other on costs</th>
<th>Rounded</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO4 PO2/3</td>
<td>$49,259</td>
<td>$62,559</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$78,199</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td>$355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO5 PO3/2</td>
<td>$61,388</td>
<td>$77,963</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$97,453</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO6 PO4/2</td>
<td>$71,033</td>
<td>$90,212</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$112,765</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO7 PO5/2</td>
<td>$79,903</td>
<td>$101,477</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$126,846</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
<td>$580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO8/2</td>
<td>$88,111</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$139,876</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**

ROGS 2008, Report on Government Services, Productivity Commission
From the case studies, workshop review process, research and consultations, the relevant services provided by the State Government have been identified. For each of these services an estimated cost for a range of levels of the service has been produced, based on time duration or level of intensity eg intermittent, limited, extensive, and pervasive. The costs exclude capital expenditure but recurrent costs may include depreciation. These costs are indicative only as there are many variations which could occur in delivering an effective service.

All figures are converted to 2007-08 dollars using price deflators from ABS 5206.0, as advised by the Office of Economic and Statistical Research, Queensland Treasury. Because source data were of variable quality, estimates are then rounded for ease of use.

There are no data presented here on the costs to family, extended family, or guardians. Individuals will also provide funds through appropriate Centrelink programs. These funds need to be considered when they are available to purchase interventions.

### APPENDIX 3:

**Case Study 1 Lisa - Pathway Through Homelessness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>SERVICE PROVIDERS AND THEIR COSTS</th>
<th>HOUSING SERVICES</th>
<th>COST OF SERVICES FROM COST MENU BY USAGE RATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY PATHWAY EVENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTERVENTION &amp; SUPPORT SERVICES</strong></td>
<td><strong>HOUSING SERVICES</strong></td>
<td><strong>COST OF SERVICES FROM COST MENU BY USAGE RATES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1979 – 1992</strong></td>
<td>Housed: Living at home</td>
<td>None known about</td>
<td>None to be costed, however the commencement of social costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Born in greater Brisbane into a difficult family situation with family violence from partners of mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• boyfriend at 12 years who was 7 years older and mother not approve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• left home due to family breakdown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1992 – 1995</strong></td>
<td>Primary Homelessness: living on streets with boyfriend</td>
<td>Services were limited in 1992 for homeless people, and none accessed</td>
<td>None sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lisa and boyfriend survive as best they could</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• little 'street knowledge' about what services were available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• pregnant at 14, and supported by street friends until late into pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1995 – 1996</strong></td>
<td>Housed: Lived at home</td>
<td>Public maternity services used for birth, and as an underage mother this could have been a point to identify Lisa as 'at risk'</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lisa moved home prior to birth of Child 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Separated from child's father during the period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Public Maternity Services</td>
<td>Maintenance of Renting on Benefit Payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 – 1997</td>
<td>Housed: Living in flat with new boyfriend</td>
<td>Public maternity services used for birth, and as a young mother having her second child this could have been a point to identify Lisa as ‘at risk’. Police and criminal justice system services around suicide. Lisa receives support from priest but no other assistance accessed.</td>
<td>Maintained renting on benefit payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 – 1999</td>
<td>Housed: Rental accommodation and relations</td>
<td>Public maternity services used for birth, and as a young mother of twenty years having her third child this could have been a point to identify Lisa as ‘at risk’. Legal Aid represents Lisa in Family Court custody case. No other services accessed.</td>
<td>Maintained renting on benefit payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 – 2002</td>
<td>Housed: rental accommodation</td>
<td>Public maternity services used for birth, and as a young mother having her fourth child this could have been a point to identify Lisa as ‘at risk’. Lisa calls the DV Hotline and takes advice to move to regional centre to family members.</td>
<td>Maintained renting on benefit payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 – 2007</td>
<td>Housed: Department of Housing in regional centre</td>
<td>The main interventions were from the QPS attending disturbances at the property. Over the five years, it is likely that QPS attended at least three times a year as an average (15 times), and during 6 months in the tenancy it would have increased (an additional 6 times). The Department of Child Safety visited the family in response to neighbour complaints, concerns from the Department of Education about non-attendance by the one school age child, and concerns from the Department of Housing. This was during the 6 months of particular issues and may have been 3 times. These services are crisis response and not family case management which was required. There was The Dept of Housing provided the accommodation, and staff were aware of issues with the family. A client service manager (CSM) and client service officer (CSO) regularly attended the property. The intensity required varied with the residence of the partner in the property and his behaviour. Over the time there were: - periods of 2/3 visits per week for up to 3 months total - periods of weekly visits, for up to 3 months total - periods of intense contact when QPS and Child Safety were involved responding to complaints, and with DV Orders being taken by the QPS. This also included the Area Manager (AM)</td>
<td>Dept of Housing: - Public housing rental: 5 years = $8,850 Property management: - 60 attendances by CSM (AOG) = $13,350 - 60 attendances by CSO (AO4) = $10,650 - week involvement of AM (A08) = $3,200 - damages and rent arrears $10,400 QPS: - 21 call outs at house (2 cars) = $48,300 - attending court for DVD = $5,500 Child Safety: - 3 calls to house = $670 Women’s Shelter - 3 nights = $600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Pathway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Intervention &amp; Support Services</th>
<th>Housing Services</th>
<th>Cost of Services from Cost Menu by Usage Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent arrears result in payment plans that are complied with by Lisa</td>
<td>no service in the regional centre that was able to provide this intervention, which is why the Department of Housing officers played a significant role and attempted to find a family case worker without success.</td>
<td>The core role of the Department staff is property management not family case management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 6 born in 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour and complaints reach a level where the family are facing definite eviction and so they abandon the property and return to Brisbane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario 1: Early Intervention

#### Time Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Intervention &amp; Support Services</th>
<th>Housing Services</th>
<th>Cost of Services from Cost Menu by Usage Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa stated that if she had received the services from a DV service in the regional centre similar to what she is receiving today in Brisbane, this would have been the point to make a difference. Lisa made attempts to deal with the domestic violence, even going to a shelter, but there was no intense family case management intervention available to support her decisions and break the cycle of domestic violence. If a coordinated service intervention had been made, it would have required extensive case management from a community service with some specialist support similar to what Lisa has now, but it would have required shorter timeframes of the extensive and limited case management. The cost required to support her violent partner has not been included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost of Intervention in 1 year:**
- Extensive case management for six months: $6,000
- Limited case management for six months: $2,500
- Domestic violence program: $5,000
- Parenting program: $2,000
- Total: $15,500 per annum

#### 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Support worker 1 week</th>
<th>Brokerage - Hostel rent</th>
<th>Household: Emergency Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family returned to Brisbane, and sought assistance from Micah for accommodation and some items for baby</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>Micah Projects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah arranges hostel accommodation while negotiating with housing provider for accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support worker 1 week @ limited: $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa quite skilled at obtaining emergency relief and support from agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Brokerage - Hostel rent: $170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Accommodation: 1 week: $1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Support worker 1 week</th>
<th>Brokerage - Hostel rent</th>
<th>House: Community Housing Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commence tenancy in a housing complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Micah Projects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support arranged for family in area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Brokerage: $1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence escalates as well as violence against child 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support worker 1 week @ limited: $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints by neighbours starts early in the tenancy and the pattern of call outs for the QPS, and Child Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the property manager and housing manager for the community housing organisation are involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- community provided property = $4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Property Management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- property manager = $5,000 estimated actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- rent arrears and damage: $6,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scenario 2: Later Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>SERVICE PROVIDERS AND THEIR COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY PATHWAY EVENTS</td>
<td>INTERVENTION &amp; SUPPORT SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa was not an ongoing client of any service during their tenancy here, although their history with the Department of Housing in the regional centre would be a clear indicator of such a requirement. The domestic violence was reported to the housing provider early in the tenancy through Police callouts reported by other tenants in the complex. In this situation, the accommodation could have been established where the tenancy was conditional on ongoing service provision from a support agency, with Lisa’s agreement. With the violent husband’s history of property damage at the regional centre, for tenancy management purposes the tenancy could have been established with only Lisa’s name on the tenancy. Extensive case management support for Lisa by a case manager that can coordinate the services she requires is needed, with a housing first framework. This would maintain Lisa and her 4 children in housing and bring the services to her there. Given the passage of 5 years and the birth of two children, intervention at this stage would require much more intensive case management and support over a longer period, partly to ensure Lisa developed the skills to stand up to her violent husband. These costs have not taken into account services for the violent husband as no scenario is made about whether he stays with the family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Intervention:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasive intervention by case worker over six months: $13,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive case management for six months: $6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokerage funds for maintenance of property: $500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Programs: $5,000pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting program: $2,000pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: $26,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited case management for 12 months: $5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Programs: $5,000pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting program: $2,000pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: $12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 – 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless: Supported Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa is now living without the children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa takes up the referrals made to a DV service and to a Parenting Program and is very positive to the interview about what she is learning from these programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah case worker assigned for intensive support under a program providing visits 7 days per week for up to 6 months. Micah has to source household goods for Lisa as the previous tenancy was abandoned along with all their possessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah provides accommodation at a CAP service for 3 months and this is extended for 3 months under a PTA lease and cannot be extended. Accommodation found in a community rent scheme property under a client exchange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah Projects:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pervasive case management for 6 months: $11,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Household Goods for Lisa: $250 brokerage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supported housing NGO for 6 months: $26,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME FRAME</td>
<td>SERVICE PROVIDERS AND THEIR COSTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY PATHWAY EVENTS</td>
<td>INTERVENTION &amp; SUPPORT SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa brings case to court for DVO which involves the children attending and so involves the DV Service to support Lisa and the Department of Child Safety to bring the children the</td>
<td>Brisbane Domestic Violence Advocacy Service provides services and programs. Access visits organized by Child Safety and Lisa progresses from supervised to unsupervised visits, one hour per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lisa has very limited access to children because of the resources involved in organizing the children from three placements in care because they live in 3 different locations and limited resources for Child Safety to coordinate visits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 2008 to 2009</td>
<td>Housed: Transitional Housing (Community rent scheme (CRS))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lisa moves into a community rent scheme property as cannot continue in supported accommodation</td>
<td>Case management support from Micah will continue in this property. The change in location means that for the government agencies involved it is a change in region and so case management for Lisa will change, particularly Child Safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lisa has the objective of working towards return of children by Christmas, which may or may not be a realistic goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children continue in care with access visits to Lisa’s flat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lisa continues support programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TIME FRAME SERVICE PROVIDERS AND THEIR COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY PATHWAY EVENTS</th>
<th>INTERVENTION &amp; SUPPORT SERVICES</th>
<th>HOUSING SERVICES</th>
<th>COST OF SERVICES FROM COST MENU BY USAGE RATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2009 onwards</td>
<td>Housed: Department of Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This time period for Lisa is a scenario as it is based on a range of assumptions as follows:

- Lisa’s case is reviewed by the Department of Housing and as damages are from the violent husband, and with Lisa having maintained her rent payments for nearly the 5 years, she is excused the debt and allocated a house as priority when children are returned to her.
- Child Safety returns the children to Lisa’s care with continued monitoring for a period of time.
- A community service provider is able to provide the family support case management required by Lisa in order for her to be successful in family and community living.

Ongoing case management will be required for Lisa and will need to be pervasive in the transition to a household with 4 children after being without them for 20 months. Ongoing personal support for Lisa is required to give her life skills for a household of 5 people, parenting skills and skills to stand up to her ex-partner. This will take time and costs are assumed for at least 18 months. No costs are associated with the abusive ex-husband and his needs.

### Year 1
- Case Management:
  - 6 months @ pervasive level: $11,000
  - 6 months @ extensive level: $5,000
- Public Housing: $1,770 pa
- DV Service: $5,000
- Parenting Program: $2,000
- Total: $24,770

### Year 2+
- Case Management:
  - 12 months @ limited level: $5,000
- Public Housing: $1,770 pa
- DV Service: $5,000
- Parenting Program: $2,000
- Total: $13,770
## APPENDIX 4:
### Case Study 2 **Vida** - Pathway From Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>SERVICE PROVIDERS AND THEIR COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY PATHWAY EVENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTERVENTION &amp; SUPPORT SERVICES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 – mid 2000</td>
<td>Housed: Living at home and marital home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vida is born and lives in a regional location. She marries and has three children</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vida separates and then comes to Brisbane with youngest child around 9 years and oldest two in late teens and early twenties</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid 2000 – 2007</strong></td>
<td>Housed: private rental market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vida is supporting the household from her employment with little support from two older daughters</td>
<td>None sought except for some food vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Second daughter becomes pregnant</td>
<td>Salvation Army food vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vida continues to support family and receives little support from father for her youngest daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late 2007 - early 2008</strong></td>
<td>Housed: private rental market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vida become ill and loses her job, so family gets behind on everything</td>
<td>Worker negotiated with the Department of Housing for a new bond loan, and had to use $250 brokerage to pay old debt. REACH paid 2 weeks rent in advance of $600.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No maintenance is received for the youngest child</td>
<td>Vida borrowed a van and moved the family herself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No others in employment in household and one daughter has a drug problem</td>
<td>TAASQ: assessment and referral to REACH: $100 estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early 2008 to present</strong></td>
<td>Housed: private rental property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A hearing at Small Claims Tribunal for eviction is in two days when Vida contacts TAASQ and is referred to REACH worker</td>
<td>Worker negotiated with the Department of Housing for a new bond loan, and had to use $250 brokerage to pay old debt. REACH paid 2 weeks rent in advance of $600.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The support worker attends Tribunal and is able to obtain a payment plan from the SCT</td>
<td>Vida borrowed a van and moved the family herself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAASQ: case management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• support worker: $3,600 (actual cost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• brokerage for new rental property: $850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCT:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TIME FRAME | SERVICE PROVIDERS AND THEIR COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY PATHWAY EVENTS</th>
<th>INTERVENTION &amp; SUPPORT SERVICES</th>
<th>HOUSING SERVICES</th>
<th>COST OF SERVICES FROM COST MENU BY USAGE RATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• For 3 weeks Vida pays extra amount in rent, then second daughter receives her baby bonus and it is used to clear rent arrears in full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Relief food vouchers: $100 estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family is offered new lease but support worker assists to find a property for $80 a week less in rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vida’s application to the Department of Housing is reactivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vida is seeking Child Support with assistance of support worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vida obtains skilled blue collar employment with previous employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario : No Early Interventation**

The scenario developed is based on the assumption that Vida and her family would have a pathway into homelessness without the referral by the TAASQ to the early intervention case management process. TAASQ could have assisted in the SCT hearing and if they had achieved a payment plan, which is not certain, the service cannot do case management and so the plan would not have been adhered to, and eviction would have followed. The landlord would have moved and stored the family’s belongings for three months at the expense of Vida, and the property would require cleaning organized by landlord. They would be listed on a tenancy database for rent arrears and other costs owed. TAASQ would likely have been contacted and given the family a referral to one of the homeless persons’ hubs or another community service. This would have led the family through the steps of the ‘shelter’ model. No assumptions have been made about whether the family could or would stay together, or divide into separate households at even greater expense to the government.

**Household Crisis/Homelessness**
- Eviction and sleep in the car for a few nights
  - TAASQ representation at hearing and referral: $500 (estimate)
  - Debts for Vida (Personal debt would include: Moving belongings $800; storage for 3 months $1000; cleaning $500: $2300)
  - Emergency relief agencies provide food vouchers

**Crisis Shelter**
- Homelessness Service
  - Assessment: half day at PO4: $290
- Crisis accommodation
  - Crisis accommodation for family of 6 people: $750 per week for 2 weeks: $1,500

**Supported Accommodation/Short Term**
- Family support required to deal with the dynamics of their living situation, and addiction issue of daughter
  - 3 months at extensive level of case management for the family as a whole: $2,500
- Supported accommodation
  - Accommodation for 3 months: NGO at $1,000 per week: $3,000
  - Baby bonus of $4133 comes through to assist with expenses such as food, car repayments, replacing household goods or getting them back from landlord and paying that debt

**Longer term Housing**
- Community housing provider
  - 6 months as wait for Department of Housing accommodation: $2,350
- Family support still required
  - Likely at the limited level for 6 months: $2,500

**Public Housing**
- This is the same goal as with the lived pathway but now support would be required to establish successful tenancy and so require limited level of case management for 3 months: $1,250

**Total costs:** $23,890
### APPENDIX 5:
**Case Study 3 Alfred - Pathway From Homelessness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>SERVICE PROVIDERS AND THEIR COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY PATHWAY EVENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTERVENTION &amp; SUPPORT SERVICES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1967 - 1978</strong></td>
<td>Alfred was born inter-state He attend school until grade 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housed: Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1979 – 1997</strong></td>
<td>Housed: Department of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• He had various labouring jobs including meat works, railways and Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alfred escalates drug and alcohol abuse and finally leaves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario 1 - Early Intervention

Depending on circumstances, key intervention points include immediately after release from prison or after long stay in health facility or psychiatric care. A costing analysis has not been developed for this scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1997 – 2007</strong></th>
<th><strong>Homelessness: Rough Sleeper to tertiary level to prison terms</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This 10 year period is based on the knowledge of service providers working with Alfred and rough sleepers like him and the call on services from their homelessness.</strong> The service usage is provided from the practical implementation knowledge from the Workshop described in Appendix 5.</td>
<td>The annual service usage and costs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 admission per year: $3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• E&amp;C attendance 10 times a year: $4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambulance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 times a year: $2,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stop and Search 15 times per year: $1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Call Outs: 3 per year: $1,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 Magistrates Court case per year relating to drugs: $3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remand:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• held in watch house or remand for 20 days a year: $3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• D&amp;A attendances: 15: $4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental health attendances: 15: $4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nurse Practitioner: 40 check ups per year: $4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men’s Hostel: 30 nights at $65 per night: $1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICAH hub assessment and referral team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited: $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong> $39,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TIME FRAME | SERVICE PROVIDERS AND THEIR COSTS
--- | ---
KEY PATHWAY EVENTS | INTERVENTION & SUPPORT SERVICES | HOUSING SERVICES | COST OF SERVICES FROM COST MENU BY USAGE RATES
2007 | Homeless and Housed: Department of Housing | | 
- Micah works with Alfred for a time at end of period with money through Responding to Homelessness Strategy
- Dept of Housing offer housing in location not wanted by many in a western town. It is accepted by Alfred who moves there for a new life, but the housing breaks down as it is hard to separate from his rough sleeper community | A support worker organizes the housing and arranges for Alfred to move and be set up in the house. The worker organizes with local service to meet him and provide some support. | A Department of Housing premises is identified and offered. | Micah: Dept of Housing: Local town services: |
2007 – 2008 | Homelessness: Rough Sleeper | | 
- Alfred returns to be a rough sleeper with friends. | | | 

Scenario 2008 onwards - Housing First Intervention

The timing of an early intervention based on a Housing First model is an issue with regard to age as different ages will require different responses. Permanent housing may not be for the young but they still benefit from stability and security in culturally appropriate youth housing. The 25 to 40 year old age group may engage with agencies but experience shows that the over 40 year old group are ready to settle down. For indigenous people, culturally appropriate responses are important to maintain successful outcomes. As Alfred is over forty now, this scenario is feasible for him. The usage rates of services have been reduced based on the evidence from the United States and the following are indicative annual costs.

Police:
- House call out: 3 per year: $1,710
Health:
- Doctor check ups: 12 : $1,200
- D&A visits: 2 : $600
- Mental health visits: 12 : $3,600
Community support agencies:
- Extensive case management for the year: $10,000
Community Rent Scheme:
- property management: Indigenous $7,700

**Total: $24,810**
Overview
A workshop was held on 11 June 2008 and attended by seventeen support workers and program managers from Micah’s projects operated from the Brisbane Homelessness Service Centre, several community agencies associated with the Centre and its clients and a government department. Participants had knowledge of the three case study participants through direct service delivery or as part of their program management role. They were asked to contribute their ‘practical implementation knowledge’ from these and other clients in the homelessness service system.

Task
Specifically, participants:
- reviewed the lived experience pathways for the participants and provided information and feedback for the Appendices and for the pathway elements in the main text of the report
- provided analyses on:
  - the range of services used and their usage
  - a description of the services used, which assisted the preparation of The Cost Menu in Appendix 1
  - the range and level of some of the costs
- provided feedback and ideas on the scenarios developed for participants and their pathways out of homelessness and in the prevention of their homelessness
- discussed some conclusions for the report generally around:
  - service provision models and support for a ‘housing first’ approach
  - importance of early intervention approaches
  - linkages and networks among service providers and the need for more effective linkages.

Conclusions
Early Intervention
- identify key points where it could be considered, such as immediately after prison or after some time in a health care, drug and alcohol or mental health facility
- while in a tenancy, develop a system that flags there are issues developing in that tenancy, such as breach notices for rent arrears so that level of arrears does not get too high
  - agreements would need to be in place for the property manager to provide this information to a third party agency to work with tenant.

Homelessness
- range of services in the system are around crisis, such as Police, Child Safety and Emergency Relief Agencies
- community agencies work with the crisis and often difficult to move from crisis mode
- the longer the time a person is homeless and the more agencies stay in crisis response mode the greater the cost escalation to deal with homelessness
- very high cost in associated services, such as police service
- need more early intervention and less crisis response.
Lack of Integrated Service Delivery
- there are a lot of costs in service delivery when situations escalate into the crisis stage and that brings in many service delivery agencies and departments
- a lack of co-ordination in service delivery leads to duplication and this is a drain on the scarce resources of agencies
- agencies and clients experience a disconnect with service delivery
- the crisis still perpetuates with continued assessment processes and little delivery of a co-ordinated service “it is all about assessment and not service”.

Housing First
- income security required
- affordability level of housing maintained
- more than one model required to reflect different ages and stages of life but all require:
  > security
  > environment or design that includes other people in a community in a variety of resident population density
  > co-ordination of services
- support options to meet individual needs
  > but not just focused on the individual
  > need community building and community engagement with the other residents, the local residents and traders and the broader community
- systems to support the approach across agencies.

Linkages
- linkages with property managers through formal processes for disclosure with tenant consent when apply for a service.

Sector Capacity
- award rates for the workers need review: “we are the new working poor” said one worker
- levels of funding for the programs to achieve the required objectives need review, and the gap between service provision costs for the community sector and government reduced
- funding is not at a level to provide capacity for service workers to adopt a problem solving process for clients, so all very reactive.