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Chapter 1

A context for the research and case management models
The research reported in this thesis has investigated the efficacy of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model (Model) as both a service and business model. The Model was applied in an Australian not-for-profit organisation delivering an employment services program.

A case management approach to the delivery of social services to clients is common across organisations in the Health and Community Services sector. However, the methodology behind case management varies widely, with many models emerging over the past two decades and most models becoming more focussed on the delivery of services rather than the benefits derived from them by the client recipients. The Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model is novel in that it is a progressive-developmental model – unlike others that are simply ‘parcelling’ models custom-tailored to a specific discipline, target group or vulnerable population, and often driven by contract management focussed on specific outputs. This thesis will review the efficacy of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model in the delivery of the Australian Government’s national employment services program (i.e. Job Services Australia).

It is also important to recognise that case manager characteristics and typology will make a difference in the case management process for the various types of employment models. Taylor et al. (2016) examined how case managers viewed the challenges and program barriers to self-sufficiency. The research identified three distinct case manager characteristics – ‘social work’, ‘efficiency engineers’ and ‘conflicted’ identities. The managers identified as ‘social work’ were more holistic and focused on structural barriers to self-sufficiency and these formed the smallest group in the research. The ‘efficiency engineers’, in contrast, were process driven, focusing more on individual barriers. The ‘conflicted’ managers were a combination of the other two types, and as the largest group in the research they were focused on both structural and
individual-level barriers to self-sufficiency. The effect of case manager characteristics on client outcomes has not been determined in this research. However, the majority of ‘efficiency engineers’ and ‘conflicted’ case managers believe that welfare-to-work programs were largely unsuccessful due to the clients rather than the structure of the programs (Taylor et al., 2016).

Various principles and standards of case management have been developed to cultivate a productive and professional relationship between case managers and clients (Ford, 2002; Marfleet et al., 2013). In Australia, the National Standards of Practice for Case Management follows five principles and four standards (case identification and assessment, planning, monitoring and evaluation and outcomes) to guide the case management process (Marfleet et al., 2013). Similarly, Ford (2002) focuses on case management as a client-centered rather than a program-centered approach – that it is a shared partnership between case manager and clients – providing an organized, structured process for moving clients through the process of change and toward the goal of self-sufficiency. The philosophy and goals in Dr. Beverly Ford's book ‘Making Case Management Work’ have been adapted for implementation by the United States of America (USA) Oregon Department of Human Services in the USA.

Of interest is an innovative approach to case management in Alameda County, California (USA) that focused on providing an exit for clients, with recovery principles and practices to provide services that build resilience, self-determination and self-sufficiency (Ashcraft et al., 2009). The approach included having peer staff (recovery coaches) as part of the exit team to provide shared experiences in supporting the client. The vocational and housing resources were offered as “scholarships” to deserving clients with the potential to “give back” and make a positive contribution to their community. The most radical aspect of this approach was that clients and staff would
attend a day-long retreat in learning how to work as partners in recovery (Ashcraft et al., 2009).

There are various types of employment case management models. These differ in their philosophy or viewpoint regarding underlying assumptions and in the way activities are packaged in servicing job seeker clients. An overview of contemporary employment case management models will be discussed in the next section of this chapter, such as the ‘Work First’ model that was a popular strategy within welfare-to-work programs in the early 1990s, made prominent in the United States of America (USA) after the Californian Jobs-First Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) evaluations (Freedman et al., 2000; Temby et al., 2004). The Work First model encouraged the unemployed to enter the labour market as quickly as possible with job search a central activity in these programs. Generally, the Work First model is relatively effective; however, several reviews have indicated that rapid job placement often does not lead to stable long-term careers and fails to address the underlying problems of the long-term unemployed (Davidson, 2011; Danziger & Seefeldt, 2003).

Subsequently human capital development models emerged such as the Standard and Motivational Models that are characterised by a common system and process for every job seeker client, assuming clients need frequent monitoring and encouragement as they do not have the motivation and knowhow to go about finding a job (Davidson, 2011). Variations such as the Customised Employment Model identify a client’s unique needs, abilities and interests and work directly with employers to advocate for a specific client (The Office of Disability Employment Policy (ODEP), 2005). Other service providers took to the other end of the scale in the Formal Assessment Model using case managers with professional paramedical qualifications to undertake a range of formal assessments including physical, attitudinal and psychological to identify
employment barriers in developing a return to work plan (Davidson, 2011).

In the last decade, there has been an emergence of social enterprises, organisations that pursue both social and economic goals, creating employment, training and support for disadvantaged groups (OECD, 1999). Social enterprises using business strategies, are intended to be economically viable business with aims to address social issues, such as homelessness or social exclusion. Their social and environmental objectives can range from job creation to reducing environmental impact, example recycling, providing services for small communities (such as petrol), and creating responsibly sourced and produced products and services (Castellas and Barraket, 2017). However, many social enterprises struggle with financial challenges to develop scalable businesses, as they balance their operational structure through a combination of market resources, non-market resources, non-monetary resources (voluntary work) and private grants (OECD, 1999). Often they lack the necessary resources or skills for operational growth and stability. A United Kingdom research by a foundation for social entrepreneurs, indicated that 71 per cent of social entrepreneurs struggled to make a living from a social venture, to have a sustainable revenue stream and 60 per cent found it difficult to access the right kind of finance (Burnell and Gabriel, 2012).

Similarly, the concept of the Self-employment Model for disadvantaged groups may have intangible psychological benefits that come from working and having a pay check to support themselves and their family, rather than high income (Pew Research Center. 2009). This was demonstrated by the Australian government Productivity Commission that income inequality is lowest among full-time workers and highest amongst the self-employed (Greenville, Pobke, and Rogers, 2013). In fact, there was no evidence that self-employment enables a better work-life relationship than being employed (Pocock, Skinner, and Pisaniello, 2010). However, the flexibility and independence that self-employment provides job satisfaction to some – for example, Pew Research found that
39 percent of self-employed workers were “completely satisfied” with their jobs, compared with 28 per cent of all wage or salaried employees (Pew Research Center. 2009).

Many long-term unemployed people face multiple employment-related challenges that impede their ability to find and keep jobs, including a lack of work readiness and work experience, health and disability limitations, substance abuse, housing instability, limited literacy proficiency and prior felony convictions (Danziger & Seefeldt, 2003; Dean, 2003).

The Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model being investigated in this thesis contains a continuum of five stages (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, and Thriving) that individuals are intended to move through, from the early stages of dependency, poverty and low-income status onto higher levels of self-sufficiency. The emphasis of this methodology is on defining true self-sufficiency for people as involving not just a job with a certain wage and benefits, but rather income security, stable employment, and improved social connection over time. Based on the Self-Sufficiency Standard and Massachusetts Family Self-Sufficiency Scales and Ladders (Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), 1999), the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model is a matrix-based system that is intended to allow case managers to develop an intervention strategy for clients using a tool that initially assesses and plots them on a five-step assessment system (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, and Thriving). Each stage along the continuum is described by a comprehensive set of client characteristics, which in turn are accompanied by problem- and issue-resolving support services, treatments and interventions.

The research project will be a study of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model within a not-for-profit host organisation, documenting the journey in their
implementation of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as part of their delivery of the Australian Government’s national employment services contract (i.e. Job Services Australia).

In the next section, this thesis will explore contemporary case management methodologies including the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model originating from the United States Department of Housing’s Family Self-Sufficiency Program in Massachusetts (Massachusetts DHCD, 1999).

**Contemporary case management models**

This section provides a detailed view of the various types of employment case management models that have been applied internationally, including specialised employment services for people with disability and the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model. Many of the models discussed are simply parcelling models custom-tailored to a specific discipline or vulnerable population, and often shaped by contract management with a focus on specific outputs of the programs (i.e. employment outcomes and training). The discussion of the models will include the philosophy, underlying assumptions and how activities are packaged to service clients. Case studies will be provided to illustrate each model.

**Work First Model**

Characteristics of a Work First Model: Employment programs in the last decade have been based to a large extent on the Work First methodology that fundamentally emphasises moving job seekers into work as quickly as possible. The philosophy underlying the Work First model is that any job is a good job and the best way to succeed in the labour market is to join it, developing skills and work habits on the job (Brown, 1997). Typically, there is a lack of assessment and provision of intervention
pertinent to barriers to employment such as skill sets, experience, education, accommodation, health or disability barriers.

In the 1990s, many states across the United States of America adopted the Work First approach in their federal welfare reform programs. The initial evaluation showed that many of the programs were successful when they emphasised on quick route into employment, rather than job training or more intensive case management, or both. However, with the deep recession in the late 2000s and early 2010s, the work-first approach was challenged as there were not enough jobs, creating an increased in unemployment and poverty (Feldman, 2011).

Similarly, in Australia, the profiles of the unemployed changed in the last decade towards the more disadvantaged with additional barriers to employment, programs based on the Work First methodology came under scrutiny with widespread criticism of their inflexibility. As indicated by Davidson (2011, p. 83) ‘Did “Work First” Work?’, the profile of recipients of unemployment payments in Australia became more disadvantaged although the unemployment rate plummeted to 30-year lows (Davidson, 2011). There was recognition in the 1980s, that Work First strategy’s central activity of job search needs to combine with education, training, and other features, to generate larger or more lasting increases in employment rates, earnings, and income (Brown, 1997). In fact, some programs were putting support and approaches to make sure the clients stay employed (Feldman, 2011).

In Australia, the number of people unemployed for two years or more increased significantly from 16 per cent to 43 per cent from the period 1990 to 2008, while the number of people unemployed for 5 years or more increased from 5 per cent to 23 per cent for the same period (Davidson, 2011). Around two-thirds of the OECD countries have statutory minimum wage, which can be used to demonstrate benefits levels.
relative to minimum wage incomes. As discussed by Besharov and Couch (2012), for most of the OECD countries, a family with one person on minimum-wage job will typically not make enough to escape relative poverty using the 50 per cent threshold of net income value. It was also important to note that child care costs and other costs (example: healthcare and emergency) have not been taken into consideration in calculating the level of threshold (Besharov and Couch, 2012). For a family with children, these costs would have additional impact on their expenses. A minimum wage job, together with the threat of reduced or withdrawn unemployed benefits, may not be enough for people to adequately meet their basic needs and provided little incentive for them to seek true self-sufficiency through employment. As a result of the changing labour market and increased research into barriers to employment, the emphasis today is on interventions for sustainable employment outcomes.

In the state of Missouri (USA), the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills programs, known as FUTURES, shifted its focus in 1999 from emphasizing educational opportunities and job skills training to short-term activities and employment. The research showed that participants of the FUTURES program did no better in terms of wages and recidivism than those who had not enrolled in the program in moving welfare recipients towards self-sufficiency. However, the research also showed that the work-first approach did not help to build basic work skills for recipients, and they had less human capital and far fewer opportunities. Although the FUTURES program shows a means of promoting self-sufficiency, and that it can promote earlier workforce participation, there needs to be a mix of skills and training to raise a participant’s earning capacity. In the initial FUTURES program, case managers had a smaller caseload and were working with motivated recipients who opted to be in the program. This changed when the program shifted to a more standardised, one-size-fits-all approach away from the tailored and educational-based program. There were also
indications, before the program changed, that post-secondary education provided individuals with long-term benefits of professional skills, career opportunities and higher earning capacities that might result in a permanent exit from welfare. For the more disadvantaged, individualised training and a thorough diagnosis through case management would have better results. The one-size-fits-all approach may no longer be appropriate. Rather, there needs to be a tailored case management approach utilising a mix of services and activities including long-term educational services (Bishop, 2004).

*Case Study – Work First Model*

A teen was transformed almost overnight from a high school student to the sole caretaker for two younger sisters when her mother died of cancer: ‘I went to sleep one day as a child, and I woke up the next as a full adult.’ She began working different jobs, mostly retail or restaurant work to support her family while trying to graduate from high school by going to classes at night. Then she became pregnant with her first child and signed up for Public Assistance and was immediately referred to America Works, the welfare to work program which forms the basis for the Work First Foundation model. After a month at America Works, she was placed at a drug store as a cashier where she worked for a year and was promoted to lab technician. Being employed allowed her to get a subsequent job at FEDEX where she started as a part-time courier. She was successfully promoted at FEDEX and eighteen years after she first was placed in a job from welfare she now earns $75,000 a year and is getting ready to send her child to college. She says ‘The America Works Work First model is a good start for people. America Works helped me focus on what I needed to do, things like time management. They taught me how to manage money, and presentation. I feel grateful to be where I am now.’ (Work First Foundation, 2012,
Standard Model

The Employment Services Regulatory Authority in conjunction with Deakin Human Services Australia and the Department of Employment, Training and Youth Affairs in 1997 identified these three models: Standard; Motivational; and Formal Assessment. These models differ in their emphasis, the underlying assumptions, and in the way activities are packaged in servicing the job seekers (Employment Services Regulatory Authority, 1997).

Characteristics of a Standard Model: The assumption underlying the Standard Model is that many job seekers do not know how to go about finding a job. The model is characterised by a common system and process for every job seeker, establishing the initial relationship with frequent short, sharp and focussed meetings between job seeker and case manager. Case managers will prioritise efforts on job seekers assessed as job ready or on a particular group of job seekers for example young people - this is known as ‘streaming’ job seekers. Case managers adopting this model would have 8 to 15 appointments to see job seekers per day. Job seekers are provided with standardised job search activities with a condition for job seekers to approach a prescribed number of potential employers within a set period through weekly cold canvassing. Feedback, analysis and coaching is provided to job seekers following unsuccessful approaches to employers. Job seekers participate in interview technique training and group job search activities such as job clubs. These job clubs are supportive environments, providing mutual support, sharing of ideas, contacts and strategies for job seekers with similar barriers to employment.

Case Study – Standard Model

Susan came to Hanover in need of financial help to pay her rent. In discussing her needs, Susan disclosed that her situation was caused by her unemployment. Hanover
was able to avert her eviction, but she was still unemployed.

Whilst working in office administration on and off for 10 years, Susan decided to undertake an arts degree to obtain formal qualification, gain skills and improve her longer-term career options. At the age of 32, having completed her degree, she was only able to obtain intermittent casual work. Susan now feels despondent about her choice because many employers feel she is over qualified, whilst others tell her she does not have sufficiently up-to-date administration skills. She believes her degree has not helped - rather it has meant she no longer has marketable office experience.

With the introduction of Job Network, she thought that she might obtain practical advice to obtain meaningful employment. Centrelink informed her by phone that she had been assessed and she was given the name and contact details of Job Network agencies. She reported that she did not have a face-to-face interview with Centrelink staff.

After contacting her chosen Job Network provider, she was referred over the phone to a prospective employer. However, the job interview was unsuccessful as both Susan and employer agreed that she was unsuited to the job on offer. No further contact was made by her Job Network provider.

Susan therefore chose a second provider. Again, a single referral was arranged to a job vacancy without a face-to-face interview with this second Job Network provider. The job interview was also unsuccessful.

Susan has also been actively looking for work herself and has obtained 3 interviews. None of these have been successful. Susan still carries a significant HECS debt and is worried that when she does find work she may be forced to seek alternative lower cost housing. She has become increasingly depressed about her job prospects and

Motivational Model

Characteristics of a Motivational Model: The assumption underlying the Motivational Model is that many job seekers lack the self-esteem necessary to secure a job. This model is highly client-centric and individualized with building self-esteem and motivation as a pre-requisite for a successful entry or return to work. The model is characterised by building a relationship with job seekers based on behaviour modelling, positive support and reinforcement. Basically, building a relationship with job seeker through informal assessments. There is strong emphasis on individualised job search and job search techniques.

Case Study – Motivational Model

Jack 16 years old was expelled from school in Year 9. He suffered from inadequate family support, financial distress, low self-esteem and behaviour problems. Alcohol and drug misuse increased the problems and he had legal issues to work through. Disconnected from his father, Jack lived with his mum, and the household relied on Centrelink benefits. Jack was referred to Youth Connections – Northern region by his school, that made a real difference to Jack. He’s a smart kid but he smoked a lot of cannabis, drank a lot and had trouble getting out of bed before mid-afternoon. His mum is a single parent and has a disability, so there wasn’t a lot of support at home.

First of all, the case manager spent time building a relationship with him so that he felt comfortable with our service and staff. We sent a bus around to collect him in the morning and he began to participate in our adventure activities and youth camps. We then tapped into his interest in music and he really became engaged.

Jack enrolled in and successfully completed Certificates I and II in Creative Industries. In 2011, he completed a Certificate III in Creative Industries. Throughout
that time, he began writing and recording his own music. He recently got a traineeship with a production house and is starting a Certificate IV in Creative Industries. His employer already thinks Jack is the best trainee they’ve had! (The Salvation Army, 2012, Case Study)

**Formal Assessment Model**

Characteristics of a Formal Assessment Model: The assumption underlying the Formal Assessment Model is that an accurate identification of a job seeker’s employment strengths and barriers is essential to a successful job search. This model emphasises formal assessments of physical, attitudinal and psychological impact to identify employment barriers to develop a return to work plan. The model is characterised by an individualised program of assistance, motivation and positive reinforcement of ability. Case managers would have professional paramedical qualifications to undertake a range of formal assessments; the relationship with the job seeker is deemed to be a ‘helping professional’ one working towards helping the job seeker to be job ready. Employment barriers of job seekers are addressed before they commence on job search activities and returning to work. There are group sessions for job seekers with similar barriers, used to improve job search skills, build self-confidence and provide mutual support.

**Case Study – Formal Assessment Model**

John, a Senior Police Constable, was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) following a physical attack at work and was unable to return to his pre-injury employment.

Following referral, we performed a vocational assessment to identify appropriate vocational goals. As part of this assessment, we obtained a comprehensive outline of John’s previous work history, interest areas, personality factors, work aptitudes and abilities, and work capacities. As a result of the PTSD John was unable to work in
large groups of people or high-pressure environments. He also had a preference for autonomy in his work. The assessment considered his previous work history in labouring positions and pre-injury wage. Vocational areas of national parks field officer, plant machine operator, truck driver and store person were identified.

We worked with John to develop and agree clear vocational goals based on the findings of the vocational assessment. These were agreed by his treating doctor. A tailored redeployment program was developed with John consisting of retraining (plant machine tickets) and job seeking training (covering topics such as resume development, cold canvass techniques, injury disclosure, interview techniques). We also provided active job search services to John supporting him in preparing cold canvass campaigns and applying for advertised positions.

Following a period of intensive job seeking, John was successful in securing and sustaining full-time employment as a plant machine operator at a pay rate above his pre-injury earnings (Rehab Management, 2012, Case Study).

**Customised Employment Model**

Characteristics of Customised Employment Model: The Customised Employment Model was identified by the Office of Disability Employment Policy (ODEP), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (2005). The principles underlying the Customised Employment Model focus on up-front negotiations between job seekers and employers and may include more significant modifications to the employer’s work expectations. This model emphasises comprehensive exploratory assessments in creating an individualised blueprint for the job seeker, identifying a job seeker’s unique needs, matching their abilities and interests and working with employers in negotiating specific job duties or employee expectations. The job seeker is in control
of the planning process and is the primary source of information in deciding which job market to explore. Identifying potential employers and finding negotiation points (improving operations or increasing profits) that might fit the job seeker profile. Negotiating a job description – including job creation, job sharing, job carving or resource ownership (ODEP, 2005). One of the innovative strategies of the Customised Employment Model is resource ownership which is a mutually beneficial process of acquiring materials, equipment, or skills that, when matched to a job seeker’s interests and profile, benefits the employer through productivity and/or increase in profits, and provides employment for the job seeker (Griffin et al., 2007). In essence, an employer who recruits a graduate will gain the graduate’s intellect that was an investment in the form of a university degree, trading it for wages and career growth opportunity, similar to a truck driver who owns their personal tractor who is hired with the equipment to perform the job. For a person with disability, resource ownership counteracts the effects of disability stigma by suggesting a shared risk between the worker and the employer (and perhaps the funding agency), and a partnering approach to job creation (for example funding the equipment required for the job).

Case Study – Customised Employment Model, Strategy Resource Ownership

Georgia, a single mum with muscular dystrophy and a psychiatric disability, was referred to a local community rehabilitation program for job development services. She asked for work in an office setting and shortly began work as a part-time clerical assistant. In order to increase her hours and pay, she used a Plan for Achieving Self Support (PASS) to purchase a new full-featured copier. This machine provided various collating and copying features that reduced the complexity of tasks assigned, increased speed, and drove down the cost per copy. A PASS plan leverages an individual’s supplemental security income payments to use in pursuing a career goal and is one of
the few financial options that can provide actual operating cash to businesses.

Bringing her resource into the company boosted her income by over 25 per cent. She has now been employed by the same company for 15 years, earning full benefits and an employer-matched retirement (Griffin et al., 2007, p. 1, Examples 2).

Social Enterprise Model

Characteristics of Social Enterprise Model: Social enterprises are businesses that trade for a social purpose, creating employment for disadvantaged groups. These groups would include those with low qualifications, especially young people, minority ethnic groups, parents, the matured aged, people with disability, those with an intergenerational history of unemployment, homeless people, ex-prisoners, those with addiction problems and people with multiple disadvantages (Aiken, 2007). ‘The distinguishing feature of social enterprises is their capacity to find innovative and dynamic solutions to the problems of unemployment and social exclusion, and to contribute to the type of economic development that enhances social cohesion, which is one of the facets of sustainable development’ (OECD, 1999, p.9).

The five types of social enterprise identified are as follows (Aiken, 2007): Worker cooperatives – these tend to arise to meet employment needs of members due to specific interest or commitment, or to apply a market skill in a collective way. Often the setup is small but offers permanent work. Examples would include co-ops devoted to children and care, whole food and recycling, and cleaning and small-scale catering businesses. Social firms – operating as commercial businesses, social firms are specifically set up to create employment for disadvantaged groups, some with targets to have at least 25 per cent of disadvantaged people with an integrated workforce to ensure a viable business model. They have ambitious targets aiming for commercial success and job creation for the highly disadvantaged. Social Firms UK (2007)
describes social firms as market-led businesses that are set up specifically to create
good quality jobs for severely disadvantaged people (people with disability, the
homeless or ex-offenders) in the labour market (D’Angelo et al., 2013). Community
businesses – these are organisations trading in commercial markets that take on
marginalised workers (disadvantaged but not the most severe cases), but with no
targeting or special provision. There is an emphasis on work, albeit within a supportive
and training environment. Intermediate Labour Market Organisations (ILMs) –
offering traineeships and apprenticeships, and/or short-term training and employment
offering productive work (recycling IT or white goods, landscape gardening, etc.).
Often trainees would move into paid work in other organisations or go on to become
core staff member within the same organisation should a vacancy arise. Voluntary
organisations with embedded or arm’s-length employment initiatives – from large
nations to neighbourhood community projects that have undertaken employment and
training projects as part of a work trial (examples: women and training initiatives in
childcare organisations, undertaking translating, administrative or part-time youth
work or as advocates or trainees in community anchor organisations).

In Australia, the predominant social enterprise model widely adopted is the Australian
Disability Enterprises (ADE) – there are over 600 commercial businesses across
Australia that provide employment for people with disability funded by the Australian
Government Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous
Affairs (Australian Disability Enterprises, 2012). Commercial businesses that are
supported by the ADE provide supported employment assistance to approximately
20,000 people with moderate to severe disability who need substantial ongoing support
to maintain their employment (Department of Families, Housing, Community Services
and Indigenous Affairs (FAHCSIA), 2012). The ADE employees work under the same
conditions as the general workforce in a wide variety of work tasks such as packaging.
assembly, production, recycling, screen printing, plant nursery, garden maintenance and landscaping, cleaning services, laundry services, and food services. The fundamental principles of the ADE are to provide real work and in a real business environment for people with disability. These businesses are funded to provide appropriate support (for example, counselling and flexible work) and on-the-job training for people with disability to learn new work skills, building confidence and social skills as a stepping stone to open employment.

Case Study – Social Enterprise Model

Cleanable is a non-profit cleaning business run as a social enterprise. It was established in Melbourne in 2005 as a subsidiary of Westgate Community Initiatives Group (WCIG) in partnership with Social Firms Australia (SoFA) and Social Ventures Australia (SVA).

This social enterprise was created to provide long-term employment and retraining opportunities for individuals excluded from the mainstream labour market as a result of mental illness. Previously, WCIG had experienced difficulty successfully placing this target group in mainstream employment, and attempts using underdeveloped social enterprise models had failed either financially or in providing a suitable workplace. The social firm model is premised on providing employment for the target group in an integrated workplace with mainstream award wages and appropriate workplace supports within viable businesses.

Cleanable offers a range of commercial, domestic and industrial environmentally friendly cleaning and maintenance services, and has recently diversified the business to include a retail outlet and online store, selling eco-friendly cleaning products. Today, Cleanable works at 36 sites across Melbourne and has 16 employees with a
mental illness. It is one of only a handful of social firms in this emerging space in Australia (Cleanable Property Maintenance Services, 2012, About Us).

**Self-employment Model**

Characteristics of Self-employment Model: The Self-employment Model supports job seekers to work for themselves, receiving income from a trade or business that they operate personally (Blanchflower, 2000). Self-employment can promote invention and innovation; increase a job seeker’s self-reliance and wellbeing; create new jobs and increase competition within a market to benefit consumers. As such, governments around the world provide subsidies to encourage self-employment, offering assistance for small businesses. It is reported in Blanchflower and Oswald (1998) that the self-employed were more satisfied with their jobs than employees, and that approximately 46 per cent of the self-employed were in the top category of ‘very satisfied’, whereas the figure was 29 per cent for employees (Blanchflower & Oswald, 1998). In Australia, United Kingdom and France for example, the unemployed with an interest to start a small business may be able to receive income support while they attempt to start their business. Some of these countries also provide loans to small businesses, and exempt small businesses from certain regulations and taxes (Blanchflower, 2004).

In Australia, one of the longest running employment activities is the New Enterprise Incentive Scheme (NEIS) funded by the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR). NEIS has helped more than 100,000 people develop new viable small businesses around Australia since 1985 (New Enterprise Incentive Scheme, 2012). Job seekers are referred into NEIS through the Australian Government’s Job Services Australia and Disability Employment Service program. The program provides individualised assistance to job seekers with accredited small business training, business advice and mentoring, to put their business ideas into
practice. In addition, job seekers are eligible to receive a NEIS allowance for up to 52 weeks and rental assistance for up to 26 weeks. In the evaluation of NEIS, Mulvey, Kelly and Lewis (2002) reported that the main aim of self-employment programs is to provide alternative routes to employment, especially for those facing barriers to mainstream work. For example, the long-term unemployed and mature-aged with additional benefits of secondary job creation, increased income of participants and enhanced job prospects if the business does not succeed (Mulvey et al., 2002).

Case Study – Self-employment Model

Art has been the single constant in Jet’s life since he was a teenager. Having lost both parents at an early age, he found a passion for art as self-expression and to bring him closer to his late father, who was also an artist. So, when it came time to grow up he knew it was the only thing he wanted to do for a living.

‘Having sold some paintings when I lived in Perth as a teenager, I moved to Queensland to be closer to family and study art. I enrolled in a Diploma of Visual Arts, completed the 12-week NEIS and just over a year ago, I went out on my own.

“I needed financial support but didn’t know what options were out there for young entrepreneurs like me. While researching business finance I came across NAB’s Microenterprise Loans and recruited the help of my NEIS mentor,’ Jet said.

As the first in the region to apply for a Microenterprise Loan, Jet worked through the application process with Yeppoon NAB Branch Manager Dave Evans.

‘No-one else in Australia is doing anything like these Microenterprise Loans, so each application is evaluated on its unique strengths, although they all have to show a feasible business plan and each approved applicant will work with a mentor for the
first year of the loan. When Jet applied for the loan he was able to show a strong track record of his painting sales because he’d kept records and established relationships with galleries in the area. This meant we were able to see that he could realistically earn a living from his art as a business,’ Dave said.

Jet’s work is becoming well-known in the region’s art community. He’s won awards from the Rockhampton Regional Gallery, TAFE and art shows in Mackay and Yeppoon. He’s also found buyers in France, California and London for his pieces sold on eBay.

‘I used the loan to establish my studio at home, which acts as a base to store materials, so I can maintain a steady volume of work and manage my cash flow. Small scale entrepreneurs like me have very limited financial options, but it’s important that other people in my situation know about the support that’s out there, like NAB’s Microenterprise loans. They make owning your own business much more realistic for many people,’ Jet said. (NAB Community Microenterprise Loans, 2012, Case Study)
Explaining self-sufficiency - beginning from the standard

The Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model began as a measure of the standard that was necessary for working adults and families to survive. The standard was used by the policy makers to develop welfare guidelines that adequately support the needs of working families. Subsequently it was taken up as a program model measuring family, organisation, and community development progress and outcomes based on the goals and strategies of the program. It finally evolved into a holistic case management model for individuals with tools that help to progress them towards self-sufficiency.

The Self-Sufficiency Standard created by Wider Opportunities for Women and Dr Diana Pearce in 1996, was a set of numbers that calculate the money required by working adults to meet their basic needs without subsidies of any kind. Dr Diana Pearce, the originator of the Self-Sufficiency Standard is currently a Senior Lecturer in the University of Washington in Seattle, WA. The first article on the Self-Sufficiency Standard was published in the March/April 2001 issue of Poverty and Race by Dr Diana Pearce, entitled ‘The Self-Sufficiency Standard: A New Tool for Evaluating Anti-Poverty Policy’ (Pearce, 2001). This article discussed welfare reform in the United States whereby the welfare roll was declining and many of the ‘welfare leavers’ were in paid employment. She questioned if their earned income would truly provide them self-sufficiency (the ability to meet their basic needs adequately). If not, were there any available subsidies to help them?

In the United States, federal departments use the poverty guidelines published by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) as an eligibility criterion in providing welfare subsidies and aid (i.e. United States Department of Agriculture, Department of Energy, Department of Labor, Department of the Treasury, Legal Services Corporation and Corporation for National and Community Service) (U.S.)
Department of Health & Human Services, 2012). The federal poverty guidelines were developed in 1963 and 1964, by multiplying the cost of the economy food plan by family size and a factor of three to allow for other expenses such as housing and clothing. Initially, the federal poverty guidelines were adjusted yearly by price inflation of the economy food plan cost index. It also does not take into account current day’s consumption pattern including increased cost of housing, transportation, home heating or item-by-item budget. After 1969, the overall Consumer Price Index (CPI) was used to update the federal poverty guidelines instead of the economy food plan cost index. There were minor changes made to the federal poverty guidelines, but the overall poverty guidelines remained similar to that implemented in 1965 (National, R. C. S. M. R., 1995). In 2001, Dr Pearce challenged the federal poverty guidelines that many families with incomes above the poverty line still lack sufficient resources to adequately meet their basic needs. In her calculation, if a regular family works full-time (40 hours per week or more) and year-round (52 weeks per year) at USD7.00 per hour, they would yield wages just over the Year 2000 HHS poverty line for a family of three (USD14,150). This would exclude them from receiving any subsidies such as food and medical insurance (Pearce, 2001).

To dispute the accuracy of the federal poverty methodology, Dr Pearce developed the ‘Self-Sufficiency Standard’ (the Standard), an income adequacy measurement standard that calculates the amount of money working adults need to meet their family’s basic needs without public or private subsidies. The methodology was customised to different family size and composition (including the age of children), is graphically specific, and includes work expenses. She envisioned that the Standard can be used to develop new policies within government organisations and as a tool for counsellors and individuals to determine the minimum wage necessary to cover costs, taking into account available subsidies.
Though the first published article based on her methodology was published in 2001, she was already actively working with the methodology of self-sufficiency since 1996. From 1996 to 2003, she consulted and developed Self-Sufficiency Standards for various regions (Massachusetts, North Carolina, District of Columbia, City of Alexandria, Arlington County and Fairfax County, Montgomery County and Prince George’s County, Maryland, Texas, Iowa, Virginia, Indiana, Illinois, Washington, DC Metropolitan Area, New Jersey, Connecticut, Wisconsin, New York City, New York State, South Dakota, Utah, Maryland, Kentucky, Colorado, Alabama, California, Delaware, Hawaii, Louisiana, and Mississippi) and community organisations (Women’s Association for Women’s Alternatives and the Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth) in the United States (Pearce, 2009).

In 2004, Snohomish County Community Action Division of the Human Services Department, United Way of Snohomish County, and other community partners convened a taskforce to advance and complement the Self-Sufficiency Standard with a federal standard for outcomes measurement – ROMA (Results Oriented Management and Accountability) – as it pertains to the provision of services in the local community. ‘ROMA is a tool designed to encourage an outcomes-based approach to the service delivery, management and administration of human services. It consists of a series of outcome scales documenting an individual or family’s condition’ (Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA), 2012, About ROMA). The taskforce developed a matrix that defined self-sufficiency in 25 key areas (outcome scales). This matrix is based on the goals and strategies of individual programs and can be adapted in any combination for a specific program. In addition, each scale was a continuum of the individual’s progress towards self-sufficiency, progressing from In Crisis, At-Risk, Safe, Stable to Thriving.
The 25 outcome scales are participant-oriented and include Access to Services, Career Resilience/Training, Childcare, Clothing, Education, Employment Stability, English Language Skills, Food, Functional Ability, Housing, Income (Self-Sufficiency Standard), Income (Area Median Income), Income (Federal Poverty Level), Legal, Life Skills (Household Management), Life Skills (Human Relations), Life Skills (Financial Matters), Life Skills (Setting Goals), Life Skills (Resourcefulness), Mental Health, Parenting, Physical Health, Safety, Substance Abuse, Support System and Transportation.

The taskforce envisioned this Self-Sufficiency Matrix to be a useful tool in case management whereby case managers can work with individual participants in their progress towards self-sufficiency, having specific interventions that will overcome their barriers. The individual can use it as a self-assessment tool to determine their own strengths, setting goals and monitoring areas for improvement. For organisations, it can be a management tool to determine if the program delivered is meeting its objectives and if resources are adequate for performance. For both the funding and the funded organisations, the matrix can be used as a measurement tool to provide and articulate funding priorities and report on consolidated outcomes for multiple participants. The matrix can also be used as a communication tool to share information with both the general public and policy makers about the success of local programs as well as community conditions, including what barriers exist for individuals and families working towards self-sufficiency.

The Self-Sufficiency Matrix provides important guidance for policymakers and program providers regarding how to target their education, job training, workforce development, and welfare-to-work resources. It helps individuals choose among occupations for work experience and educational training. It also shows policymakers how subsidising childcare, transportation or health care impacts the wages necessary
for working families to make ends meet. Since then, the methodology has been adapted and adopted by various programs in the United States.

In 2000 and 2001, eleven community action agencies in Massachusetts piloted the Massachusetts Self-Sufficiency Scales and Ladders Assessment Matrix and were asked to report their success in implementing the model (Massachusetts DHCD, 1999). The central emphasis of the project was to map client needs and help community-based organisations to better meet the needs of their clients along a continuum from self-sufficiency. It was also to help improve programs and services, identifying short and long-term services and support that is required to help move families out of poverty. In addition, the focus on self-sufficiency will help better meet the needs of employer partners.

Overall, the community action agencies reported positive experiences with the tool and some of them moved from the pilot phase towards integrating the model into their service delivery strategies. Some reported implementation challenges (for example staff issues and information management technical issues). In general, the community action agencies were appreciative of having a comprehensive tool available for case management and saw their clients move up the ladders as planned.

The other barriers to using the Self-Sufficiency continuum framework include the Work First design of the government funding programs that often emphasises funding and outcome measures on job placement over education and training. Funding usually ends when workers are employed or up to a six-month timeframe and does not support them past the ‘Safe’ stage in the self-sufficiency continuum. The implementation of the model also requires commitment, time and flexible funds – all the community action agencies reported that it took a minimum of one year and highly dedicated staff to develop the workforce partnerships and programs that are not recognised by the
funding bodies as an upfront cost. It also requires coordination of multiple resources and strategic partnerships amongst a complex array of organisations that specialise in different areas of self-sufficiency. Most community action agencies do not have the experience or capacity to effectively develop these relationships (Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), Massachusetts Community Action Program Directors’ Association (MASSCAP), & Commonwealth Corporation, 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The programs that adapted and adopted the Self-Sufficiency continuum framework includes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Asian Neighbourhood Design (AND) fights poverty by assisting community residents with housing and community revitalisation through a training program as a non-profit commercial business selling furniture made by trainees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Action for Boston Community Development (ABCD) and Financial Services Academy (FSA) of the New England College of Finance (NECF) operates programs that prepare welfare recipients for work through job-readiness training, adult education, job placement services, childcare and transportation assistance, pre-placement support, and case management services up to 12 months after job placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jamaica Plain’s Neighbourhood Development Corporation works closely with neighbourhood residents, organisations and businesses committed to planning and carrying out community development projects to benefit low-income residents of Jamaica Plain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jewish Vocational Service’s mission is to empower individuals from diverse communities to find employment and build careers, and to partner with employers to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hire and train productive workers.

The Asian American Civic Association’s mission is to assist Asian newcomers to achieve the necessary adjustments through a wide range of social services, including translation and interpretation, information and referral, tax preparation assistance, and counselling in immigration, housing, employment and job placement, college, social security and financial assistance, fuel assistance, and family and individual counselling to overcome problems related to social and emotional adjustment to a new country.

The Caregivers Job Training and Placement Program helps low-income immigrant and refugee women who speak English as a second language become self-sufficient through increasing their English skills and developing job skills in early childhood education.

The Hotel and Hospitality Industry Program (HIP) is a one-stop service centre for immigrants and refugees to receive assistance in adjusting to a new country and achieving self-sufficiency.

The Seattle Jobs Initiative is a short-term manufacturing training program in welding. It includes a three week ‘boot camp’. Graduates who no longer are in crisis then move into the 14-week manufacturing training program.

At the time of writing, self-sufficiency case management is still a fairly new methodology and recent research is contributing to its recognition and adoption by different programs such as those reported by Endres (2016) on the Family Development Matrix of the California Department of Social Services, Office of Child Abuse Prevention (California Department of Social Services, 2012). The California Department of Social Services, Office of Child Abuse Prevention (California Department of Social Services, 2012) implemented the Family Development Matrix,
a scales-and-ladders instrument with 20 core assessment indicators that helped service providers assign scores to document family progress. The guidelines also defined the matrix status levels with a scale progressing the family from In Crisis, At-Risk or Vulnerable, Stable, Safe to Thriving (Endres, J., 1999). The reliability/validity of this methodology was tested before implementation; the analysis shows that generally there was good reliability although specific areas could have been improved to increase reliability (Endres et al., 1999). After six years of implementation, the research of this methodology from 2009 – 2015 indicates that there has been a rapid growth in the number of agencies using the Family Development Matrix, evidence that the perceived value of this methodology had increased across different agency types. Furthermore, of the 140 community-based family support agencies, research of 25 agencies using the methodology indicated a positive pattern of change across all types of clients. It showed that the Family Development Matrix assessment and case management model can facilitate improvement from an in-crisis/at-risk status to a stable/safe and self-sufficient status in a relatively brief period of client engagement and can be effective as a measure of indicators of family functioning (Endres, J., 2016).

**The Host Organisation’s Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model**

The philosophy underlying the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model defines true self-sufficiency for people as involving not just a job with a certain wage and benefits, but rather income security, stable employment, and improved social connection over time.

The essentials of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model describe a continuum of five stages that individuals move through, from stages of dependency, poverty and low-income status onto higher levels of self-sufficiency (as shown in Figure 1). Each stage along the continuum is described by a comprehensive set of participant
characteristics, which in turn is accompanied by support services, treatments and interventions.

Figure 1: The Self-Sufficiency Continuum

A stage is defined as the portion of the scale that best describes the current progress of an individual as follows:

1) **In-Crisis**: The situation needs immediate attention (for example, for every scale there is an actual crisis that must be addressed without delay).

2) **At-Risk**: If the situation is not addressed promptly, it will likely deteriorate and become a crisis.

3) **Safe**: There is no anticipation of the situation deteriorating into an at-risk situation, at the very least, in the short-term.

4) **Stable**: The situation is stable and may not deteriorate any further. Intervention is not a priority.

5) **Thriving**: The situation is stable, and the client meets all criteria of self-sufficiency including all measures within the scale. (Massachusetts DHCD, 1999)

In Australia, there has been a growing proportion of unemployed who are highly disadvantaged with significant barriers to employment in a labour market, where
addressing barriers to employment becomes a critical pathway towards achieving sustainable employment. Many of these long-term unemployed are highly disadvantaged with multiple and complex barriers to employment including criminal histories, homelessness, disabilities, limited work history, low levels of literacy and numeracy, and social-cultural indicators. The following section provides a description of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model, the terminologies and assessment tool of the model that is used in this study.

**Description of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model**

The Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model being investigated in this study has been adapted and applied by the host organisation in relation to the delivery of employment services within the Australian Government’s national employment services system (i.e. Job Services Australia).

Drawing on the Massachusetts Family Self-Sufficiency Scales and Ladders (1999), ten life domains were chosen in this methodology as they are deemed to have significant impact on an individual’s true self-sufficiency, namely the scales: Language, Literacy and Numeracy, Housing, Employment, Health and Wellbeing, Transport, Education and Training, Drugs and Alcohol, Ex-Offender History, Mental Health and Disability.

The scale for each domain is used to assess the participant’s circumstances. Even though each scale to some extent provides an accurate picture of participant situations, it is important to understand the inter-relationships among these scales. Therefore, no one scale is sufficient to move a participant from poverty to self-sufficiency. The best approach is to apply interventions to prioritise scales for the participant during initial intake and then develop a comprehensive goal-based strategy addressing several scales.
Each life scale is assessed according to a selection of measures, expressed as a statement of circumstances, which capture the individual’s present situation and identifies barriers that need to be addressed.

For example, in the Employment scale, four measures determine a participant’s condition: Employment Status, Work History, Work-related Skills and Career Management Skills. If the participant is unemployed with a limited work history, has some work related transferrable skills but does not have an updated resume, they will be deemed to be ‘At-Risk’ stage.

Similarly, in the Housing and Living Arrangements scales, four measures determine a participant’s condition: Security, Affordability, Quality and No. of times moved. A participant will fall under ‘In Crisis’ stage if they are living in short-term temporary accommodation (for example crisis accommodation, friends’ or family’s couch or floor, temporary hostel accommodation, motel/hotel/inn, or sleeping rough), unable to afford permanent housing, in accommodation that presents a risk to health and safety (for example exposed to cold, in disrepair, no cooking facilities, dirty, or is infested with vermin) and have moved four or more times in the last 12 months.

On the other hand, the same participant may be assessed as being ‘Safe’ in the Health and Wellbeing scale with three measures of General Health Status, General Health Treatment/Support Services and Impact, if the person can deal with health-related needs, has access to subsidised or free medical care, and health issues have minor impacts on 2-3 areas of their life for example employment, family, social interaction.

The following table summarises the ten scales in the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model and respective measures for each scale:

Table 1: The ten scales and measures of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management
Interventions are the actions taken by a case manager and participant to overcome barriers that have been identified as preventing the participant from employment. The level and type of interventions will vary, according to the participant’s stage and their individual strengths, which are important to attaining and maintaining self-sufficiency. While some interventions will be necessary as a matter of urgency, others will be made over the shorter or longer term. For example, an intervention for a participant ‘In Crisis’ in the Housing scale could be to provide an immediate accommodation alternative; while an intervention for a participant judged to be ‘Safe’ according to the Housing scale, could be to assist them through a public housing application process to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language, Literacy and Numeracy</td>
<td>English Literacy, English Language and Numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Security, Affordability, Quality and No. of times moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>General Health Status, General Health Treatment/support services and Impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Access and Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>School Education, Post-Secondary Qualifications, Education and Training Goals and Attitude to Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol</td>
<td>Current Status, Treatment and Support Services and Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Offender History</td>
<td>Status, Community Reintegration and Support network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health History</td>
<td>Mental Health Status, Treatment/Support services and Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Treatment/ support services, Overall Impact and Effect on employment/training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
find more affordable long-term accommodation to enable them to reach a ‘Stable’ and ‘Thriving’ stage.

The type of intervention applied will depend on available resources; the level of outside intervention may vary depending on the stage at which the participant is assessed for example, a participant at ‘In Crisis’ stage may be less able to address a barrier without external intervention than a participant assessed at ‘Safe’ or ‘Stable’ stage who may be more capable of exercising an effective intervention drawing upon their own strengths and resources with less external assistance.

**The Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model Assessment Tool**

The measurement tool used by case managers to work with individual participants in their progress towards self-sufficiency is the matrix-based system that initially assesses and plots participants according to their stage in each life scale, according to a self-sufficiency score. It then measures movement or progress along this continuum or range from this initial assessment point, (for example, from ‘In Crisis’) to an end point (‘Thriving’). The matrix measures incremental progress, stabilisation or decline of the specific scale of the participant. Detailed description of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model Assessment Tool is provided in Appendix 1.

A person’s circumstances are assessed against a series of statements and as the most appropriate option is chosen, a self-sufficiency score is assigned which will determine the job seeker’s stage for that particular scale. Each self-sufficiency stage is assigned a hypothetical percentage as detailed in the below Table 2.
Table 2: The Self-Sufficiency Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Sufficiency Stage</th>
<th>Degree of Self-Sufficiency Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Crisis</td>
<td>20 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Risk</td>
<td>40 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>60 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>80 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thriving</td>
<td>100 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This numerical representation is then used to plot the job seeker’s current situation on the Self-Sufficiency Assessment and the results graph, as can be seen in Table 3 and Figure 2. This provides the case manager with a holistic view of the job seeker’s overall situation and enables them to prioritise immediate needs of the clients, providing suitable interventions in proper sequence and in a timely fashion.

Table 3: Example of a Self-Sufficiency Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Self-Sufficiency Score</th>
<th>Self-Sufficiency Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language, Literacy and Numeracy</td>
<td>20 per cent</td>
<td>In Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Living Arrangements</td>
<td>80 per cent</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>20 per cent</td>
<td>In Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>40 per cent</td>
<td>At-Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>0 per cent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>40 per cent</td>
<td>At-Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol History</td>
<td>0 per cent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Offender History</td>
<td>0 per cent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health History</td>
<td>40 per cent</td>
<td>At-Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Assessment</td>
<td>0 per cent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The individual job seeker’s progress to self-sufficiency is graphically represented in the historical status of job seeker graph (Figure 3). By capturing their circumstances at different points in time, the progress of a job seeker with the assistance of their case manager will be evident.

It is important to recognise that the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model needs to be reinforced by a support structure including specialist case managers, a service mix of healthcare professions and established partnerships with community support services and training organisations. The training package developed to support this
methodology includes the following:

- Introduction to Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model.

- Case Management training developed to the National Standards of Practice for Case Management released in November 2008 (Maher & Cooper, 2008).

- The electronic Self-Sufficiency Matrix tool with instructional video and user guides for identifying the participant life domain, assessing the immediate needs of the clients.

- Ten Reference Guides in line with ten scales (Language, Literacy and Numeracy, Housing, Employment, Health and Wellbeing, Transport, Education and Training, Drug and Alcohol, Ex-Offender, Mental Health and Disability) with tools and recommendations to assist in providing suitable interventions in proper sequence and in a timely fashion.

It can be seen from the discussions above how the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model provides the framework and resources to allow case managers to work with individuals in progressing them towards self-sufficiency. A unique feature of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as compared to the other types of case management models outlined in detail earlier is its focus on participant impact rather than service delivery. Most of the dominant case management models represent a parcelling of services and their approaches vary only in the delivery and customisation of these services to their specified target groups. The Self-Sufficiency Model by contrast focuses on an individual’s circumstances and provides tailored interventions to overcome identified barriers towards self-sufficiency. Despite recent examples of applications across various organisations in the United States, the Self-Sufficiency Case Management approach is unique to the Australian environment, and this paper
will proceed to investigate its adaptation in the context of the Australian employment support services.

In the next chapter, as a context for this thesis, the history of national employment service programs in Australia is provided, including specialised employment services for people with disability. As well, the rationale for investigating the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model in relation to employment will be discussed, underlying the importance of focussing unemployed job seekers on achieving long-term self-sufficiency.
Chapter 2

History of employment services in Australia
This chapter discusses the history of employment services in Australia as it evolved from the traditional Work First methodology towards today’s human capital development models such as the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model.

The first type of employment services program originated in 1946 with the establishment of the Australian Government Commonwealth Employment Service through the Reinstatement Committee that passed the Re-establishment and Employment Act 1945 (Attorney-General’s Department, 1945 and O'Donnell, & Mitchell, 2001). This Act was established to assist members of the Permanent Forces with the Naval, Military or Air Forces who returned after the Second World War with matters relating to the reinstatement of these servicemen to their former civil employment. Any person who completes a period of war service may apply to his former employer for reinstatement in employment. It stipulates penalties whereby employers must provide the occupation and conditions in which the servicemen were employed immediately prior to the commencement of their period of war service. It also protects the rights of reinstated employees that their absence from employment when they left to commence war service and when they are reinstated in employment be reckoned as part of the period of employment.

This provides for continuity of annual leave, sick leave, long service leave and superannuation or pension (whether for themselves or their dependants). This Act also makes references to apprenticeships and traineeships, whereby the apprentices are entitled to resume their apprenticeship and have preference over any apprentice engaged during their absence on war service, and the employer shall not refuse to permit the apprentices to resume their employment. If the servicemen have not notified the apprenticeship authorities of their engagement on war service, the employers have an obligation to do so. Their contract of apprenticeship shall be deemed to have been
suspended during the period of their absence and shall remain suspended until it is revived, transferred or cancelled. Upon their return, they can lodge an application with the apprenticeship authority recommending revival, transfer or cancellation with the employers.

A new scheme, the ‘Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme’ was also established to provide options of vocational training (including training for a professional or an agricultural occupation) for discharged members of the Forces. This scheme selected persons for training, the type and method of training and made resources available to establish these training courses (National Archives of Australia (NAA), 2018). Other schemes were the Servicemen’s Settlement and the Housing and Legal Service Bureaux to help the returning soldiers. The Servicemen’s Settlement permitted advances or payments to enable the state to acquire, develop or improve land for settlement by discharged members of the Forces. Similarly, the state was also able to allocate, construct or purchase dwelling-houses for these servicemen. The Legal Service Bureaux established by the Attorney-General was able to furnish legal advice to these Servicemen (Attorney-General’s Department, 1945).

In 1978, the Commonwealth Employment Service Act pertaining to civilians seeking employment was passed and the Commonwealth Employment Service (CES) was transferred to the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations (Commonwealth Employment Service Act 1978 (Cth)). The Commonwealth Employment Service introduced the Manpower Program that aimed to provide persons, or classes of persons, with employment by providing assistance and information relating to seeking employment or a change of employment. The CES could register persons who were unemployed and who sought to claim unemployment benefits under the Social Services Act 1947 into the Manpower Program (Social
Services Act 1947 (Cth)). The Program could provide individualised vocational guidance relating to the person’s qualification and occupation. They could make special arrangements in regard to the individual needs of people with disability, as well as immigrants, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and youth who would otherwise be disadvantaged in relation to employment. They also worked to assist employers and intended employers who wished to fill vacancies with suitable candidates from the program (Miller, 1975).

For 12 years from 1983 to 1996, the Australian Government was led by the two Australian Labor Party leaders, Prime Ministers Bob Hawke and Paul Keating (NAA, 2016). During this period, in a move to shift from ‘passive welfare’ to reciprocal obligation, Labor’s Working Nation introduced the Active Labour Market employment program including ‘Job Compact’ in 1994 that targeted persons who had been unemployed for 18 months or more. This Program had individualised case management for the long-term unemployed (unemployed for 12 months or more), with training, job search assistance (in the form of job clubs), wage subsidies for employers and direct job creation. The Job Compact program participants had access to funded training programs and a guaranteed job placement for 6 to 12 months. This program had participation requirements whereby unemployed people had to actively undertake job search with evidence of proof required and accept suitable work if it was offered (Finn, 1997).

The most radical policy change to the employment services sector occurred in 1994 with the privatisation of employment services under the Keating Labor Government. This change ended the government’s monopoly on employment service provision with 30 per cent of the Commonwealth Employment Service market share privatised and contracted to non-government providers (not-for-profit and for-profit). These private
providers were paid on a fee-for-success basis and competition was encouraged between the providers on the quality of their performance. In the White Paper released in 1994, Prime Minister Keating argued that ‘healthy competition will lead to service improvement’ (Keating, 1994). The job seekers had the flexibility to choose their own employment agency and negotiate a service contract with the private providers to their advantage. In 1996, there was a change in government as Keating’s Labor Government was defeated by the Coalition Government led by John Howard. The Coalition criticised the Active Labour Market employment programs as being too expensive, poorly targeted and ineffective. However, the change in government less than 2 years after the program was implemented made it impossible to determine if the program would have provided effective long-term benefits (Fowkes, 2011).

Interestingly, despite criticising the Active Labour Market employment programs, Prime Minister John Howard’s Coalition Government continued to support the outsourcing movement. In his first budget, John Howard increased the private providers’ market share from 30 to 50 per cent but abolished the majority of the government-funded training programs initiated by the Keating Government (O’Sullivan et al., 2009).

The Howard Government was determined to fundamentally overhaul labour market assistance, and, in May 1998, Job Network was born (Jobs Australia, 2015). In the largest public tender of human services in Australian history at that time, 306 organisations with about 1,400 sites were selected as Job Network members after a comprehensive and highly competitive public tender. Of the 306 Job Network organisations, 287 were private organisations (153 were for-profit and 134 were not-for-profit) and 19 were government (Kemp, 1998). As Job Network commenced on the three-year contract, Employment National formerly known as Commonwealth
Employment Service was dissolved with the last of the 165 Employment National offices around the country closing on 30 June, 2003. Since then, Australia’s employment service provision has been contracted to private employment service providers. In the media release in February 1998, Minister for Employment, Dr David Kemp said ‘Job Network focuses on results. Job Network members will be paid when they place a job seeker in a job for a sustained period of time. These incentives will help ensure unemployed people get jobs and are no longer churned through programs that, sadly, in the past, have often led back to the unemployment queue’ (Kemp, 1998).

The Job Network program was modelled on a Work First methodology, encouraging the unemployed to enter the labour market as quickly as possible. Job Network was developed on an evidence-based approach, as presented by Dr David Kemp to the 1996 Paris meeting of OECD Labour Ministers in the paper “Enhancing the Effectiveness of Active Labour Market Policies (ALMP) - Evidence from Programme Evaluations in OECD Countries”. The learnings from programme evaluations of ALMPs indicated that the ability to help large numbers of unemployed at any given time was limited, publicly provided training in large programmes did not have a positive impact, though there was recognition that this may be a result of the problems with the courses or with targeting the right kind of participants. However, job-search assistance provided satisfactory results on a consistent basis in finding employment (Robert, 1996).

Managed by the Department of Employment and Workplace Relations and Small Business (DEWRSB), Job Network was deemed to provide significant advantage in comparison to the Commonwealth Employment Service program as there were now four times the number of sites for employment services across Australia (OECD, 2000).
A new competitive market between Job Network members with strong financial incentives to place long-term unemployed people in jobs. A new national job vacancy database was implemented at Centrelink offices. The services were tailored to individual client needs, with improved access to free computers, facsimiles and telephones to help job seekers prepare applications and apply for jobs. The Job Network program (Contract 1 – 1998 to 2000) was initially structured into three program streams:

- **Job Matching (Flex 1)** – a basic service for short-term unemployed and employers which included taking vacancies, preparing resumes, screening and referring job seekers to jobs.

- **Job Search Training (Flex 2)** – for people unemployed for three to six months, which included two weeks of intensive job search training followed by a period of assisted job search.

- **Intensive Assistance (Flex 3)** – individualised assistance determined by the provider, for highly disadvantaged and one year plus unemployed (Webster, 1999 and O’Neil, 1999).

The Job Network program went through two contract variations (Contract 2 – 2000 to 2003 and Contract 3 – 2003 to 2006), but the fundamental methodology to encourage the unemployed to enter the labour market as quickly as possible remained the same (DEEWR, 2007 and O’Neil, 2003). With the introduction of the Job Network program (Contract 3 – 2003 to 2006) the Active Participation Model, a more prescribed case management model, was introduced with a quarantined pool of funds called the Job Seeker Account that providers can utilise to provide or purchase training for job seekers. The contract required the Job Network members to provide three main
services to eligible job seekers with individually tailored Activity Agreements, detailing activities and services negotiated with the job seeker (DEEWR, 2007 and O’Neil, 2003).

The Job Network Employment Services Contract 3 (2003 to 2006) and Job Network Employment Services Extension (2006 to 2009) was structured into three program streams:

- Job Search Support services (0-3 months) – This is a basic introductory session in the use of self-help JobSearch kiosks, job seekers would develop a vocational profile and lodge a resume in the Department of Employment and Workplace Relation’s information system and be provided with a job match list.

- Intensive Support services – These services developed individualised Job Search Plans; provided 100 hours of formal/informal Job Searching Training course for jobseekers; responsible for advising job seekers towards mutual obligation options such as employment, training, study, voluntary work and Work for the Dole programs. There was a standard rate for every job seeker in the Job Seeker Account that had strict guidelines on the purchase of appropriate employment related services, training and products for individual job seekers.

- Job Placement services – Service providers were paid a fee to canvass employers and/or host organisations for vacancies and/or assignments, lodge all non-executive vacancies on Australian JobSearch and match, screen and refer suitable registered job seekers to vacancies or assignments (DEWR, 2002 and DEEWR, 2005).
For almost a decade since 1998, the Job Network program was the Australian Government flagship employment program – a model underpinned by a focus on outcomes (Thomas, 2007).

‘The new Job Network was designed on “work first” principles.’ (Fowkes, 2011).

The initial Job Network program emphasised encouraging the unemployed to enter the labour market as quickly as possible. Case management was centred on helping job seekers primarily with job search techniques and lodging resumes to employers. The Job Network contract went through two contract variations with the same fundamental methodology. Though the Job Network program (Contract 3 – 2003 to 2006), a new case management methodology Active Participation Model (APM) was introduced as part of the contractual requirements (Figure 4). Similarly, the journey for case management methodology for the host organisation followed that as prescribed in its contractual requirements with the host organisation adopting the APM for the remaining duration of the contract that was Job Network Employment Services Extension (2006 to 2009). The key elements of the APM were designed to increase the frequency and continuity of contacts between Job Network providers and the job seekers and to keep job seekers engaged with the labour market. It was also designed to maximise on compliance effects where job seekers not actively engaged in ongoing employment focussed activity and job search have their income support payment contingent on re-engagement, and further non-compliance that may result in a penalty (Davidson & Whiteford, 2012 and DEEWR, 2007).
The APM stipulated a strict frequency of contacts with job seekers and had a complex fee structure that encouraged the providers to maintain the level of contact and to obtain employment outcomes as illustrated below in Table 4 and Table 5.
Table 4: Job Network Service Fees (2006–2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of assistance</th>
<th>Job seeker qualification duration</th>
<th>Required contacts</th>
<th>Total time for all contacts in service period</th>
<th>Total fee for all contacts in service period</th>
<th>Total fee for all contacts in service period (including supplementary identification as highly disadvantaged)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Search Support—registration</td>
<td>0–3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45 minutes (average)</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-referral interview</td>
<td>0–3 months—eligible JSSO job seeker with no recent work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 minutes (average)</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Preparation</td>
<td>0–6 months—eligible FNE parents, Mature Age and Caregivers with no recent work experience</td>
<td>A minimum of 3 contacts</td>
<td>A minimum of 3 contacts in the first 3 months, then dependent on level of job search training activities in the second 3 months</td>
<td>$180 for first 3 months, then $808 for second 3 months (if applicable)**</td>
<td>$180 for first 3 months, then $808 for second 3 months (if applicable)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4–6 months—eligible FNE parents, Mature Age and Caregivers with recent work experience</td>
<td>A minimum of 3 contacts with additional contacts dependent on level of job search training activities.</td>
<td>$848** (if applicable)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4–6 months—eligible JSSO job seeker with no recent work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30 minutes (average)</td>
<td>$229</td>
<td>$229 (if applicable)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 days (or equivalent)</td>
<td>100 hours</td>
<td>$688</td>
<td>$688</td>
<td>$688 (if applicable)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400 month assessment interview payment for those not going into job search training or Employment Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30 minutes (average)</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$42 (if applicable)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 months and 10 months</td>
<td>70 minutes (average)</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>$84 (if applicable)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13–18 months</td>
<td>12 minutes (or equivalent)</td>
<td>10.5 hours total (if applicable)</td>
<td>$834</td>
<td>$1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19–24 months</td>
<td>60 minutes (average)</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25–30 months</td>
<td>8 on average (with a minimum of 6 contacts over the period)</td>
<td>6.25 hours average total</td>
<td>$495</td>
<td>$742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (DEWR, 2005)
The next radical change to the employment services sector occurred in July 2009 under a Labor Government led by Prime Minister Kevin Rudd. After 11 years, Job Network was replaced by Job Services Australia (DEEWR, 2008). In fact, the new program amalgamated Job Network, Work for the Dole, Green Corps, Job Placement Employment and Training, Personal Support Programme and Remote Services, into a single contract. In the discussion paper ‘The Future of Employment Services in Australia’, the Minister for Employment Participation, The Hon Brendan O’Connor MP, indicated that there was an increase from 18 per cent in September 2004 to 29 per cent in March 2008 of Job Network job seekers who had been in receipt of benefits for more than five years, showing an unprecedented skills shortage, poorly targeted assistance, and insufficient employer focus, which in turn indicated that the Job Network continuum was too rigid and bound in excessive red tape. ‘The Job Network

Table 5: Job Network Intensive Support outcome payments per job seeker (2006–2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of registration by Centrelink or other party notified by DEWR</th>
<th>Payment Type</th>
<th>Intensive Support Interim Payment 13 weeks</th>
<th>Intensive Support Final Payment 26 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From commencement in Intensive Support to 12 months (if not identified as Highly Disadvantaged)</td>
<td>Intensive Support Under 12 Month Outcome</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEIS Intensive Support Outcome</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–24 months OR if the Fully JN Eligible Job Seeker has been commenced in Intensive Support customised assistance</td>
<td>Intensive Support Outcome</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
<td>$825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive Support Intermediate Payment</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEIS Intensive Support Outcome</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–36 months OR identified as Highly Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Intensive Support Outcome</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive Support Intermediate Payment</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEIS Intensive Support Outcome</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years or longer (also payable for Highly Disadvantaged unemployed three years or longer and all job seekers on Disability Support Pension)</td>
<td>Intensive Support Outcome</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive Support Intermediate Payment</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEIS Intensive Support Outcome</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The duration of the job seeker’s registration will be calculated at the time of placement into employment or qualifying education, not at the time of the outcome claim.

Source: (DEWR, 2005)
is no longer suited to a labour market characterised by lower unemployment, widespread skill shortages and a growing proportion of job seekers who are highly disadvantaged and long-term unemployed’ (O’Connor, 2008).

The Job Network program was deemed not to sufficiently assist job seekers who were more disadvantaged in the labour market; service providers were not rewarded through the current contract (Job Network) for investing in job seeker skills through education and training. The APM with a prescribed continuum of service, during which providers were paid to undertake regular interviews with each job seeker was deemed too inflexible and not individualised (OECD, 2012).

*From 1 July, this year the new employment services will give providers genuine flexibility to focus on addressing the barriers to employment that disadvantaged job seekers face. There will be incentives for providers to ensure job seekers are equipped with the skills and training required to meet the labour needs of employers. Each job seeker will work with providers to develop an individually tailored plan which sets out the services and training that will best help them find and keep employment. An Employment Pathway Fund will be available to support the plan and can be used to help address vocational and non-vocational barriers to employment.* (O’Connor, 2009)

The Job Services Australia program was designed with an approach better focussed on capacity building and social integration in the longer term. Of significance was the change that Service Fees, Outcome Payments, Placement Fees and the Employment Pathway Fund were weighted to the most disadvantaged job seekers, with Stream 4 attracting significantly higher fees than Stream 1 (DEEWR, 2008). The Employment Pathway Fund could be used for vocational and non-vocational interventions, training and skills development, self-employment, mentoring, or work experience activities.
This fund unlike the Job Network Job Seeker Account has more flexibility allowing service providers to purchase assistance for job seekers based on their individual needs and their barriers to employment. Though there were guidelines, Providers were not limited to a fixed shopping list of items that could be reimbursed under the Employment Pathway Fund (DEEWR, 2014). For Stream 4 job seekers, the fund could also be used to provide assistance with; rent and crisis accommodation, food and utilities, medical costs, medication and alternative therapies and legal costs. Job Services Australia structured the program into four streams:

- **Stream 1** – ‘work-ready’ job seekers. They were immediately assisted in the preparation of a resume and advised about local labour market opportunities and job search methods. It was expected that up to a third of these job seekers would find employment in their first three months, without further assistance.

- **Streams 2** – job seekers with relatively moderate barriers to employment. These job seekers may need assistance with their job search activities, identifying appropriate job vacancies, relevant training, work experience and other interventions including identified vocational barriers. Their assistance includes a Skills Assessment, identification of employment or study goals, skills development training, referral to education or training, job search training and supported job search assistance, and purchase of vocational and non-vocational assistance using the Employment Pathway Funds (up to $500 per individual).

- **Streams 3** – job seekers with relatively significant barriers to employment. Similar assistance to Stream 2 with higher frequency of contact and Employment Pathway Funds (up to $1,100 per individual).

- **Streams 4** – job seekers with severe barriers to employment. Stream 4 job
seekers with complex and or multiple non-vocational barriers that may prevent them from obtaining and sustaining employment or undertaking further skills development. The assistance combined pre-employment and employment assistance that included suitable non-vocational interventions to address the job seeker’s barriers and social inclusion using the Employment Pathway Funds (up to $1,650 per individual). Most significant was the recognition in the performance framework for social outcome measures for job seekers in Stream 4.

Similar to the other contracts, the Job Services Australia contracts did not guarantee the numbers or types of participants the providers would receive during the term of the contract (DEWR, 2005 and DEEWR, 2008). The providers were offered maximum allocation of job seekers based on the tolerance levels 80 per cent to 120 per cent of their contracted share. The contracts were for a term of 3 years (which has since been changed to a term of 5 years in the recent Jobactive 2015–2020 contract (DoE, 2014)), after which a competitive tendering purchasing process was held with the overriding principle guiding the selection of tenderers to be value for money to the Australian Government. The selection criteria weightage may have differed through the different tenders but fundamentally the assessments were on the demonstrated performance in the delivery of employment services contract, proposed strategies for the services and strategies to promote, sustain and enhance the delivery of services at a local level. This competitive environment directly affected the certainty of future cash flow and longer term planning for the host organisation.

In addition, the contract was monitored through performance management by the Department measured through the ‘Star Ratings’ and other information used to assess quality of service. If the Department was not satisfied with the performance of a
provider it had the right to reduce, withdraw or terminate business for all or part of the remaining contract period (DEWR, 2005 and DEEWR, 2008).

‘Providers faced two main sources of uncertainty regarding their future caseloads, and hence their future cash flows. These led to considerable turbulence in the employment services market at and immediately after each tender round.’ (Davidson & Whiteford, 2012)

Preference was given to tenderers that geographically cover all the Employment Region with full-time sites (DEWR, 2005; DEEWR, 2008 and DoE, 2014). The privatisation of the Commonwealth Employment Service to Job Network Employment Services Contract 1 in 1998 already saw a fourfold increase in the number of sites to 1,401 for employment services across Australia. Through the years, the number of sites offering employment services saw significant changes. At its peak during the Job Services Australia (2009 to 2012) contract, there were 2,282 sites, a 63 per cent increase from the Job Network Employment Services Contract 1, which subsequently dropped to 1,694 sites in the Jobactive (2015 to 2020) contract. That was still a 21 per cent increase from 1998.

The stark reality of the industry with its competitive nature of tendering for business every three years had also seen an 86 per cent reduction in the number of organisations providing the service (from 306 organisations in 1998 to 44 organisations in 2015) that is now delivering the employment services contract for the Australian Commonwealth Government as illustrated below in Table 6.
Table 6: Changes in the distribution of Providers and sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Providers</td>
<td>No. of Sites</td>
<td>No. of Providers</td>
<td>No. of Sites</td>
<td>No. of Providers</td>
<td>No. of Sites</td>
<td>No. of Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As at February 1998.
2 As at July 2000.
3 As at August 2005
4 As at September 2008.
5 As at June 2010.
6 As at March 2015.
7 As at June 2016.


The instability of the contracts may have contributed to the high turnover rates of staff in the industry. In the year 2004, less than 6 per cent of the organisations in the industry reported a turnover rate of less than 15 per cent. More than 67 per cent of the industry reported a turnover rate of more than 25 per cent, whilst 15 per cent of the industry reported a turnover rate of more than 40 per cent (NESA, 2008). Though the number of organisations delivering the contract had significantly reduced whilst the number of sites had increased, the rate in the turnover of staff of less than 15 per cent had gradually improved to 23 per cent in 2012 which was a significant improvement from the year 2004 but less than the 27 per cent in 2010. However, in contrast more than 25 per cent of the industry reported a turnover rate of more than 40 per cent, which was higher than in 2004 as seen in Figure 5 (NESA & Jobs Australia, 2008; NESA, 2010 and NESA, 2012).
Figure 5: National average annual staff turnover per cent in employment services industry. Source: (NESA & Jobs Australia, 2008; NESA, 2010; NESA, 2012).

The following paragraphs provide information on the contract and the terminologies used in the Australian Government’s Job Services Australia program that will be used throughout the studies.

The Australian Government’s Job Services Australia program – through a contracted provider – was to provide the right mix of training, work experience and other interventions to help job seekers, particularly the disadvantaged, obtain suitable employment. Every job seeker was linked to a provider of their choice; the provider had to develop an individually tailored plan with the job seeker (i.e. Employment Pathway Plan). The Employment Pathway Plan (EPP) documented the various types of assistance, vocational and non-vocational needed to address the barriers faced by that individual. The activities and interventions identified in the EPP was supported by a pool of funds called an Employment Pathway Fund (EPF) (DEEWR, 2008).
As previously described, the Job Services Australia program structured the job seekers into four job seeker streams allocated with different levels of assistance governed by his or her Job Seeker Classification Instrument (JSCI) score: Stream 1 (most work ready), Stream 2 (relatively moderate barriers to employment), Stream 3 (relatively significant barriers to employment) and Stream 4 (severe barriers to employment) (DoE, 2016 and DoJSB, 2018). The program was designed with Service Fees, Outcome Payments, Placement Fees and the Employment Pathway Fund weighted to the most disadvantaged job seekers, with Stream 4 attracting significantly higher fees and funds than Stream 1. (Refer to Figure 6)

![Figure 6: Overview of the streams in Job Services Australia. Source: (DEEWR, 2008).](image)

To assess the comparative performance of providers, they were measured using the Job Services Australia (JSA) Star Ratings as a measure of their contractual performance and for the Department to drive improvement in performance, allocating business share to providers if necessary. A set of performance measures with relative weighting included the 13-week outcomes, 26-week outcomes, job placements and social outcomes for Stream 4 and when they are off income support (off benefit) for Stream 1 as illustrated below in Table 7. The overall JSA Star Ratings were calculated by aggregating the individual Stream ratings with Stream 4 contributing 40 per cent,
Stream 3 contributing 30 per cent, Stream 2 contributing 20 per cent and Stream 1 contributing 10 per cent (DEEWR, 2012).

Table 7: The Star Ratings Performance Measures and Weightings (July 2009 to June 2012 and July 2012 to June 2015)


Using the performance measures and weightings, the Star Ratings model calculated a performance score for each site across Australia comparing the individual site performance scores to the national average site performance score (Table 8) (DEEWR, 2010). This was used by the Department to monitor the provider’s performance and was also publicly available to job seekers when searching for a provider. Throughout the life of the contract, the only changes were the components of the Social Outcome measures that changed from 6 months of additional assistance and work experience to the number of barriers serviced in Stream 4 job seekers. That measure equated to 15 per cent of the Stream 4 star rating by assessing the level of assistance that providers were delivering to address the recorded barriers to employment of Stream 4 job seekers. The measure did not necessarily require barriers to be fully overcome; rather that assistance was delivered which may contribute towards overcoming the barrier (DoE, 2012 and DoE 2014).
Table 8: Distribution of JSA Star Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Stars</td>
<td>40% or more above the average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Stars</td>
<td>Between 20% and 39% above the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Stars</td>
<td>Between 19% above and 19% below the average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Stars</td>
<td>Between 20% and 49% below the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Star</td>
<td>50% or more below the average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (DEEWR, 2012).

The providers were paid service fees to assist job seekers in each stream for approximately 12 months of service (Stream 4 may have an additional six months) unless the job seeker had been employed, moves into full-time education, moves into the Work Experience phase of the stream or exits the program of the providers (DEEWR, 2010). The service fees for each job seeker were paid to providers in recognition of the specified services provided including case management, skills assessments and contract compliance. The provider had to help the job seekers with preparing a resume and advise them about local labour market opportunities, job search methods and access to training opportunities and review the job seeker’s progress towards overcoming identified vocational and non-vocational barriers. The service fees were weighted to the most disadvantaged job seekers: Stream 1 received up to $781, Stream 2 received up to $885, Stream 3 received up to $1,120, Stream 4 received up to $2,736. The specific amount payable is described in Table 9 below.
Table 9: Job Service Australia Service Fees by streams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREAM SERVICE FEES AND TIMING</th>
<th>SERVICE FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes the Initial Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes Skill Assessment and managing intensive Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes the Initial Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes the Initial Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes the Initial interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th 13 weeks,</td>
<td>$413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$2736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 13 weeks,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes one-off Work Experience Service Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd 13 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd 13 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th 13 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (DEEWR, 2010).

In addition, providers could use the Employment Pathway Fund (EPF) flexibly to assist any job seeker or group of job seekers to purchase vocational and non-vocational interventions, training and skills development, self-employment, mentoring, or work experience activities (DEEWR, 2014). The EPF was held as a credit at the outlet of each Job Services Australia provider and could be used at the provider’s discretion in
line with the principles of the EPF guidelines. The EPF was weighted to the most disadvantaged job seekers: Stream 1 received up to $11, Stream 2 received up to $550, Stream 3 received up to $1,100 and Stream 4 received up to $1,650 (DEEWR, 2014).

Providers could also claim placement and outcome fees when the job seeker had remained in employment, unsubsidised self-employment, an apprenticeship, a traineeship or qualifying education for a minimum of a 13- or 26-week period (DEEWR, 2014). Similarly, the placement and outcome fee were weighted to the most disadvantaged job seekers with emphasis of 26 week outcomes generally valued more highly than 13 week outcomes: Stream 1 received up to $385 – $440 only in job placement fees, Stream 2 received up to $385 – $2,800 in outcome and job placement fees, Stream 3 and 4 received up to $385 – $6,600 in outcome and job placement fees (DEEWR, 2014).

The above information on the contract and the terminologies used in the Australian Government’s Job Services Australia program will be used throughout the studies in chapters Three to Five.

**Employment for groups of people who experience significant disadvantage**

In the last decade, there has been a growing number of unemployed who are highly disadvantaged with significant barriers to employment in a labour market that is now categorised by lower unemployment and widespread skill shortages (O’Connor, 2008).

In the 1990s, Australia’s unemployment rate peaked at 11.0 per cent in October 1992 and since then it has gradually declined, with a record low of 4.1 per cent in March 2008 and last reported at 6.1 per cent in June 2015. With these changes in the characteristics of the unemployed, addressing barriers to employment becomes a critical pathway towards achieving sustainable employment. Meeting these challenges is central to the methodology proposed by the Self-Sufficiency Case Management
Figure 7: ABS 2016, seasonally adjusted unemployment rate. Source: (ABS, 2016)

The growing number of unemployed who are highly disadvantaged with significant barriers to employment includes people with disability. The participation of people with disability in the labour force continues to be significantly lower at 54 per cent, compared with 83 per cent for people without a disability (O’Connor, 2008).

Similarly, according to ABS data, the number of homeless people increased from 99,900 in 2001 to 104,676 in 2006; of significance were the 10.4 per cent increase in the number of homeless adults outside of families and 16.8 per cent increase in the number of people in families with children as illustrated below in Table 10 (Chamberlain & MacKenzie, 2008).

Table 10: Changes in the composition of the homeless population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Change Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of persons</td>
<td>Number of persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with children</td>
<td>22,994</td>
<td>26,790</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth aged 12 to 18</td>
<td>22,600</td>
<td>17,891</td>
<td>-20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (singles and couple only)</td>
<td>54,356</td>
<td>59,995</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As reported in the ABS Adult Literacy and Life Skills Survey 2006, the unemployed population with Skill Level 3 or above are significantly lower (Prose - 40 per cent, Document - 40 per cent, Numeracy - 27 per cent, Problem solving - 16 per cent and Health literacy - 25 per cent) compared to the employed (Prose - 60 per cent, Document - 61 per cent, Numeracy - 56 per cent, Problem solving 36 per cent and Health literacy - 47 per cent) as illustrated below in Figure 8 (ABS, 2008).

Figure 8: Skill level, proportion at level 3 or above by labour force status. Source: (ABS, 2008). Note: Health literacy domains are additions to the 2006 survey and hence no time series information was available.

A large proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are highly disadvantaged with significant barriers to employment. Although the employment to population ratio has increased for Indigenous people (from 51 per cent in 2005 to 54 per cent in 2008), the gap is still significant compared to the employment to population ratio of 76 per cent for non-Indigenous people as illustrated below in Figure 9 (SCRGSP, 2011).
Australia continues to be culturally and linguistically diverse with 27 per cent (6.0 million) of the population born overseas at 30 June 2010 (ABS, 2011). Migration from July to December 2011 was 116,600, a 19.9 per cent increase over the corresponding period for the previous year (Department of Immigration and Citizenship, 2011). Compared to younger people, mature-aged workers are more likely to face redundancy and experience more difficulty in securing re-employment following job loss (Taylor & Walker, 1998). Similarly, in a tight labour market, young people and school leavers would be competing for fewer vacancies; they are often amongst the first to lose their jobs and have difficulties in finding a long-term sustainable job (Scarpetta et al., 2010).
Rationale for investigating the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model

The Australian Government’s national employment services system with the change of Job Network’s Work First methodology towards human capital development models in the Job Services Australia contract, has taken into consideration the change in the higher disadvantaged characteristics of the unemployed and a lower unemployment labour market (O’Connor, 2008).

Some organisations providing employment services to their participants have had to explore human capital development models to meet the changing needs of disadvantaged job seekers and contractual changes in delivering an employment services program. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, some organisations were associated with the negative practice of ‘creaming’ and parking’ participants (Considine et al., 2011). ‘Creaming’ of participants was when a provider preferred dealing with those easy-to-place job seekers, most likely to achieve payable outcomes and hence contribute to higher performance star ratings. ‘Parking’ of participants was when the providers provided little assistance to participants with low employment probabilities, even creating temporary mundane jobs that maximised placement payments, manipulating the system to rotate the participants through the system (Considine, 2001; Considine et al., 2011 and Productivity Commission, 2002). In the Productivity Commission report, the Commission emphasised that while ‘parking’ of participants can be an adverse phenomenon, the providers could hardly be blamed for responding to the incentives built into the system, hence recommending changes (example service fees for increased frequency of engagement and short term outcome payments) for future contracts to reduce the issue (Productivity Commission, 2002). Correspondingly, this places more importance on human capital development models such as the proposed Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model where addressing barriers to employment becomes a critical pathway towards achieving sustainable
employment.

In the next chapter, this thesis will explore a case study of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model within a host organisation in their delivery of the Australian Government’s national employment services (i.e. Job Services Australia).
Chapter 3

Study One - Case management within the host organisation
This chapter reports on Study 1, which comprised a case study of the host organisation. It provides the history of the host organisation with their diversity of programs as well as the development of their case management models with specific emphasis on the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model.

The first part of Study 1 describes the history of the host organisation. It has been constructed from staff interviews and organisation documents. The second part of the case study covers the adaptation and introduction of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model (Model), which is the subject of the thesis investigation. This has been constructed from a questionnaire completed by key members of the host organisation responsible for implementation and utilisation of the Model, with specific emphasis on the impact of implementing the Model in the organisation.

**Part 1 – The host - an organisation in context**

The host organisation is one of the service providers contracted by the Australian Government to deliver employment support services. The host organisation is a company that is highly committed to continuously improving their service delivery to meet the changing needs of highly disadvantaged job seekers as previously described in Chapter 2. The host organisation adopted and adapted a service model (Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model) which places greater importance on human capital development to meet the generally more complex needs of highly disadvantaged job seekers in a market with higher employment participation requirements.

This is a single-case study design due to the unique position of the organisation in being the only provider delivering the contract using the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model. The model was being piloted in Australia and as a revelatory case (i.e. revealing something hitherto unknown), this situation presented an opportunity to
observe and analyse a phenomenon usually inaccessible to other researchers due to commercial sensitivity (Yin, 1994).

Method

The information about the host organisation was drawn from a number of different sources including participant interviews, annual reports from 2001 to 2012, company website, tender submissions, communication articles and program briefs. These documents were used to substantiate the information provided in regard to the organisation’s journey from its establishment to its operations at the time of the data collection in chronological order.

As well as the documentation, unstructured interviews were held with staff and senior managers who were asked about the early days of establishing the company, their personal journeys within the company, the growth of the company and the programs that have been implemented over the years. The participants were able to provide knowledge of the company from its start, including the diversity of programs and the directions that have led towards adopting a new case management methodology.

Results

The host organisation has from its inception been a dynamic, innovative and expanding organisation with unique business models and a strong focus on enhancing the lives of its clients and communities. As such, it provided an excellent organisational environment to introduce and test a unique case management model.

The 1980s was a time when society’s view of people with disability was shifting from dependency to independence. In 1992, two founding individuals established the host organisation, spearheading the then revolutionary idea that people who have an intellectual disability, given a good job match and support, could successfully work
for full award wages rather than in sheltered workshops or institutions. They approached the then Commonwealth Department of Families, Community Services and Health (DFCS&H) to fund this employment initiative as part of the Competitive Employment and Training (CETP) program. With an additional four employees, they were able to support 120 people with intellectual disability on employment assistance and targeted training aimed at working in open employment with the same benefits and conditions as non-disabled workers.

Although one of the founding partners retired in 2006 after 14 years of holding the reins of the business in partnership with the existing CEO, the stability in the governance of this company is demonstrated by the six independent, volunteer non-executive Directors, three of whom have been on the Board since 1992. The directors on the Board are from a diverse range of backgrounds and professional expertise including legal, finance, audit, risk, psychology, disability and government relations background, guiding the company towards contributing to some of Australia’s most disadvantaged.

In 1997, as the CETP program was renamed Disability Employment Support (DES), the host organisation successfully tendered for service expansion and became the largest DES service nationally with the capacity to support 410 job seekers with a disability annually. The significant change to this program came in 2003, when the funding was changed from Block Grant Funding to Case Based Funding (as described in Chapter 2) and the program subsequently became known as Disability Open Employment Services.

Leveraging its expertise in employment for people with disability, in 1998 the host organisation successfully tendered to become a Job Network service provider under contract to Commonwealth Department of Employment Workplace Relations...
(DEWR) providing pre-employment, placement and post-placement support to
approximately 1,000 job seekers with a combination of multiple complex needs. It then
achieved further Job Network service expansion in 1999, increasing its support to
3,000 clients and expanding from three to ten offices across Melbourne.

In 1999, the host organisation continued to diversify its services and contracts and
became a Community Support Program contractor for the Department of Families,
Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA) supporting 302
clients annually, with the majority being homeless and having mental illness (including
dual diagnosis). In 2001, the program came to be known as the Personal Support
Program (PSP) and the host retained their contract after achieving the top 3 per cent
national ranking in improving significant social and economic outcomes for
participants. The host organisation’s Personal Support Program’s (PSP) innovative
program participation model enabled participants to better manage life challenges and
achieve their goals by way of strategies including rapid connection upon referral,
intensive case management, advocacy, provision of job search training, financial
assistance for basic necessities such as hygiene packs and food parcels, and providing
outreach services such as home visits and driving participants to doctors, lawyers,
Centrelink and community support groups for appointments. Participant intervention
plans were reviewed up to several times a week and as often as daily; this decreased
progressively to fortnightly and eventually monthly as the participant’s social situation
stabilised.

In 2003, to further assist job seekers into employment, the host organisation set up a
Registered Training Organisation (RTO) division that offered accredited and non-
accredited training courses. This division focussed on encouraging lifelong learning
and providing training opportunities that suited an individual learning style and needs
and increased the host organisation’s capability to assist job seekers towards achieving fulfilling employment with a career path.

In 2004, through funding from the Victorian Department of Justice, the host organisation delivered an intensive post-release support program for high risk and high need offenders. In two years, the host organisation supported 40 clients and received outstanding performance bonuses for both years of operation.

A significant growth period for the host organisation began in 2005 whereby the host organisation acquired four not-for-profit organisations with similar values and culture. This allowed expansion into New South Wales (five offices), Tasmania (four offices) and the northern suburbs of Melbourne (two offices). In addition, two of these organisations were operating social enterprises that provided employment to disadvantaged workers. In this study, they are named as Social Enterprise One and Two.

The first organisation acquired was established in 1984 to assist people with disability into open employment through the Competitive Employment and Training Program (CETP). Similar to the host organisation from 1996 to 2005, Organisation One diversified its contract to include the provision of a Personal Support Program (PSP) to support people with psychiatric issues to achieve social health and wellbeing outcomes. With this new contract, they established additional offices interstate specialising in supporting 333 people annually, with 60 per cent impacted by psychiatric disabilities.

The host organisation’s second acquisition was a registered training organisation (RTO) that was also delivering open employment through CETP. In addition, Organisation Two was operating a labour hire social enterprise that was providing
supported paid employment experience for highly disadvantaged workers through commercial grass cutting, vegetation control, litter collection and a cleaning business.

The host organisation’s third acquisition was an organisation established in 1988 to assist people with an intellectual disability into open employment through CETP. In 1999, Organisation Three in partnership with The Deaf Society also diversified into the specialisation of employment support for people who are deaf or hearing impaired.

The host organisation’s fourth acquisition was an organisation that was established in 1993 to support people with psychiatric disability through the More Intensive and Flexible Service program (MIFS) funded by Commonwealth Family and Community Services. In addition, Organisation Four was operating a commercial cleaning social enterprise that provided a supported work environment for people with mental illness, getting them ready for open employment.

**Social Enterprise 1 - Labour Hire Services**

This labour hire service had operated since 1998, providing commercial grass cutting and vegetation control services. At the time of data collection, it had a workforce of 23 full-time staff, and more than 60 casual staff, including 40 staff with a disability and 20 mature-aged workers (i.e. people aged 45-64 years). The labour hire service offers flexible work arrangements such as reduced hours and duties to suit disadvantaged workers. The environment provided an incentive for workers to socially interact on a regular basis with benefits to their health and wellbeing. This social enterprise’s sustainability is demonstrated by the fact that they do not receive any government funding. It is also a leader in safety management as one of the first social enterprises in Australia to be awarded the national health and safety standard (Australian Standard 4801 Occupational Health and Safety Management System). With a long-standing reputation for excellence, in 2004, the company received the
Equity Award for Organisation from the State Training Authority and in 2005 was a finalist in the Business Excellence Awards.

**Social Enterprise 2 - Cleaning Services**

With the motto of ‘We don’t want charity, just an opportunity to provide a high-quality cleaning service to you’, this cleaning service was established in 2001 and was the first social enterprise in the state to exclusively employ people with psychiatric disabilities. As an Australian Disability Enterprise (ADE), the supported workforce has the assistance of a counsellor with partial funding provided by the Australian Government’s Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs. At the time of data collection, this cleaning service had a workforce of 40 staff, 32 of which are people with disability ranging from schizophrenia to dissociative disorders. The business provides cleaning services to large corporations and community-based organisations across the state. In 2003, the business successfully achieved award based wages and on-the-job training opportunities for staff through the Australian Open Learning for the modified Certificate II in Cleaning. A most significant achievement is that through the enterprise, a high 90 per cent of their workers attained nationally recognised certificates in Asset Maintenance. In 2009, this cleaning services business celebrated its million-dollar revenue milestone, demonstrating its leadership in social enterprise business strategy and commercial cleaning sustainability.

In 2006, the new Uncapped Stream in Disability Open Employment Services (DOES) was introduced and named as the Disability Employment Network. The host organisation successfully tendered to deliver the new stream with the combined expertise and geographical coverage of the four acquired not-for-profit organisations.

In the same year, the host organisation developed and launched a youth program to
assist young people with disability into employment. With financial support from the Victorian Department of Human Services (DHS), the program provided training in a variety of areas from preparation for work, literacy and numeracy, through to accredited units in hospitality and business administration. In addition, work experience placements were also sourced for participants, so they could put into practice what they were learning and get a feel for different areas of work.

In the same year, the host organisation expanded its geographical coverage from 10 to 14 sites through an increase in the Job Network contract funded by DEWR. The host organisation also introduced the first Specialist Job Network ex-offender employment program to exclusively support ex-offender clients through early engagement, lower caseloads, building trust and providing pre-release training. This program focussed on participation in training programs prior to release, early referrals and engagement with community services, counselling, accommodation providers and Centrelink and activities such as basic career planning and job search training. In the transition into society and into the workforce, from 2007 to 2008, the program serviced 368 clients, placing 175 ex-offenders into employment and education. Of those placed, 21 per cent achieved 25–36 week interim outcomes, 12 per cent achieved 25–36 week final outcomes and 1 per cent achieved more than 36 week final outcomes.

The success of this Specialist Job Network ex-offender employment program was instrumental for the host organisation in expanding its expertise in this field. In 2007, the host organisation was funded by the Commonwealth Attorney General’s Department to deliver a similar Specialist Ex-offender program in Employment and Mentoring in New South Wales. Through a partnership with two correctional centres of the Department of Corrective Services, this collaborative project provided ‘through care’ case management supporting prisoners with disability during and beyond
incarceration. This innovative program included a service mix of case management, individualised assistance for complex multiple needs, preparation for work training, mentoring (formal and facilitated), and referrals to other community support programs. The program recruited and trained 32 mentors, successfully matching 18 mentors to participants, delivered 200 hours of vocational and life skills training to 25 participants in the two correctional centres, and placed 14 participants (74 per cent of all released participants) into employment.

In 2007, the host organisation in partnership with a Victorian-based leading asylum seeker organisation was successful in a funding application to the Victorian Department of Innovation, Industry and Regional Development (DIIRD) for a specialist employment program for asylum seekers and refugees. This was a customised case management program with training for 20 asylum seekers and refugees on Temporary Protection Visas and Bridging Visas with skills in demand and/or labour market shortage areas, structured mentoring and advocacy. This program drew on the combination of demonstrated strengths of the host organisation with respect to their expertise in employment and training for the highly disadvantaged and the partner with expertise in leading refugee/asylum seeker aid, health and advocacy organisation.

In the course of administering employment programs, the host organisation identified a gap in providing cost effective professional services to address psychological and vocational barriers to highly disadvantaged and long-term unemployed people. In 2005, the host organisation began building its capability to deliver a cost effective and efficient fee-for-service professional psychological intervention service to enhance service levels. In 2007, the host organisation was officially approved by Comcare as a national Occupational Rehabilitation Services (ORS) provider delivering early
intervention occupational rehabilitation assessment and return to work, job analysis or workplace assessment psychological services, and occupational rehabilitation counselling.

The host organisation continued to diversify its programs and in the same year was successful in its application to deliver the Personal Helpers and Mentors program (PHaMs) in Victoria, on behalf of FaHCSIA. At capacity, PHaMs assists 60 people aged over 16 years old whose abilities to manage their daily activities and live independently were severely impacted by mental illness. Participants receive intensive, flexible, holistic, long-term one-on-one community-based support, with outreach and access to appropriate support services (for example counselling, hospitalisation, crisis assessment and intervention, respite care, legal, family support, material aid, help with child protection and custody issues). Within a year, seven participants were engaged in Supported Accommodation Assistance Programs, six completed Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation, three gained supported employment, three gained volunteer work and seven participants were enrolled in vocational educational and training. With zero staff turnover at the time of data collection, the program consistently operated at capacity and in the 2008 survey of participants, 97 per cent reported excellent service confirming participants were achieving their goals. This demonstrated the host organisation’s expertise in developing and delivering a high quality and effective support to highly disadvantaged clients.

In 2009, the government’s Job Services Australia (JSA) program with an emphasis towards comprehensive case management replaced several contracts including Job Network, Work for the Dole, Green Corps, Job Placement Employment and Training, Personal Support Program and Remote Services. The host organisation in partnership with three not-for-profit subcontractor partners, successfully tendered to deliver the
JSA program, expanding from 5 to 10 employment service areas (ESAs), including the Northern Territory, with an overall 30 per cent increase in new business.

The host organisation continued to innovate and diversify to support highly disadvantaged communities, and in 2010 established two new social enterprises in the field of electrical and maintenance services. The approach was a blended workforce of qualified tradespeople working alongside people from disadvantaged backgrounds, those experiencing barriers to maintaining work in the competitive labour market due to disability, mental illness, age, cultural background, homelessness or other barriers.

**Social Enterprise 3 – Electrical Trade Services**

The host organisation acquired a commercial electrical business, converting the business into a social enterprise, the first not-for-profit licensed registered electrical contracting business in the state. The business aimed to employ one apprentice for every A Grade electrician, focussing on recruiting a mix of apprentices under-represented in the trade, such as women, Indigenous Australians, mature-aged, people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, and tenants of subsidised housing. At the time of writing, the business employed a Manager, three A Grade electricians, a female apprentice and an apprentice from a culturally and linguistically diverse background.

**Social Enterprise 4 – Property Maintenance Services**

In 2010, in contrast to building expertise from the acquisition of existing companies, the host organisation built a new social enterprise to provide commercial property maintenance services in general carpentry, painting, gardening and cleaning whilst creating paid employment and skills development opportunities for the disadvantaged tenants of social and public housing. In addition, half of their vulnerable employees were diagnosed with a mental illness. Operationally, this Property Maintenance
Services was modelled as a blended workforce with the disadvantaged workers working in conjunction with qualified tradespeople. In June 2011, the organisation commissioned a Social Return on Investment analysis of this Property Maintenance Service; it stated that for every $1 invested in the program, $8.24 of value was created for stakeholders and 52 per cent of value was created through the outcomes experienced by their disadvantaged employees whose lives improve significantly as a result of their ongoing and secure employment (Family and Community Development Committee, 2012). The success of this social enterprise encouraged the organisation in replicating the model with DEEWR’s Innovation Fund providing establishment costs. In 2011, the organisation established the Property Maintenance Services Model in another state with a focus on helping culturally and linguistically diverse workers.

**Community Investment Division**

As a not-for-profit organisation, the host organisation is fundamentally committed to the sustained health of its clients and communities. The host organisation’s Community Investment Division reinvests up to 20 per cent of annual surplus revenue into community projects to ensure that the most disadvantaged and underprivileged members of society are assisted in achieving their personal, vocational and employment goals. The host organisation’s community investment initiatives seek to support people who fall through the cracks of existing public and private sector programs. The participants of their initiatives face challenging barriers and discrimination in the workforce and their personal lives.

The host organisation’s first community investment commitment in 2001 was in support of an initiative by the Victorian Magistrate’s Court and the Victoria Police, sponsoring an all-African youth soccer team. This initiative by the state encouraged the development of projects to provide social and sporting opportunities to culturally
isolated and disadvantaged youth. With a coach and team attires sponsored, the team won the 2002 Victorian Soccer League Premiership in their first year. This project also won a prestigious award from the Department of Sport and Recreation for its work in integrating disadvantaged culturally and linguistically diverse at-risk youth.

Their next project was a reintegration program for ex-offenders providing early intervention and specialist vocational and mentoring services. This project used a specialist team operating within a case management model, helping participants with finding accommodation, addressing health issues, re-engaging them in education and helping them to find meaningful work. The participants were also guided by a trained mentor, who was their personal guide and support – inspiring and motivating them to tackle their challenges, to persevere, and to pursue their goals. Mentors provided a positive social connection and role model for family and workplace relationships. From 2002 to 2006, there were 370 voluntary participants; most of the participants experienced positive lifestyle changes involving a dramatic reduction in offending and drug use, with participants’ self-esteem and confidence increased along with a rise in vocational participation. In recognition of this innovative initiative in breaking the cycle of crime and incarceration, the host organisation was awarded the National Crime Prevention Award in 2006 by the Australian Government Attorney-General’s Department. The host organisation’s efforts in this field highlighted the gap in mainstream government programs. At time of writing, the host organisation had four specialist ex-offender programs in the government’s Employment Support Service and JSA programs.

Concurrently in 2003, the host organisation initiated and sponsored the development of an employment program with a Victorian based asylum seeker advocacy organisation. Asylum seekers on bridging visas and refugees on temporary protection
visas are among the most disadvantaged groups in Australia in terms of access to employment. Whilst they have the right to work, they do not receive, or only receive limited support from Centrelink and government related employment programs and do not have access to subsidised public education, training or apprenticeships. The sponsorship facilitated the recruitment of a part-time employment coordinator within the asylum seeker organisation to support over 200 asylum seekers and refugees annually. The host organisation also provided expertise in employer engagement strategies and access to the host organisation’s employer database of 3000 employers. In addition, funding was provided to the asylum seeker advocacy organisation for a part-time catering service trainer to help set up their Social Enterprise Catering Services.

Again, this initiative highlighted the gap in mainstream government programs that led to funding by the Victorian Department of Innovation, Industry and Regional Development (DIIRD) for a specialist asylum seekers employment program as described in previous paragraphs. Consequently, at the time of data collection, there were three specialist programs assisting culturally and linguistically diverse migrants and refugees in the government’s JSA program.

In 2008, the host organisation diverted their attention to supporting Indigenous populations in Victoria and New South Wales. Their first project was a program to up-skill and support Indigenous small business owners. In partnership with a local city council in Melbourne, the host organisation recruited an experienced coordinator to organise a regular open-air night market featuring Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts, crafts, food, music and dance. In addition to a place to showcase their products and talents, the Indigenous small business owners were given the opportunity to improve their skills in merchandising, marketing, promotions, taxation.
requirements, legal structures, small business law and financial management. The host organisation’s financial support continued for two years and supported 16 trainees and 100 stall holders. This project aimed to improve economic and social standing of Indigenous stall holders, as well as positively impacting on the Indigenous community, general community and local businesses. The initial financial support from the host organisation was a step towards sustainability and it is now governed through a majority Indigenous board represented by stallholders, the Koorie community and partner organisations.

The Indigenous project in New South Wales was set up to support Indigenous job seekers with a disability in Western Sydney, through a vocationally focussed horticultural and landscaping program. In partnership with seven organisations, a local university, state housing, a local church, RTO, a division of Corrective Services NSW and two Indigenous organisations, the project aimed to promote physical and mental health and wellbeing, leading to improved lifestyle choices and strengthened skills related to gaining and maintaining employment.

A similar project in Victoria was set up to support disengaged Indigenous and non-Indigenous youth through a vocationally focussed creative arts program. The host organisation provided community investment funds to employ a vocational counsellor for 12 months that supported 80 young people engaged in study and training related to work and performing arts activities. This project was delivered in partnership with thirteen organisations, the local council, three youth services, two Universities, TAFE, Secondary College, a Local Learning and Employment Network, Community Centres, the Aboriginal Education Association, the Indigenous Foundation and a professional theatrical company. One of the achievements of this project was a theatre production featuring reconciliation themes.
In 2012, the company achieved a significant milestone commemorating its 20th anniversary. At the time of data collection, across 29 offices in Australia (Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and the Northern Territory) as well as the United Kingdom, the host organisation employed around 700 full-time employees and continues to expand its range of employment and training programs.

In summary, for more than 20 years, the host organisation’s existence was characterised by continuous growth and diversification throughout its history within an extremely dynamic operating environment. From six staff operating a disability employment service in one location, the organisation grew to more than 700 staff in 29 locations, operating several different programs and businesses (mainstream and disability employment services, rehabilitation services, training, and social enterprises) as well as a community investment division. The organisation had been very responsive to emergent opportunities and successful in its response to those opportunities. The adaptive ability of the host organisation is important to ‘take up’ of a new service / case management model. Regular contract changes have required changes to service and case management models.

The host organisation with its strong focus on enhancing the lives of its clients and its communities, provide an ideal organisational environment to introduce and test what is a unique case management model. The following sections discuss the methods and results of evaluating a human capital development model that is the proposed Model where addressing barriers to employment becomes a critical pathway towards achieving sustainable employment.

Part 2 – Introduction and adaptation of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model

The context for acceptance of the Model within the organisation
In the past decade, the Australian Government Job Network – and subsequently renamed Job Services Australia (JSA) – and more recently the Jobactive program accounts for around 47 per cent of the host organisation’s revenue. The business environment, which the host organisation depends for its revenue is a volatile environment that directly affects its operational structure and service model. Through the evolution of the program, the host organisation was constantly adapting to the changes stipulated by the contract as much as the ‘learning by doing’ and constant adaptation of the contract by the policy makers in the Australian Government (Finn, 2011).

The host organisation has worked on the basis of service and business models from early in its existence. The host organisation adopted the Active Participation Case Management Model when it was implemented in July 2003 as part of the Job Network contractual requirements. The model provided a journey of the job seeker, stipulating timelines inherently designed on Work First principles and had limited funds, assessment and intervention tools that were required by case managers to assist job seekers’ vocational and non-vocational interventions needed to address the barriers faced by that individual.

The host organisation internally developed an assessment tool, the Core Assessment Tool (subsequently renamed Primary Assessment Tool in the Job Network Employment Services Extension (2006 to 2009)). In addition, they also developed the Customised Assistance Participation Program, which contained the strategies required for case managers to assist job seekers with employment barriers.

The Core Assessment Tool was a six-page form that helped to document the job seeker’s current situation (housing, social supports, health and other issues, English language skills, transportation and licences), their employment goals, job seeking
capabilities, marketable skills, job preferences and barriers to gaining employment.

The Customised Assistance Participation Program lists work preparation activities designed to maximise opportunities for sustainable employment. The list of activities includes writing resume and covering letter, understanding job ads and employment application forms, career planning, employer research, employer canvassing and visits, newspaper and internet job searching, researching suitable training courses, register with labour hire companies, preparing for an interview, starting and keeping your job and other tailored initiatives/activities.

The assessment and intervention tools that were developed for the Active Participation Case Management Model emphasised on employment barriers and were designed on Work First principles. The intervention activities were centred on improving job-searching skills and did not take into consideration other barriers to employment such as mental health, transport or improving vocational skills.

After 11 years of the Job Network program, in July 2009 the Australian Government introduced Job Services Australia (JSA), radically changing the employment program towards an emphasis on employment outcomes through vocational and non-vocational interventions for the most disadvantaged job seekers. The program was designed with fees and performance measures weighted to the most disadvantaged job seekers, with Stream 4 job seekers (severe barriers to employment) attracting significantly higher fees and funds than Stream 1 job seekers (most work ready).

This prompted the host organisation to adopt the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model in 2009 that would accommodate the changes associated with the JSA contract and meet the host organisation’s mission to guide and inspire people to realise their potential and achieve fulfilling vocational goals as a not-for-profit organisation.
The movement from a Work First methodology to a progressive-developmental case management methodology was a significant shift in the mindset and organisational structure of staff and managers within the organisation. The remainder of this qualitative study of the host organisation focussed on the adaptation and introduction of the Model by those with direct responsibility for implementation and utilisation of the Model, and the impact of the Model on the organisation’s structure, practices and resources.

Recognising the need for a progressive-developmental model, given the conditions of the JSA contract, the organisation introduced the Model. Questions provided to the staff responsible formed the basis of investigating the adaptation and implementation of the Model for use within the host organisation. Acceptance by the host organisation’s staff was essential to successful adaptation and implementation of the new Model. The participants differ in their experience with the Model; some were involved in the initial decision to develop and implement the Model and others were using it operationally. Hence, their responses were different in terms of levels of understanding and also different in their focus on key points within the Model.

**Participants**

The participants in this part of the study were the case managers, implementation managers and senior managers of the host organisation, which was one of 112 service providers in 2009 contracted by the Australian Government to deliver the JSA program (as described in Chapter 2).

The host organisation provided a list of 22 participants for this study. According to the organisation, 16 case managers were selected due to their higher usage of the electronic matrix form – the assessment tool that was part of the host organisation’s Model. Three implementation managers were selected to participate in the study, as they were
responsible for the development and implementation of the Model. Another three senior managers were selected to participate in the study as they were responsible for the decision to implement the Model and to monitor its performance. Of the total participants, 50 per cent (11) selected phone interviews, while 36 per cent (8) completed the electronic questionnaire and 14 per cent (3) had face-to-face interviews.

In terms of the diversity of participants, 64 per cent were female and 36 per cent were male – which is consistent with the National Employment Services Australia report ‘Australian Employment Services Workforce Development Project Remuneration Survey 2010’ stating that females are the dominant gender of employees in the industry at 71 per cent (NESA, 2010). The ages of the participants ranged from 24 years to 62 years. Their tenure with the host organisation ranged from 1 to 18 years and the length of time in their positions at time of interview ranged from 2 weeks to 7.2 years.

Instrument

The instrument included three questionnaires that delved into the reasons for adopting a new case management model and the perceived benefits of the Model before implementation, as well as the challenges the host organisation faced in adapting the Model to fit with new contractual requirements and the organisation’s operational structure (Appendix 2, 3 and 4). The questionnaire also investigated the value of the Model to participants in understanding their acceptance of the Model’s philosophy. It also described the issues and challenges in implementing the Model, the perceived limitations, and subsequent changes from the initial application of the Model. Finally, the participants provided reflections and opportunities for improvements to the adapted Model after almost 8 years of being part of this initiative.
Procedure

The participants were interviewed for approximately half hour at the end of the contract after the two time periods, one when the Model was in place and a post-Model period. The host organisation provided a list of participants and their contact information. The questionnaire was disseminated to participants along with a letter of participation invitation, outlining the research objectives and a participant consent form. The participants were offered flexible modes of completing the questionnaire: face-to-face interviews, completing an electronic questionnaire, and/or phone interviews.

The host organisation provided the researcher with access to their facilities for the field-located component of the research and access to data files for purposes of aggregated data analyses. All the participants were required to provide a consent form for their feedback to be included in this study.

Results

**Initiative of adopting a new case management model – the drivers and perceived benefits?**

According to the participants, the main reason the host organisation had to research adopting a new case management model was in response to the changes proposed by the Australian Government in the new employment program Job Services Australia (JSA) in 2009. The key elements of the new program were to achieve both economic and social inclusion outcomes. This was a competitive purchasing process and the host organisation felt that it had to significantly differentiate their service model to achieve a competitive advantage for success in the purchasing process.

The host organisation conducted in-depth research into different service models’ options for the new contract. The research team evaluated different service models
being utilised internationally, with research from the United Kingdom – ‘In work better off: Next steps to full employment Government Green Paper’ (DWP, 2007); the United States – ‘How to Design Effective Employment Model’ (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2002); and Finland, Germany and Italy – ‘Joblessness as a major challenge for Public Employment Services Country reports from Finland, Italy and Germany’ (Arnkil et al., 2008). This research finally led to the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model (Model) originating from the United States of America’s Department of Housing’s Family Self-Sufficiency Program in Massachusetts (Massachusetts DHCD, 1999).

‘I remember the research from Massachusetts and various other programs and it was adapted to the government contract. That was also a competitive advantage for the host organisation. My memory was no one else was thinking that way or doing it that way. It was ahead of it’s time.’ Participant A comment.

In selecting the Model, the research team’s views were that the job seekers would not be ‘parked’ and left behind – everyone could access a level of service based on their needs and a certain level of benefit to help them progress through the stages of the Model’s continuum. It was viewed by the team as a powerful reason for implementing the Model – one of the participants recalled that no one else was thinking that way or doing it that way in 2009 in Australia and it therefore seemed ahead of its time. The Model was deemed in line with the new contractual requirements and it would provide an improved and consistent case management approach across the organisation that was in line with the organisation’s mission and vision.

‘Not all people could be placed in work due to their barriers and they would be disadvantaged. So, the host organisation’s Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model that was developed helped essentially every individual that walked through our door –
everyone could get some level of service based on their needs and some level of benefit to help them progress through the stages of the host organisation’s Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model. They were better off for the experience of coming to our service. They may not have the ultimate job, but they were not parked and left behind, they were given a level of service in line with their individual circumstances. That was a great and powerful reason for implementing the model back in 2009.’ Participant B comment.

The benefits of the Model, according to all of the participants, was that it provided case managers with an assessment starting point by identifying an individual’s priority barriers and strengths, and enabled them to apply appropriate interventions and monitor progress over time. The case managers were also able to use the reference guides as a tool to provide relevant and individual intervention options to address job seeker circumstances and progress along the continuum from In Crisis or At-Risk, to Safe, Stable, and potentially Thriving.

The host organisation provided post-placement support to job seekers based on their individual circumstances up to 26 weeks in line with contractual requirements. All the participants agreed that there was a need to continue providing support services, as there are other life domains that may impact on a job seeker’s ability to maintain their employment (for example accommodation issues and health and wellbeing issues). Helping job seekers to address concerns in the other life domains through post-placement support and appropriate interventions could increase their chances of remaining in paid employment and hence sustained periods of Safe or Stable circumstances.

For many of the job seekers, especially the long-term unemployed, securing a job is another chapter in their life that they will have to cope with both mentally and
physically. That can include adjusting to waking up on time to commuting to their workplace, making new friends at work, learning the ropes of the job and financial changes (for example bank accounts and taxes). Many of the job seekers may also have non-vocational barriers that need continual intervention strategies as they cope with the stress of work.

All the participants agreed that it is logical to focus on workforce development as it provided a person with motivation and goals (short, medium and long-term) and these may eventually help them move closer to self-sufficiency. In fact, it is critical especially at the In-Crisis or At-Risk phase as a person lacking in skills, with issues with mental health, accommodation or drug and alcohol issues will find it difficult to secure or keep a job.

In addition, the Model fits in with the not-for-profit philosophy of the host organisation. One of the participants compared the Model to Maslow's hierarchy of needs: the more basic needs such as clothing, shelter, food, health and wellbeing need to be fulfilled before the person can achieve other milestones.

One of the senior managers commented that the organisation would have preferred to assist job seekers past the 26 weeks of being employed as barriers can continue to be present. However, due to the government funding, the organisation had to exit the job seekers from the program and were not in a financial position to continue working with them past 26 weeks of employment.

**What this says to us**

While the key driver for adopting the new case management methodology was predominantly economic reasoning, the philosophy behind the Model resonated well with the organisation’s managers, with perceived benefits to job seekers, and
alignment with the organisation’s values. Funding success was increasingly about service providers being able to offer more innovations in service delivery and the more complex and harder-to-place job seekers were attracting the highest revenue. This funding model meant that the providers had to address the needs of the harder-to-place job seekers or fail to attract the revenue required to be successful in this changing industry.

**Adapting the Model to fit**

According to the participants, the initial barriers to implementing the Model were the amount of work required to adapt the USA version of the Model with relevance to Australian employment services program(s) and terminology, as well as integrating it with the organisation’s operational processes.

The assessment tool of the original USA version of the Model measured 25 life domains (as described in Chapter 1). In discussion with operation managers, staff and a team of academics from a local university, the Model was modified to ten life domains (as described in Chapter 1) relevant to the Australian context, in line with government contractual requirements.

These ten life domains (The Self-Sufficiency Matrix) were initially developed as a paper-based format with calculations made using an Excel spreadsheet. Case managers would frame questions using the forms as cues and then determine which box to check in the spreadsheet based on the job seeker’s responses. The electronic spreadsheet would then calculate a numerical self-sufficiency score for each particular scale before plotting it onto the appropriate range on the Self-Sufficiency Assessment Results and Historical Status graph in Excel. The input process of a job seeker’s response into an Excel was straightforward, but each job seeker’s assessment was saved as a separate spreadsheet file and each new assessment was created as a new worksheet. The
spreadsheet format was not designed for collaborative work in tracking multiple job seekers as different case managers may assist the same job seekers. The spreadsheet also had limited track changes, audit functions, lacked the ability to consolidate information and there were no wider reporting functions.

As part of the delivery of the government contract, the host organisation was already using a third-party client management information system software. Following staff suggestions, the host organisation engaged this third-party software provider to integrate and customise the Self-Sufficiency Matrix into its software to provide graphical representation and higher reporting functions. This version of the electronic matrix form was seen as an adequate platform and although feedback from users was that it was cumbersome, the graphs were well accepted.

‘The development of the model into an assessment tool that could be used on a practical basis offered a lot more potential for the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model than other models. This was reflected in some of the verbal feedback in training from staff who had joined host organisation from other providers where they had theoretical models but nothing they could practically use.’ Participant C comment.

Several of the participants were involved in developing the comprehensive training package that integrated the theory of the adapted Model with the contractual requirements of the government funding contracts. A half-day training session was provided to all operational staff in the organisation. The training was divided into theoretical (the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model, principles of case management according to the National Standards of Practice for Case Management, relevance to government contractual requirements and service delivery) and practical sessions with case studies using the electronic matrix tool. Ongoing support for the staff was in the form of instructional videos on how to use the electronic matrix tool.
and ten reference guides that provided examples and recommendations to assist case managers in providing suitable interventions, in proper sequence and in a timely fashion. The staff were also provided with ongoing development training via webinars and teleconferencing to discuss improvements or share experiences, and at times one-on-one assistance was provided to staff.

In addition to adapting it to the Australian context, the participants indicated that the introduction of the Model also triggered major structural changes within the organisation to support the delivery of the adapted Model. The host organisation introduced three levels of case managers instead of the generic Employment Consultant position (Trainee Case Manager, Case Manager Level 1 and Case Manager Level 2). The roles of the case managers were aligned to the JSA contract, which had four streams of job seekers with different levels of assistance allocated by a Job Seeker Classification Instrument (JSCI) score, rather than the job seeker’s duration of unemployment or position in a continuum of service. It was designed so that different levels of skills, experience and knowledge of the case managers were able to assist with the different streams of job seekers. The case managers were supported by the existing program manager roles – highly experienced case managers with a high-level of contract knowledge focusing on best practice and contract performance. The host organisation also increased the number of post placement officers to ensure job seekers had support after they found work to continue with their progress. In addition, to help with job seeker referrals to community support services and training organisations, the new position of community engagement consultant was appointed across the organisation. The roles were also aligned with Australian Community Employment Training and Support Services 2009 Award (now transitioned into the Social Community Home Care and Disability Services Award).
What this says to us

The organisation’s initial commitment to adapt the Model was evident. Adaptation of the Model was done methodically with experienced staff and academic input. The organisation went to great lengths to develop a comprehensive training package for its implementation. It also invested in converting the Self Sufficiency Matrix into an electronic format in an effort to increase the use of the matrix by staff, as well as improve the user experience. Corresponding changes were made in the organisation’s structure to meet the needs of job seekers and the demands of a new contract. An alignment of the structure, staff titles and designations to more contemporary industrial awards provided clarity to the skill-based bands and levels, rates of pay and other conditions that were apparent to the staff. This had a substantial impact on the organisation with significant changes to staffing arrangements, additional human and financial resource in modifying the Model, developing the training packages and integrating the Model with the information technology (IT) systems.

Value of the Model

In familiarity testing, the participants were able to reiterate the key elements of the Model – they described it as a holistic and structured case management model with an assessment methodology that tracks an individual’s circumstances against the ten life domains. They described it as enabling appropriate intervention choices to help an individual move towards self-sufficiency measured over time.

According to the participants, the Model also enabled the host organisation to wrap around other support services – for example, community organisations and other intervention services that can help the job seeker based on their individual needs. The participants also described how the Model helped the host organisation understand how it can work with the employers wrapping them around the same case management
The participants were asked how important each of these factors (for example, employment, education, financial conditions and health outcomes) in the Model was in achieving overall self-sufficiency for job seekers. All 22 participants (100 per cent) indicated that all of the factors were important and could influence life circumstances, although obviously not all of the factors are applicable to all every job seeker (for example drug and alcohol, ex-offender status). Six of the participants indicated that it was very important, and another that it was vital, to address the barriers to employment in order to achieve the best possible outcome for the job seekers.

In asking if the participants were familiar with other case management models, 44 per cent were not familiar with other case management models before using the Model. Those who had experienced other models felt that the Model has a holistic approach to case management assessment, is simpler than other models, less time consuming, more in-depth, easier to use and more efficient/effective without compromising on the quality/quantity of information.

A majority of the participants (79 per cent) indicated that they felt the Model’s job seeker objectives were realistic. With exception, two of the participants felt that it was unrealistic – one reason given was that the five stages of the scale do not reflect smaller movements, making it difficult to accurately place some job seekers as their life circumstances changes often. Another participant felt that it was more useful as an ‘at the moment’ tool rather than as a ‘continuous chain of events’ tool.

A majority of the case managers (81 per cent) felt that the Model offers ‘best practice’ in case management that helps with identifying barriers and linking the barriers to strategies and activities. In exception, two participants felt that the Model does not
help with case management and that it was best used as a case coordination tool. The additional benefits of the Model were that it provided staff with clarity of purpose and job satisfaction, especially for the case managers working with Stream 3 and Stream 4 job seekers who presented with significant barriers.

More than half of the participants (53 per cent) indicated that the Model provided an assessment tool that could be used on a practical basis unlike other models, identifying job seeker barriers that enable them to work on strategies to overcome barriers. Others viewed the Model as a reflection of the job seeker’s situation and thus easier to communicate and plan the job seeker’s training and activities.

A majority of the case managers (75 per cent) were able to reiterate how the scale was designed to identify progress against a set criterion in the assessment tool along a continuum and that it was a good snapshot of the individual’s circumstances. However, some negative comments were that the information entered was lengthy, some categories doubled up, and that it should be revisited more frequently after the initial completion – if not revisited it would become inaccurate and, therefore, invalid.

A simple majority of participants (63 per cent) indicated that they found it easy to track job seeker progress using the scale. Five of the participants accredit this to the innovative design of the electronic matrix tool and the visual presentation of the graphs with different colour coding that provided a visual impact for quick referencing. With exception, six participants felt it was difficult to track client progress using the scales. Some elaborated that it was a time-consuming process and also replicated existing processes. It can be challenging to ask job seekers at the initial interview stage all the questions and receive current, truthful and accurate information and also to constantly adjust information. There were also concerns that people’s lives are often fluctuating between different positions and as such it was moderately difficult to track job seeker
progress. A significant number of participants (47 per cent) mentioned the visual benefit of the graphical representation of the job seeker’s life circumstances in the structured assessment tool (electronic matrix form).

More than a third of the participants (37 per cent) indicated that it was easy to track job seeker progress towards self-sufficiency using the host organisation database and no improvements were required. They attributed this to the electronic matrix form with the historical view graph that was available on the third-party software. Only one participant expressed that it was moderately difficult as they were required to update case notes and thus the electronic matrix form was not updated regularly. Other participants provided suggestions for improvement such as auto-populating the information into the electronic matrix form directly from Job Seeker Capacity Assessment that was conducted by Centrelink staff and linking it to the Barrier Management tool that was optional in the government IT system (DEEWR, 2012). Four of the participants (25 per cent) suggested automated notifications to update the electronic matrix form at each appointment or every 6 months as a ‘set task’ function.

A substantial 63 per cent of participants indicated that by identifying the job seeker’s individual circumstances, goals, barriers and strategies through the assessment tool, it assisted the job seekers in recognising their barriers and provided a clear visual map of progress and a quick identification of barriers or deterioration in an area that could lead to quicker response and hence an early intervention. Four of the participants (25 per cent) indicated that the electronic matrix form was a tool to assist case managers in their assessment of the job seekers.

A majority of the participants (84 per cent) indicated that they would recommend the Model to other community service organisations. However, there were recommendations that it had to be better customised to the organisational goal and
mission. They cautioned against recommending it to another community service organisation if the objectives of the funding body were only process driven or if the funding model does not sufficiently support the resourcing of the Model. A few of the participants also felt that it would be more suited for organisations delivering mental health and disability programs rather than the general employment services (JSA) program.

‘The staff had job satisfaction and they had a career path and we had the traineeship qualification as well. That model changed a lot of things for the organisation, structurally, culturally. The fact was our turnover went down to 18 per cent before that it had been 30 per cent. It was one of the reasons for the lower turnover, not everything but one of the reasons.’ Participant D comment.

According to the participants, the Model changed many things for the organisation, structurally and culturally. The Model contributed to staff satisfaction and a career path towards assisting more highly disadvantaged job seekers. The host organisation’s staff turnover rate reduced significantly from 30 per cent to 18 per cent in part due to the introduction of the Model.

**What this says to us**

The participants were familiar with the philosophy of the Model and a significant number of them supported the theory and potential of the matrix-based system in helping job seekers towards self-sufficiency, despite a recognition of multiple challenges in implementing and operating within a self-sufficiency framework.

**Issues and challenges**

The participants said that about three years into the implementation of the Model, operation managers made decisions to scale down the resources, training and ongoing
support for the Model. This included reverting the tiered case managers to a generic position of employment consultant, whilst the program manager, post placement support officer and community engagement consultant positions were made redundant at the end of 2012. The function of post-placement support to job seekers was allocated to a new centralised Customer Service Centre. Unlike the post placement support officers located at sites who visited job seekers and employers at work locations to resolve any employment issues, the Customer Service Centre staff were office-bound and were only calling job seekers and employers to confirm that job seekers were still working to fulfil contractual requirements, rather than to support the employers or job seekers. The training module was also reduced, with more emphasis on getting employment as a priority for job seekers.

The participants indicated that the change seemed to have been done ‘overnight’ without much organisational communication. The participants reported that it was to reduce operating costs; however, the reasons for the change were not communicated. One of the senior managers felt that the changes were done without understanding what would be lost or gained in the implementation of the new Model. There were also suggestions that this change could have been better managed by reducing the number of staff by site to regional support instead of completely reverting to the previous operational structure.

‘The barriers started when operationally, the pressure was on. I think we fell back to the old ways of thinking and working, trying to do all things for all people. Get staff to be all things to all people. So, the lines became blurred, and we weren’t always allocating the right capability to the right job seeker cohort which would reflect that we weren’t always moving in the right direction along the continuum in accordance with the job seeker journey.’ Participant E comment.
According to two of the senior managers, the reversion at the end of 2012 to the operational structure in place before the introduction of the Model was seen as a major step back by the staff. Direct delivery staff were complaining that they did not have work satisfaction as they could not work with job seekers in an effectively holistic way. They did not have the clarity and pride of using their expertise to case manage job seekers depending on their needs. The diluted training program did not provide enough information for them to help the job seekers. In addition, staff felt that they had no clear career prospects in the company as they previously viewed the tiered case manager and different roles available as a progressive career pathway.

‘The movement from “Work first” methodology to a case management methodology was a significant shift in the mindset and organisational structure of staff and management within the organisation. Operational Management buy-in to utilising the methodology on a long-term basis was a major barrier as initial training, ongoing support and information communication was scaled down and staff was restructured and reverted back to the title of “Employment Consultants”, the positions of Post Placement Support Officers and Community Engagement Consultant were made redundant in 2012.’ Participant F comment.

Participants reflected on the service gap that was created in post-placement support after the organisation centralised this support to the Customer Service Centre, there was a decline in employment outcomes when the face-to-face onsite post placement support officers were changed to an office-bound telephone call process.

In addition, the participants also commented that the assessment tool that was underpinning the Model, due to software issues was not deployed effectively in terms of capturing job seeker barriers and helping case managers to analyse job seekers’ circumstances to provide suitable interventions. Instead, it became seen as an
additional administrative burden in a contract that was already heavy on administrative tasks.

According to two of the senior managers, the situation was exacerbated when the host organisation moved to a new third-party software provider for their client management information system due to operational demands of the contract and compliance matters. This meant that the electronic matrix form had to be rebuilt and customised to fit into new software. This version considered feedback from users of the previous matrix and allowed major design changes; the assessment tool became shorter and offered a better visual presentation of the questions. However, similar to this first software, the reporting functions of the design were incomplete. There were significant delays in development, due in part because the third-party provider admittedly underestimated the extent of customisation. Subsequently, they shifted the responsibility back to the host organisation to develop the assessment tool on a separate hosting system. However, the host organisation lacked the technical expertise to develop or maintain the electronic matrix form, its database and any reporting functions.

The concerns with the assessment tool as indicated by the case managers were varied, including: the lack of a text summary and the ability to fill in notes; the frequency with which the assessment tool was reviewed; some options were not appropriate to all job seekers (for example in the accommodation and housing section); some questions in the assessment tool overlapped; the additional time taken to fill in the questionnaire when an interpreter was required; and job seekers were unwilling or could not acknowledge the problems in their lives.

According to three of the senior managers, this change to a new platform for the assessment tool also triggered a redesign of the training package. Unlike the previous
training package, the content was significantly reduced and merged with a 2-day staff conference (entitled ‘Service Charter Roadshow’); in effect, it was reduced from half a day to a 30-60 minute presentation. The presentation had limited information on the theory of the Model, focusing mainly on the assessment tool. Subsequently, new staff were introduced to the Model during Induction as part of an ‘Introduction into Operational Awareness Module’ – with only one slide showing the stages ‘In Crisis’ to ‘Thriving’ and with no practical session on the assessment tool.

The views of the participants about their training in the Model varied depending on the type of training they had received. Most significant was that five of the case managers (31 per cent) indicated that they did not receive any training prior to using the assessment tool and the Model, and seven of the participants (43 per cent) indicated that they received limited training (less than 1 day) as part of the Induction training or roadshow.

Three of the case managers (18 per cent) indicated that the training was effective as they were part of the initial group when the Model was first introduced in the organisation. The training methodology for the initial group was a practical group-based training applying the Model to case studies, whilst the participants who received limited training had a PowerPoint presentation-based introduction to the Model.

With the different levels of training, only half of the case managers (50 per cent) felt that the training provided was efficient and effective, whilst another 43 per cent did not feel that it was sufficient as either they did not receive training, and/or the information provided was very basic. It was interesting to note that several participants were able to figure out how to use the assessment tool even though they did not receive any training.
Nine of the participants (47 per cent) felt that the training provided adequately addressed the philosophical and practical aspects of program delivery. Two of the participants (11 per cent) felt that it failed to address this aspect of the program delivery.

Other participants suggested improvements such as adding a notes section, administering the assessment tool by a professional, lessening the amount of question boxes in the assessment tool (especially for questions that overlapped), linking the assessment tool to the optional Barrier Management Tool available in the government IT system, updating the reference guides, more training on tracking individual job seeker progress and training job seekers to understand the intentions of the Model.

There were nine participants (42 per cent) who felt that the training did not adequately prepare them for implementing the Model, including five participants who had received no training. The other 32 per cent felt that they were able to implement the Model. One of these was part of the initial group that had practical group-based training applying the Model to case studies. Others felt that the quick visual reference guide of the assessment tool was beneficial that over time, once they had completed a few electronic matrix forms, they would be more familiar with the questions to ask the job seeker and work them in more seamlessly into their conversation with the job seeker.

Two of the senior managers felt that the training did not adequately prepare the staff, and that there were contradictory messages from operation managers, from the focus on finding employment first and contractual matters, to changing the case manager title to employment consultant. Without an understanding of progressing job seekers along the self-sufficiency continuum, the assessment tool was seen as just another administrative task.
A large majority of case managers (81 per cent) indicated that they had not received any on-going support in the use of the Model. Only two of the participants (12 per cent) had received on-going support and indicated that the support was adequate. The on-going support was only provided in the initial training group; when the organisation moved the assessment tool into the new third-party software provider, this help desk function was outsourced to the third-party software provider. It was designed to provide feedback directly to the third-party software provider for improvements to the electronic matrix form. However, the third-party software provider reported that not a lot of feedback was received by the helpdesk. There was a practice/training environment where staff could practice completing the electronic matrix form; however, feedback on the practice/training environment was that it often had technical issues (for example electronic matrix form kept disappearing from the training environment). The lack of training and on-going support of the Model after 2012 compromised the integrity of the Model’s implementation.

In regard to the impact on the relationships and support with other service providers and agencies, more than half of the case managers (56 per cent) indicated that it had no impact. Five of the case managers (31 per cent) indicated that it helped to increase interactions with other agencies and also to refer job seekers to services that the job seeker requires, the information was compact, and the visual presentation helped with referral to other agencies.

The senior managers indicated that they could only speculate on the impact as they had no direct contact with the other service providers and agencies. They felt that if the Model was used consistently, the identified interventions through the assessment tool would provide more opportunities for the host organisation to work with other service providers and agencies to identify solutions for the job seekers, hence
enhancing the relationship due to a shared common goal of essentially progressing the job seeker towards self-sufficiency. One participant referred to the increased number of Referral Protocol Agreements (similar to a Memorandum of Understanding), which were formally negotiated referral arrangements that the host organisation has in place with a range of community providers to assist job seekers in receiving support across the ten life domains. Another participant’s view was that there was no data indicating if the Model had impacted the on-going relationship either positively or negatively.

What this says to us

At the point of changes to operational structure in 2012, there was no formal communication or documentation relating to the change and the possible implications. The participants were unable to articulate the reasons for this change, with some participants speculating that it was related to financial reasons. Not understanding the reasons for such a significant change would have caused confusion amongst the staff, possibly affecting productivity.

The lack of support for the Model, scaling down of both training and ongoing support for the Model and the new platform for the assessment tool de-emphasised the case management approach and compromised implementation of the Model. The focus on prioritising employment first for job seekers and the contractual and compliance emphasis of the training also diluted the case management component significantly.

To put it simply, the reason the Model’s integrity was compromised may have been a financial decision, but the values of the Model continued to be appreciated by the organisation and staff. The organisation may not have understood the significance of operational changes on the impact of the service model architecture. The abandonment of the Model was a subtle, unannounced and informal process. A significant change in operational structure, scaled-down training and the lack of support by the end of 2012,
marks the post-Model period in this thesis.

**Why the Model was not better supported and the rationale for reverting to a previous model**

The senior managers deemed the effectiveness of the Model to be anecdotal due to a lack of data integrity in terms of collection and reporting of information. The host organisation used the Model as their core model in the JSA contract from 2009 until the end of 2012, and according to the participants it demonstrated significant advantages both from the performance data of job seekers and staff reviews. However, from 2012 to 2015 the Model was curtailed as the training was diluted and the operational structure was changed from tiered case managers, program managers, post placement officers and community engagement consultants to a previously applied flat structure of ‘employment consultants’.

The participants said the Model was not widely embraced by the operation managers or the more experienced case managers. As such it had not been used to its potential and therefore was not as effective as it could have been. Competing priorities such as placements and outcomes, impact on star ratings and fulfilling program requirements took precedence over adherence to the Model, which was not mandatory. Some newer case management staff and a specialist team (Personal Helpers and Mentors program) had been more willing in adopting the concept to its full potential.

On the question of effectiveness, half of the case manager participants (50 per cent) indicated that it was an effective assessment and monitoring case management tool. However, the case managers also indicated the limitations of the assessment tool in terms of effectiveness, if it was not utilised properly and updated regularly. The assessment tool was also deemed an additional administrative task and completing the assessment competes with the other administrative priorities required of the case
manager. Only three of the participants (18 per cent) indicated that it was an ineffective tool as it was used only for the initial assessment and deemed an internal process.

According to the participants, the strength of the Model in being a comprehensive case management methodology could also be a barrier in the current environment of Australian employment services. With pressure of fees paid towards job seekers employment outcomes, a contract heavy on compliance and performance measures, several providers follow suit shortly to actively replace the title of case manager with employment consultant – the intention to focus on employment first regardless of job seekers barriers. Although the JSA contract aligned well with the Model, the organisation however was moving away from the holistic case management approach, specifically self-sufficiency of job seekers, back to a focus on employment outcomes exclusively.

The participants also mentioned that government contractual priorities continued to be focussed exclusively on achieving employment outcomes and as such there was seemingly no incentive for the organisation to progress a job seeker along other life domains after an employment outcome was achieved. This was despite a recognition that the other life domains were also important to gaining and maintaining employment, for example mental health conditions, referrals to other agencies, and helping the job seekers find solutions themselves as beneficial for sustainable employment outcomes.

‘The barriers to using the framework were multiple – we had another level of assessment that was outside of our prescribed contractual requirements. The staff had to get their heads around in regard to doing an additional assessment, from getting the staff on board with the merit of doing the work and given that they couldn’t see a direct benefit to adhering to the contractual requirements. It was deemed as additional
workload, one of the biggest barriers was the way the model was sold into the staff which affected the buy in of the staff. A lot of people saw the benefits of what the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model was trying to achieve but it was additional workload for them.’ Participant G comment.

The main barriers to using the Model, according to the participants, were the buy-in of operation managers on a long-term basis. There was a constant contradiction in its application, to an extent seen as an administrative burden and that employment was a priority regardless of the individual’s other issues. It was commented that frequently during training, the trainers would highlight that regardless of a person’s circumstances or issues they should be referred to employment as a priority, and to some extent factors such as stable accommodation or education were not seen as issues to prevent people being referred to immediate employment options.

All the participants seemed to indicate that there were inherent issues of providing support services to job seekers after they had found work due to resource constraints and competing priorities. The resource requirements were more significant with the job seekers with higher barriers especially Stream 3 and Stream 4 job seekers. The time and resource constraints challenge the host organisation’s ability to provide the holistic case management approach.

‘There was actually quite a bit of disquiet when we went back to the generic role of Employment Consultant. I know the Managers liked it as it was easier for them. We also increased the training around case management when we implemented the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model, people got a lot out of it. Not that everyone was trained as it was changed again shortly. It all fell apart.’ Participant H comment.
It was also indicated by one of the senior managers that upon changing from tiered case managers to a generic position of employment consultant whereby the staff were expected to be ‘jack of all trades and master of none’, the revenue and performance of the host organisation was affected, although the participant did not have empirical evidence to directly equate this to the change in operational structure. Two of the senior managers again reflected on the enormous gap in service that is a lack of face-to-face interaction and assistance for job seekers at the workplace that was created in centralising post-placement support.

**What this says to us**

In a contract driven by incentives for employment outcomes and compliance as a performance measure, it was difficult for the organisation to relate a job seeker’s progress in self-sufficiency across the ten life domains as fundamental to long-term employment. The placement of job seekers into suitable employment and subsequent ongoing support to help them with non-vocational issues became secondary to meeting the immediate pressures of achieving placement numbers to ensure revenue for the company. A lack of data relating to the progress of job seekers in the self-sufficiency continuum did not help with providing definitive evidence to support the Model. In an operating environment where program objectives were specific with an intensive compliance regime, revenue pressures and a loss of confidence in the Model led to the curtailment of its implementation.

**Reflections and opportunities for improvements**

According to the participants, for the Model to be effective there has to be unwavering commitment by all levels of managers and staff in the organisation, with senior managers’ support in driving the Model through the organisation. It has to be the central mode of assistance, assimilating it into the service delivery instead of just
fitting the Model as an extra or as an afterthought. This should include integrating the key outcomes of the Model in improving job seeker circumstances along the continuum as part of staff’s key performance indicators, performance reviews and appraisals to help staff know how well they have been performing and what further development or training they may need to improve.

‘The workforce was changed overnight – nothing survives drastic changes overnight. There was also no communication, Operational Management just decided all of a sudden to change their job profiles.’ Participant I comment.

According to the participants, skills training and ongoing support were of significant importance in a program that involves case managing job seekers with significant barriers. This required case managers to have specialised training and support. The caseload size of the staff also needs to be suitably adjusted to the different groups of job seekers (those with moderate barriers and others with significant barriers). More effort needs to be put into the alignment of operational framework with the Model, simplifying the process, developing the tools and ensuring staff development so that the Model can penetrate deep within the organisation.

There were suggestions that specific staff be dedicated to managing job seeker referrals to community support services and training organisations, developing stronger Memorandums of Understanding with local providers and maintaining a database with up-to-date details of these community service providers.

Three of the participants viewed that the ideology of the Model has a lot of potential, is ahead of its time, has not been fully tested or realised and can be improved for better implementation.

One participant indicated that in the future, technology will further enhance the
outcomes of the Model, as the clients who were accessing the host organisation’s services were increasingly computer literate.

Two of the participants attributed the Model as the winning strategy in the host organisation’s success with government contracts in Australia and the UK, which have contributed to increasing the revenue of the company by 413 per cent to a $63M revenue company with a workforce of 600 staff within ten years.

‘This fits in with the philosophy of host organisation (and the philosophy behind employment services in general) that employment leads to empowerment – that is, with the means to earn an income, a person can move towards greater self-sufficiency.’ Participant J comment.

For one participant, the development of the Model was a time whereby the organisation was working together professionally to create what would be the core of the organisation’s service model. The planning of this brought different parts of the organisation together, and they had to work outside their silos. Personally, for the participant, it was a fantastic time; it was professionally stimulating and satisfying.

**What this says to us**

There was still a lot of support for the philosophy of the Model even after its integrity was compromised (which marks the post-Model period in this thesis). The participants felt that a stronger commitment was needed across the whole organisation for the Model to be effective.

The Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model, offering significant added value with no extra cost to the government was (unsurprisingly) attractive to government as a concept and therefore useful for winning contracts. It also had the benefit of being in line with the organisation’s goal and mission. However, the implementation of this
Model was in an environment of government policy redirections and tenders, contract compliance pressures and rising operational costs. The competitive tendering process of this industry was complex, expensive and time consuming for providers (Productivity Commission, 2002). In the 2009 tender, of the 2141 bids received from 269 organisations, only 112 organisations were successful (DEEWR, 2008). According to the Australian Services Union, more than 1,000 workers were displaced by the process and some organisations were placed into receiverships as only 72 per cent of providers were existing employment service providers (Peacock, 2009 and Kun, 2011). The contract was complex and did not guarantee the numbers or types of participants the providers would receive during the term of the contract (DEWR, 2005 and DEEWR, 2008). Once tenders were accepted, the contract was closed to other providers for the term of the contract (i.e. between 1998 – 2015, the contracts were 3 years duration). Between 1998 – 2015, the funding under the DEED remained static without price adjustments, despite Consumer Price Index (CPI) increase of 76 per cent in the same period (June 1998 – June 2015) (ABS, 2018). In the Activating States research (2008), it was reported that frontline employment services staff spend 45.24 per cent of their time in direct contact with job seekers followed by 25.16 per cent on contract compliance. On average, these staff had a heavy caseload of 109.55 clients. In addition, 89.5 per cent strongly agreed and agreed that how they do their jobs and work with job seekers were influenced by the Star Rating system, consistent with the findings of this thesis (Considine, Lewis and O’Sullivan, 2008). The organisation in pursuit of its own mission, demonstrated innovation in implementing the model but the contractual obligations and the competitive environment negates the innovation efforts of the organisation with challenges to flexibility in delivering the contract holistically.

A stronger change management process could also have better guided the
implementation of the Model with committed leadership, stakeholder participation, motivation for change and alignment of the workforce to support the changing organisation (Queensland Government, 2012). A planned and structured approach to help align the organisation with change could have been implemented at the initial introduction of the Model and also when the organisation made significant changes in 2012.

Documenting and reiterating why the Model was implemented and periodically measuring the outcomes and objectives could have provided the organisation with information to adjust or correct the Model to achieve a better outcome. They could also have developed areas of best practice and managed potential issues with proactive or remedial actions. Instead, the decision makers in the organisations made significant operational changes without any risk assessment or structured approach, which in itself is a risky move which could adversely affect business and financial performance.

Summary

This chapter contains results of a qualitative study of the host organisation. The host organisation’s journey had been characterised by rapid growth and business diversification navigating through a dynamic, even volatile industry environment. In 2009, the organisation adapted and adopted a new case management model (Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model) as a competitive strategy that successfully doubled their contracts, exceeding expectations in the competitive tendering process.

In general, the case manager’s insights were predominately related to the software design of the electronic Self-Sufficiency Matrix tool, the benefit to their client’s and the impact on their day-to-day workload. The implementation managers perspectives were related to sufficiency of resource and support to ensure staff competency in the use of the model. Finally, senior managers were more focused on the model as a
corporate strategy and the financial performance impact on the organisation.

The implementation of a novel case management model, one aimed at leading to greater self-sufficiency of clients with high support needs was perceived as groundbreaking. There were major changes to the operational structure of tiered levels of case management and a comprehensive training package was developed, later complemented by electronic assessment tools. Even so, the host could be characterised as experiencing ‘growing pains’ and ‘maturity pains’ due to rapid growth that put mounting pressures on the organisation at all levels. By the end of 2012, the integrity of the Model was compromised and curtailed by a significant change in operating structure, scaled-down training and the lack of support for the Model.

The organisation’s success through the years has been their adaptive ability to meet the demands of the customers (contract changes, staff and client needs). However, the change in 2012 did not seem to have followed the same principles. As the organisation de-emphasised the case management component of service delivery, the government increased their message of emphasising tailored case management for clients with high support needs through their literature and performance measures (DEEWR, 2013). This indicated that as the organisation had grown rapidly over a relatively short timeframe, the ability to focus on its customers may have been compromised.

The organisation may have lacked the maturity and strength of will to cope with the additional complexity that growth brings. In addition, there was increasing pressures of managing the financial impact of implementing the Model and operational activities. This was evident in their decision to scale down training when there was a large number of new staff delivering a new contract that was constantly evolving. Similarly, it was reflected in the inability to sufficiently translate the high-level philosophy of the Model into operational procedures and policies to support full and
continuing application of the Model.

As the pressures of the contract increased in a situation of declining revenue in 2012, hasty decisions were made in the hope of reversing the situation quickly. A stronger change management process in the implementation and utilisation of the Model may have helped to align the organisation’s long-term objectives. It would have given the organisation the strategies to prepare for all reasonable eventualities and to reinforce and sustain a holistic case management model. In short, as revenue declined, maybe due to a declining unemployment rate nationally, the decision was to curtail the model rather than ‘weather the storm’.
Chapter 4

Study Two - Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as a Service Model
This chapter investigates the effectiveness of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model (Model) as a service model for supporting and developing job seekers towards self-sufficiency. Having documented the uptake, implementation and curtailment of the Model in Part 2 of Study 1 in the previous chapter, Study 2 will compare the two time periods, one when the Model was in place and a post-Model period.

This study analyses the service performance data of the host organisation during the contract period of the Australian Government’s Job Services Australia (JSA) program, for 42 months (July 2009 to December 2012) while the Model was in place and 30 months (January 2013 to June 2015) after the use of the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

The thesis aims to test the effectiveness of the Model as whole, including adaptation and implementation within the contractual environment of government funded contracts. The reason that employment was used as the sole indicator of improved self-sufficiency of job seekers in testing the model in this study was due to the data made available. The initial research design included analysis of job seekers’ life scale progress along the self-sufficiency continuum. However, the time-stamped data of job seekers’ life scale progress was found to have quality issues (i.e. missing values, inexact or incorrect values), this will be acknowledged as a limitation of this thesis in the discussion chapter. Nevertheless, it has been demonstrated by various research that the benefits of employment as inferred here to lead to self-sufficiency, contributes to an individual’s social, health, psychological, and economic well-being (Creed and Macintyre 2001; Hunter, 2000; Winefield et al., 2002; McKee-Ryan et al., 2005 and Whelan, 1992).

In the JSA program, when a job seeker was placed into employment the provider could claim a placement for finding the position for the job seeker. The employment can be
in the form of a job, unsubsidised self-employment, apprenticeship, traineeship or qualifying education. They would also be able to claim an outcome when the job seeker has remained in employment for a minimum of 13 and 26 weeks. These milestones for the job seekers were translated into fees (placements, 13 week outcomes and 26 week outcomes) for the providers and were also a performance measure in the star ratings calculations. As previously discussed, the fees and performance measures were weighted to the most disadvantaged job seekers, with Stream 4 job seekers attracting significantly higher fees and higher weightings in performance measures than Stream 1 job seekers due to their assessed higher level of support needs (DEEWR, 2010).

**Methodology**

The host organisation serviced 135,673 job seekers during the contract period. This comprised of 52.3 per cent (70,902) Stream 1 job seekers, 23.7 per cent (32,185) Stream 2 job seekers, 11.5 per cent (15,664) Stream 3 job seekers and 12.5 per cent (16,922) Stream 4 job seekers. The data, provided in an Excel spreadsheet included monthly information for the entire contract period on job placements, 13-week outcomes and 26-week outcomes of the job seekers in the JSA program.

The data have been presented in linear graphs with trend lines that indicate the direction of the time series monthly data from July 2009 to June 2015. The mean and the gradients of the trend line have been analysed. Those analyses form the basis of the discussion of the model’s effectiveness as a service model. The R-squared (R²) values are not applicable in this case due to nonlinearity and the test of proportions is not applicable as the data is not normally distributed, similarly caused by the volatility in seasonal trend of recruitment, unemployment trend and also the difficulty to predict job seeker behaviours (Kvalseth, 1985; Weisburd & Britt, 2014).
The analysis of trend line provides a more accurate picture because changes in performance over time are indicated. Use of mean score has the advantage that it uses all the raw data in its calculation, but its sensitivity can be affected by extreme scores in this data set such as seasonal trend of recruitment. The mean score also homogenises performance over the period, is less specific as an indicator of performance and can mask performance trends. Hence though the mean score is used here as a performance indicator in the results, its importance is considered secondary to the trend line analysis.

**Results – analysis of the performance data**

Results relate to each of the three contract performance criteria: job placements; 13-week outcomes; and 26-week outcomes. For each of the variables, the results are graphically presented for the periods of the Model and post-Model periods respectively. Once a ‘Total Job Seekers’ analysis is presented, an analysis of differential effectiveness would investigate the four service streams 4 to 1 which indicates highest level to lowest level of job seeker support needs respectively.

The placement results of ‘Total Job Seekers’ provide an indication whether the progressive-developmental Model being investigated had more impact on job seekers gaining employment, irrespective of the level of job seeker support needs. The 13- and 26-week outcomes indicate if the holistic approach of the Model assisted job seekers towards sustainable employment and self-sufficiency. Following that, the results for each stream of job seekers indicated whether the Model is better able to assist job seekers with different levels of support needs from any particular stream more effectively.
Total Job Seekers

Placement of Total Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 10 goes here

Figure 10 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was an upward trajectory with a positive 0.1247 gradient in Total of Job Seeker placements. There was an approximate monthly increase of 150 placements over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with the post-Model period indicating a downward trajectory with a negative 0.1929 gradient in Total of Job Seeker placements. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 170 placements over the post-Model period.

There were a higher mean number of placements for Total Job Seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of placements for Total Job Seekers was 627 when the Model was in place in comparison to 556 placements once the Model was curtailed – a 12 per cent reduction in mean number of placements which equates to approximately 71 fewer job seeker placements once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

From these results, we can see that when the Model was in place, irrespective of the level of job seeker support needs, job seekers were getting more placements into employment, and that it reduced when the Model was curtailed. The statistical difference in trend lines and mean number of placements clearly indicated that the Model in general worked better at getting people into jobs.
The 13 week outcomes of Total Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 11 goes here

Figure 11 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was an upward trajectory with a positive 0.0062 gradient in Total Job Seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment. There was an approximate monthly increase of 13 job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with the post-Model period indicating a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0571 gradient in Total Job Seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 45 job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of 13-week outcomes for Total Job Seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of 13-week outcomes for Total Job Seekers was 229 when the Model was in place in comparison to 190 achieving 13 week outcomes once the Model was curtailed – a 17 per cent reduction in mean number of 13-week outcomes once the Model was curtailed which equates to approximately 39 fewer job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes (post-Model).

From these results, we can see that when the Model was in place, irrespective of the level of job seeker support needs, job seekers were achieving more 13-week outcomes, and that it reduced when the Model was curtailed. This indicated that the Model worked better at keeping job seekers in employment.
The 26-week outcomes of Total Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 12 goes here

Figure 12 shows that there was a downward trajectory in Total Job Seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment across both periods. When the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0083 gradient in Total Job Seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment. This was an approximate monthly decrease of 10 job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes over that period when the Model was in place. This compares with the post-Model period indicating a downward trajectory and a negative 0.0895 gradient in Total Job Seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment post-Model. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 77 job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of 26-week outcomes for Total Job Seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of 26-week outcomes for Total Job Seekers was 155 when the Model was in place in comparison to 114 achieving 26-week outcomes once the Model was curtailed – a 26 per cent reduction in mean number of job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes which equates to approximately 41 fewer job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

Though both the trend lines show decline, the downward trend was more significant once the Model was curtailed. In addition to a significantly higher mean score when the Model was in place, the conclusion of the results above shows that benefits to Total Job Seekers achieving 26-week outcomes when the Model was in place is still significant and it indicated that the Model works better at keeping Total Job Seekers, irrespective of the level of job seeker support needs in sustainable employment.
Stream 4 Job Seekers

Placement of Stream 4 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 13 goes here

Figure 13 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was an upward trajectory with a positive 0.1012 gradient in Stream 4 job seeker placements. There was an approximate monthly increase of 128 placements over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with the post-Model period indicating a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0554 gradient in Stream 4 job seeker placements. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 30 placements during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of placements for Total Job Seekers once the Model was curtailed (post-Model). The mean number of placements for Stream 4 job seekers was 112 when the Model was in place in comparison to 113 placements once the Model was curtailed – a 0.89 per cent reduction in mean number of placements which equates to approximately 1 less job seeker placement once the Model was curtailed. Though the mean score shows a decrease of 1 less Stream 4 job seeker placement once the Model was curtailed, the difference is not deemed significant as mean score analysis is secondary to trend line analysis. The graph shows a significant upward trend line when the Model was in place and decline once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

The conclusion of the results above, taking into consideration that mean score has disadvantages and is secondary to the trend line results, the benefits to Stream 4 job seeker placements when the Model was in place is still significant and it indicated that the Model worked better at getting Stream 4 job seekers with significant barriers into jobs.
The 13-week outcomes of Stream 4 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 14 goes here

Figure 14 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was an upward trajectory with a positive 0.0337 gradient in Stream 4 job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment. There was an approximate monthly increase of 42 job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with the post-Model period indicating a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0132 gradient in Stream 4 job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 32 job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of 13 week outcomes for Total Job Seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of 13 week outcomes for Stream 4 job seekers was 43 when the Model was in place in comparison to 40 achieving 13-week outcomes once the Model was curtailed - a 9 per cent reduction in mean number of job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes which equates to approximately 3 less job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

From these results, we can see that when the Model was in place, Stream 4 job seekers were achieving more 13-week outcomes, and that it reduced when the Model was curtailed. This indicated that the Model worked better at keeping Stream 4 job seekers with significant barriers in employment.
**The 26-week outcomes of Stream 4 Job Seekers**

**Appendix 5 – Figure 15 goes here**

Figure 15 shows that when the Model was in place, there was an upward trajectory with a positive 0.0191 gradient in Stream 4 job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment. There was an approximate increase of 24 job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with the post-Model period indicating a downward trajectory with a negative 0.014 gradient in Stream 4 job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 13 job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of 26-week outcomes for Stream 4 job seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of 26-week outcomes for Stream 4 job seekers was 27 when the Model was in place in comparison to 22 achieving 26-week outcomes once the Model was curtailed – a 20 per cent reduction in mean number of job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes which equates to approximately 5 less job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

From these results, we can see that when the Model was in place, Stream 4 job seekers were achieving more 26-week outcomes, and that it reduced when the Model was curtailed. This indicated that the Model worked better at keeping Stream 4 job seekers with significant barriers in sustainable employment.
Stream 3 Job Seekers

Placement of Stream 3 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 16 goes here

Figure 16 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was an upward trajectory with a positive 0.0272 gradient in Stream 3 job seeker placements. There was an approximate monthly increase of 35 placements over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with the post-Model period indicating a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0456 gradient in Stream 3 job seeker placements. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 42 placements over the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of placements for Stream 3 job seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of placements for Stream 3 job seekers was 111 when the Model was in place in comparison to 89 placements once the Model was curtailed – a 20 per cent reduction in mean number of placements which equates to approximately 22 less job seeker placements once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

From these results, we can see that when the Model was in place, Stream 3 job seekers were getting more placements into employment, and that it reduced when the Model was curtailed. This indicated that the Model worked better at getting Streams 3 job seekers with relatively significant barriers into jobs.
The 13-week outcomes of Stream 3 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 17 goes here

Figure 17 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was an upward trajectory with a positive 0.0074 gradient in Stream 3 job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment. There was an approximate monthly increase of 10 job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with the graph indicating a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0235 gradient in Stream 3 job seeker achieving 13 weeks of employment post-Model. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 20 job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of 13-week outcomes for Stream 3 job seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of 13-week outcomes for Stream 3 job seekers was 47 when the Model was in place in comparison to 36 achieving 13-week outcomes once the Model was curtailed – a 23 per cent reduction in mean number of job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes which equates to approximately 11 less job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

From these results, we can see that when the Model was in place, Stream 3 job seekers were achieving more 13-week outcomes, and that it reduced when the Model was curtailed. This indicated that the Model worked better at keeping Stream 3 job seekers with relatively significant barriers in employment.
The 26-week outcomes of Stream 3 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 18 goes here

Figure 18 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was an upward trajectory with a positive 0.0054 gradient in Stream 3 job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment. There was an approximate monthly increase of 7 job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with the post-Model period indicating a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0227 gradient in Stream 3 job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment post-Model. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 20 job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of 26-week outcomes for Stream 3 job seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of 26-week outcomes for Stream 3 job seekers was 30 when the Model was in place in comparison to 22 achieving 26-week outcomes once the Model was curtailed – a 26 per cent reduction in mean number of job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes which equates to approximately 8 less job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

From these results, we can see that when the Model was in place, Stream 3 job seekers were achieving more 26-week outcomes, and that it reduced when the Model was curtailed. This indicated that the Model worked better at keeping Streams 3 job seekers with relatively significant barriers in sustainable employment.
Stream 2 Job Seekers

Placement of Stream 2 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 19 goes here

Figure 19 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0291 gradient in Stream 2 job seeker placements. There was an approximate monthly decrease of 40 placements over that period when the Model was in place. During post-Model period, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0508 gradient in Stream 2 job seeker placements. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 40 placements over the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of placements for Stream 2 job seekers when the Model was in place. It means that there was a decrease of approximately 44 placements during the post-Model period. However, the mean number of placements for Stream 2 job seekers was 259 when the Model was in place in comparison to 214 placements once the Model was curtailed – a 17 per cent reduction in the mean number of placements which equates to approximately 45 less job seeker placements once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

Though both the trend lines show decline, the downward trend was more significant once the Model was curtailed. In addition to a significantly higher mean score when the Model was in place, the conclusion of the results above shows that benefits to Stream 2 job seeker placements when the Model was in place is still significant and it indicated that the Model worked better at getting Stream 2 job seekers with relatively moderate barriers into jobs.
The 13-week outcomes of Stream 2 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 20 goes here

Figure 20 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0282 gradient in Stream 2 job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment. There was an approximate monthly decrease of 35 job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes over that period when the Model was in place. During the post-Model period, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0354 gradient in Stream 2 job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 34 job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of 13 week outcomes for Stream 2 job seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of 13-week outcomes for Stream 2 job seekers was 127 when the Model was in place in comparison to 93 achieving 13-week outcomes once the Model was curtailed – a 27 per cent reduction in the mean number of job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes which equates to approximately 34 less job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

Though both the trend lines show decline, the downward trend was more significant once the Model was curtailed. In addition to a significantly higher mean score when the Model was in place, the conclusion of the results above shows that benefits to Stream 2 job seekers achieving their 13-week outcomes when the Model was in place is still significant. It indicated that the Model worked better at keeping Stream 2 job seekers with relatively moderate barriers in employment.
The 26-week outcomes of Stream 2 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 21 goes here

Figure 21 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0277 gradient in Stream 2 job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment. There was an approximate monthly decrease of 36 job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes over that period when the Model was in place. During the post-Model period, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0557 gradient in Stream 2 job seeker placements. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 50 job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of 26-week outcomes for Stream 2 job seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of 26-week outcomes for Stream 2 job seekers was 90 when the Model was in place in comparison to 57 achieving 26-week outcomes once the Model was curtailed – a 37 per cent reduction in mean number of job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes which equates to approximately 33 less job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

Though both the trend lines show decline, the downward trend was more significant once the Model was curtailed. In addition to a significantly higher mean score when the Model was in place, the conclusion of the results above shows that benefits to Stream 2 job seekers achieving their 26-week outcomes when the Model was in place is still significant. It indicated that the Model worked better at maintaining Stream 2 job seekers with relatively moderate barriers in sustainable employment.
Stream 1 Job Seekers

Placement of Stream 1 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 22 goes here

Figure 22 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was an upward trajectory with a positive 0.0255 gradient in Stream 1 job seeker placements. There was an approximate monthly increase of 32 placements over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0411 gradient in Stream 1 job seeker placements post-Model. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of 36 placements during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of placements for Stream 1 job seekers when the Model was in place. The mean number of placements for Stream 1 job seekers was 145 when the Model was in place in comparison to 140 placements once the Model was curtailed – a 3 per cent reduction in mean number of placements which equates to approximately 5 less job seeker placements once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

From these results, we can see that when the Model was in place, Stream 1 job seekers were getting more placements into employment, and that it reduced when the Model was curtailed. This indicated that the Model worked better at getting Stream 1 work-ready job seekers into jobs.
The 13-week outcomes of Stream 1 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 23 goes here

Figure 23 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0067 gradient in Stream 1 job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment. There was an approximate monthly decrease of 9 job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with the post-Model period indicating an upward trajectory with a positive 0.015 gradient in Stream 1 job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment post-Model. It means that there was an approximate monthly increase of 13 job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of 13-week outcomes for Stream 1 job seekers once the Model was curtailed (post-Model). Similarly, the mean number of 13-week outcomes for Stream 1 job seekers was 11 when the Model was in place in comparison to 21 achieving 13-week outcomes once the Model was curtailed – an 86 per cent increase in the mean number of job seekers achieving 13-week outcomes which equates to approximately 10 additional job seekers achieving 13 weeks of employment once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

From these results, we can see that when the Model was in place, fewer work-ready Stream 1 job seekers were achieving their 13-week outcomes, and that it significantly increased when the Model was curtailed. The Model did not benefit the job seekers in Stream 1 who were work ready and do not require assistance to overcome barriers.
The 26-week outcomes of Stream 1 Job Seekers

Appendix 5 – Figure 24 goes here

Figure 24 shows that during the period when the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 0.0052 gradient in Stream 1 job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment. There was an approximate monthly decrease of 7 job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes over that period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with the post-Model period indicating an upward trajectory with a positive 0.0029 gradient in Stream 1 job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment post-Model. It means that there was an approximate monthly increase of 3 job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean number of 13-week outcomes for Stream 1 job seekers once the Model was curtailed (post-Model). The mean number of 26-week outcomes for Stream 1 job seekers was 8 when the Model was in place in comparison to 13 achieving 26-week outcomes once the Model was curtailed – a 74 per cent increase in the mean number of job seekers achieving 26-week outcomes which equates to approximately 5 additional job seekers achieving 26 weeks of employment once the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

From these results, we can see that when the Model was in place, fewer work-ready Stream 1 job seekers were achieving 26-week outcomes, and that it increased when the Model was curtailed. The Model did not benefit the job seekers in Stream 1 who were work ready and do not require assistance to overcome barriers.
Summary

This chapter contains the results of a quantitative study into the effectiveness of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model (Model) as a service model. The service performance of the Model was examined by comparing the two time periods using data pertaining to each of the three contract performance criteria: job placements, 13-week employment outcomes, and 26-week employment outcomes of all job seeker service streams (Stream 1 to Stream 4, indicating the lowest to highest job seeker support needs respectively).

According to the three performance criteria, when the Model was in place it worked better at placing and keeping job seekers in sustainable employment for Total Job Seekers, compared to the post-Model period. Further analysis of the performance by streams indicated that the Model worked better at placing job seekers into employment across all four service streams than the post-Model period. It also indicated that the Model worked better at keeping job seekers in employment for 13-week and 26-week outcomes, especially for job seekers with higher support needs in Streams 3 and 4, less so for job seekers in Stream 2 and had no discernible effect on those work-ready job seekers in Stream 1. The application of the Model was effective for the types of clients it was designed to support but cannot be applied across the different client types. As described previously, at the end of 2012 there were significant changes to the operational structure, scaled-down training, and the loss of support for a holistic case management approach made by the organisation. The Model’s integrity was compromised by these major changes and may have contributed to performance decline in Streams 2, 3 and 4.

The Model attributes long-term unemployment as an individual’s responsibility (as in most case management models). Similarly, the organisation curtailed the Model
swiftly, attributing the downward trend of job seeker placements and outcomes solely to the fit of the Model. Could this have been a systemic issue of the labour market rather than effectiveness of the Model on an individual jobseeker if the three performance criteria did not improve significantly after the Model was curtailed? (Mitchell and Muysken, 2008). Only people who were taking active steps to find a job (i.e. in the past four weeks), were counted as unemployed. ABS 2013 reported that there were 692,697 unemployed actively looking for work (seasonally adjusted) (ABS, 2013). However, this number would be higher if you take into consideration the underemployed as ABS defines a person working more than one hour in a week as employed (ABS, 2014). Then there were those people considered as not in the labour force because they were not actively looking for work. ABS 2013 reported that approximately 6.3 million people aged 15 years and over were not in the labour force, of that 1,004,000 persons (16 per cent) had marginal attachment to the labour force (i.e. wanted to work and were actively/not actively looking for work but were available to start work in the reference week/within four weeks) (ABS, 2013). This equates to approximately 1,696,697 people who could potentially be working and contributing to the society. The number of vacancy online in the same period had 138,814.5 vacancies (seasonally adjusted). This meant that there were about 12 job seekers competing for each vacancy (DoJSB, 2018).

The key elements of the Model were curtailed such as replacing the new centralised Customer Service Centre (call centre) with the role of post placement support officer at sites – the integrity of the Model was compromised, marking the post-Model period in this thesis. This change limited the function of post placement support for job seekers and employers to the contractual requirement of verifying employment status of job seekers with employers. The centralised Customer Service Centre function would not have been sufficient in assisting job seekers with non-vocational barriers
and employment issues to ensure sustainable employment towards 13-week and 26-week outcomes.

For a Model to be successful for a program, its integrity must be ‘fit for purpose’ for the client group and it must be maintained. Unquestionably, the performance data supports the Model’s design for high-support need clients; it worked better for those job seekers who had high support needs, but not for work-ready job seekers. As expected, Stream 1 work-ready job seekers did not benefit from the Model, whereas it was more effective for job seekers in Streams 2 through 4, increasing in benefits for those job seekers in Stream 3 and 4 with higher support needs and in need of case management intervention. As Stream 1 work-ready job seekers at 52.3 per cent represented the largest group of job seekers on the host organisation’s caseload, that would have substantial impact on the revenue generated, this might have influenced the decision by the organisation in 2012 to switch back to focussing on employment outcomes rather than self-sufficiency development outcomes. A combination of the holistic case management Model and an employment focussed post-Model service model for work-ready job seekers would have been necessary to service the different groups of job seekers in this program.
Chapter 5

Study Three - Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as a Business Model
This study investigates the effectiveness of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model (the Model) from a business model perspective by comparing data across the two time periods. The study analyses the business data of the host organisation during the contract period of the Australian Government’s Job Services Australia (JSA) program, for the first 42 months (July 2009 to December 2012) while the Model was in place and the 30 months (January 2013 to June 2015) after the use of the Model was curtailed (post-Model). The chapter contains an analysis of the JSA program revenue, service fees, cost of services and profitability followed by an analysis of the organisation’s operating expenses during the contract period while the Model was in place and after the use of the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

The Model was a unique value proposition of the organisation that demonstrated its competitive advantage in government tendering process. In Chapter 4, we evaluated the effectiveness of the Model as a service model. For the Model to be of sustainable value to the organization, it must also be an efficient business model, the financial viability (costs and revenue) of the Model over time has to be evaluated (Morris et al., 2006).

The industry’s operating environment was marked by the Global Financial Crisis of 2007–2009, although the impact on Australia was mild compared with many other nations (ABS 2010). The seasonally adjusted national unemployment rate rose by nearly two percentage points to 5.9 per cent by June 2009. The JSA program commenced in July 2009 as the unemployment rate fell to 4.9 per cent in December 2010. Subsequently, it gradually rose for the next 50 months peaking at 6.3 per cent in January 2015 and remained relatively steady until the end of the program at 6.1 per cent in June 2015 (ABS 2106). The higher unemployment rates can translate to a higher number of job seekers commencing in the JSA program, potentially increasing
service fees which accounted for on average 50 per cent of the host organisation’s program revenue. However, with higher unemployment rates associated with a downturn in the economy and labour market, it could also make it harder to place job seekers in employment, affecting the revenue for placements and outcomes.

**Methodology**

The data provided by the host organisation in an Excel spreadsheet included monthly information for the entire JSA contract period on program revenue, service fees by stream, cost of services and profitability. However, the operating expenditures provided were for the whole organisation rather than JSA-specific figures. The JSA program accounts for around 47 per cent of the host organisation’s revenue. This makes the figures only indicative, inferring the impact of the performance of the Model as a business model. The operating expenditures analysed for this study include salary, occupancy, information technology (IT), marketing and all other expenditures across the organisation.

In the JSA program, revenue comprised all fees paid to the host organisation for services rendered including service fees, work experience fees, marketers’ recovery fees, placement fees and outcome fees. When an individual job seeker commenced with the provider, the provider could claim a service fee paid in advance for each 13 weeks of service for specified services such as case management, skills assessments and compliance. The service fees which account for more than 50 per cent of the program revenue, were weighted to the most disadvantaged job seekers, with Stream 4 job seekers attracting significantly higher service fees than Stream 1 job seekers due to their assessed higher level of job seeker support needs (DEEWR, 2010). In the JSA program, as discussed in Chapter 2, the provider had access to an Employment Pathway Fund (EPF) to purchase assistance to address vocational and non-vocational
barriers of job seekers. However, providers could also utilise their own funds as cost of services for items outside of the EPF guidelines such as for incentive vouchers (for example petrol and groceries) and additional wage subsidies made to employers to help cover the costs of wages and training for a job seeker to encourage sustainable employment.

The operating expenditure figures provided by the host organisation were for whole-of-organisation with no JSA-specific figures; therefore, the operating expenditure of the JSA program has been apportioned as a percentage of the total operating expenditure as an approximate indication of costs. The JSA program percentage of total income was used to estimate the JSA program percentage of total operations expenditure. The estimates provide a general indication only of the JSA program operations expenditure used in the calculation of the JSA program profitability.

The data are presented in linear graphs with trend lines that indicate the monthly time series data from July 2009 to June 2015. It is important to note that the gradient of 30 months in the post-Model period trend line has been extrapolated forward by 12 months in line with the 42 months when the Model was in place to standardise the two time periods. The mean, standard deviation and gradients of the trend lines have been analysed, and this analysis forms the basis of determining the Model’s effectiveness as a business model.

The analysis of the trend line provides a more accurate picture because the changes in performance over time are indicated. The standard deviation shows how much variation exists from the average, with a low standard deviation indicating that the data points tend to be very close to the mean and vice versa. Use of a mean score homogenises performance over the period and is less specific as an indicator of performance and can mask performance trends. The mean score has the advantage that
it uses all the raw data in its calculation, but its sensitivity can be affected by extreme scores in the data set such as seasonal trend of recruitment. The mean score also homogenises performance over the period, is less specific as an indicator of performance and can mask performance trends; hence though the mean score is used here as a performance indicator in the results, its importance is considered secondary to the trend line analysis.

**Results**

The analysis of program revenue provides an indication of the extent to which the Model had an impact on the income generated from delivery of the program. The service fees paid when a job seeker commenced provides an indication of the revenue allocated by government towards the administration and case management of job seekers. For the service fee analysis, once the Total Job Seekers analysis is presented, an analysis of differential effectiveness of the Model is provided across the four service streams (Stream 4 to Stream 1). The analysis of service fees provides an indication of whether the Model works for the type of job seekers/clients for which the Model was designed. The analysis of the JSA cost of services provides an indication of the extent to which the organisation had to expend resources to provide assistance to job seekers and employers. This is followed by an analysis of program profitability as determined from the remaining revenue after the program’s cost of services and operating expenses have been deducted. Following that, the operating expenditure results are presented for the areas of expenditure that impact on the organisation’s business performance and profitability, such as the organisation’s salary expenses, occupancy expenses, IT costs, marketing costs and all other expenditures.
Program Revenue by month Total Job Seekers and Total Job Seeker Commencements

Program revenue includes all fees paid for services rendered including service fees, work experience fees, marketers’ recovery fees, placement fees and outcome fees. Program revenue only for Total Job Seekers, not available for job seekers by Stream.

Appendix 5 – Figure 25 goes here

Figure 25 shows that there was a downward trajectory in program revenue and Total Job Seeker commencements across both periods. When the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory in program revenue with a negative 89.708 gradient and Total Job Seeker commencements with a negative 0.6795 gradient. There was an approximate monthly decrease of 6.8 per cent in program revenue and an approximate monthly decrease of 33.3 per cent in Total Job Seeker commencements over the period when the Model was in place. This compares with a downward trajectory of a negative 196.26 gradient in program revenue and a negative 0.1977 gradient in Total Job Seeker commencements post-Model, once the time periods were standardised. It means that there was an approximate monthly further decrease of 17.7 per cent in program revenue and an approximate monthly further decrease of 10.5 per cent in Total Job Seeker commencements during the post-Model period.

There were higher mean program revenue and Total Job Seeker commencements when the Model was in place. The mean program revenue for Total Job Seekers was $1,566,173 when the Model was in place in comparison to $1,318,991 mean program revenue post-Model – a 16 per cent reduction in mean program revenue which equates to approximately $247,183 less mean program revenue after the Model was curtailed.

The mean Total Job Seeker commencements was 1,937 when the Model was in place in comparison to 1,811 Total Job Seeker commencements post-Model – a 7 per cent reduction in mean Total Job Seeker commencements which equates to approximately
126 less mean Total Job Seeker commencements after the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

The number of job seeker commencements for the program declined at an alarming rate across both periods, although this was less so in the post-Model period. Interestingly, the unemployment rate fell to its lowest level of 4.9 per cent in December 2010 when the Model was implemented, gradually rising to 6.1 per cent by the end of the program in June 2015 (ABS 2106). The increasing national unemployment rate would affect the program revenue across both periods as job seekers face stronger competition in a tighter labour market. However, this does not explain the lower and declining rate of job seeker commencements across both periods as an increasing unemployment rate should also increase participation for employment services program(s) such as JSA.

Although both trend lines show a decline, the downward trajectory for program revenue declined slower than the Total Job Seeker commencements when the Model was in place, whilst the downward trajectory for program revenue declined at a faster rate than the Total Job Seeker commencements in the post-Model period. Furthermore, the downward trajectory for the program revenue continued and the gradient was larger post-Model, suggesting that the decline may not have been associated solely with the Model. In fact, there was a higher mean score in program revenue when the Model was in place, indicating that when there’s a downturn in the economy and a labour market with an increasing unemployment rate, the Model may have more impact on placing job seekers in employment, sustaining the program revenue for placements and outcomes. If the Model’s implementation was the cause of the decline, program revenue should have improved after the Model was curtailed. Hence, there is a need to discuss the impact of the other variables such as marketing and communication.
expenses for the organisation that may have affected commencements and hence program revenue across both periods.

**Service Fees of Job Seekers**

Service fees are paid upon job seeker commencement towards the administration of contract compliance, skill assessments and case management of job seekers.

**Service Fees of Total Job Seekers (JSA Stream 1 – 4)**

**Appendix 5 – Figure 26 goes here**

Figure 26 shows that there was a downward trajectory in program revenue across both periods, associated with a declining rate of Total of Job Seeker commencements. When the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 335.59 gradient for Total Service Fees. There was an approximate monthly decrease of $420,000 in service fees over the period when the Model was in place. This compares with a downward trajectory with a negative 258.21 gradient for Total Service Fees post-Model, once the time periods were standardised. There was an approximate monthly further decrease of $320,000 in service fees during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean service fee for Total of Job Seekers when the Model was in place. The mean service fee for Total of Job Seekers was $812,584 when the Model was in place in comparison to $640,482 mean service fees post-Model – a 21 per cent reduction in mean service fee post-Model which equates to approximately $172,101 fewer mean service fees after the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

Although both trend lines show a decline, the downward trajectory was less significant in the post-Model period. The decline in service fees over time was associated with a declining rate of job seeker commencements. This corresponds with Figure 2 that Total Job Seeker commencements declined at a lesser rate in the post-Model period. The
significance of a decline in service fees is that service fees were weighted to the most
disadvantaged job seekers, with Stream 4 job seekers attracting significantly higher
fees than Stream 1 job seekers. A significant decline in Stream 4 job seekers
commencements can have a major impact on overall revenue in service fees unless
there is a significant increase to Stream 1–3 job seekers. We need to have a look across
the four service streams (Stream 4 to Stream 1) to understand the differential
effectiveness of the Model affecting the overall revenue in service fees.

**Service Fees of Stream 4 Job Seekers**

**Appendix 5 – Figure 27 goes here**

Figure 27 shows that there was a downward trajectory in Stream 4 job seekers’ service
fees across both periods, associated with a declining rate of Stream 4 job seeker
commencements. When the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with
a negative 16.934 gradient in Stream 4 job seekers’ service fees. There was an
approximate monthly decrease of $25,000 service fees over the period when the Model
was in place. This compares with a downward trajectory with a negative 102.25
gradient in Stream 4 job seekers’ service fees post-Model once the time periods were
standardised. It means that there was an approximate monthly further decrease of
$126,000 in service fees during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean service fee for Stream 4 job seekers when the Model was in
place. The mean service fee for Stream 4 job seekers was $227,984 when the Model
was in place in comparison to $165,706 mean service fees post-Model – a 27 per cent
reduction which equates to approximately $62,278 fewer mean service fees after the
Model was curtailed (post-Model).

Although both trend lines show a decline, the downward trajectory was more
significant in the post-Model period. When the Model was in place, Stream 4 job
seekers commencements peaked in 2011 and thereafter started to spiral downwards until the end of the program, indicating that the organisation was facing some issues. As the downward trajectory was more significant post-Model, this suggests that the decline may not have been associated solely with the Model. In fact, there was a higher mean score in service fees for Stream 4 job seekers when the Model was in place, indicating that it was more beneficial for the organisation to have a Model in place for Stream 4 job seekers rather than not. This was to be expected as the Model’s holistic case management approach would have significantly impacted on job seekers with the highest support needs in Stream 4. The Model may be suitable as a business model for Stream 4 job seekers with severe barriers to employment. It would also indicate that there is a need to discuss the impact of the other variables such as marketing and communication expenses for the organisation that may have affected the commencement of Stream 4 job seekers across both periods.

**Service Fees of Stream 3 Job Seekers**

**Appendix 5 – Figure 28 goes here**

Figure 28 shows that there was a downward trajectory in Stream 3 job seekers’ service fees across both periods, associated with a declining rate of Stream 3 job seeker commencements. When the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 52.502 gradient in Stream 3 job seekers’ service fees. There was an approximate monthly decrease of $66,000 service fees over the period when the Model was in place. This compares with a downward trajectory with a negative 38.056 gradient in Stream 3 job seekers’ service fees post-Model once the time periods were standardised. It means that there was an approximate monthly further decrease of $47,000 in service fees during the post-Model period. Though both trend lines show decline, a downward trajectory was less significant in the post-Model period.
There was a higher mean service fee for Stream 3 job seekers when the Model was in place. The mean service fee for Stream 3 job seekers was $104,713 when the Model was in place in comparison to $85,373 mean service fees post-Model – an 18 per cent reduction in mean service fee post-Model which equates to approximately $19,340 fewer mean service fees after the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

Though the mean score in service fees is higher for Stream 3 job seekers when the Model was in place, the difference is not deemed significant as mean score analysis is secondary to trend line analysis. Although both trend lines show a decline, the downward trajectory was less significant in the post-Model period. When the Model was in place, Stream 3 job seekers’ commencements peaked in 2010 and thereafter started to spiral downwards until the end of the program, indicating that the organisation was facing some issues. As the downward trajectory was less significant post-Model, this suggests that the decline may have been associated with the Model. The Model may not be suitable as a business model for Stream 3 job seekers with relatively significant barriers to employment.

**Service Fees of Stream 2 Job Seekers**

**Appendix 5 – Figure 29 goes here**

Figure 29 shows that there was a downward trajectory in Stream 2 job seekers’ service fees across both periods, associated with a declining rate of Stream 2 job seeker commencements. When the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 131.53 gradient in Stream 2 job seekers’ service fees. There was an approximate monthly decrease of $165,000 service fees over the period when the Model was in place. This compares with a downward trajectory with a negative 81.872 gradient in Stream 2 job seekers service fees post-Model once the time periods were
standardised. It means that there was an approximate monthly further decrease of $101,000 in service fees during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean service fee for Stream 2 job seekers when the Model was in place. The mean service fee for Stream 2 job seekers was $207,409 when the Model was in place in comparison to $170,716 mean service fees post-Model – an 18 per cent reduction in mean service fee post-Model, which equates to approximately $36,694 fewer mean service fees after the Model was curtailed.

Although the mean score in service fees is higher for Stream 2 job seekers when the Model was in place, the difference is not deemed significant as mean score analysis is secondary to trend line analysis. Although both trend lines show a decline, the downward trajectory was less significant in the post-Model period. When the Model was in place, Stream 2 job seekers’ commencements peaked in 2010 and thereafter started to spiral downwards until the end of the program, indicating that the organisation was facing some issues. As the downward trajectory was less significant post-Model, this suggests that the decline may have been associated with the Model. The Model may not be suitable as a business model for Stream 2 job seekers with moderate barriers to employment.

**Service Fees of Stream 1 Job Seekers**

**Appendix 5 – Figure 30 goes here**

Figure 30 shows that there was a downward trajectory in Stream 1 job seekers’ service fees when the Model was in place, associated with a declining rate of Stream 1 job seeker commencements, in contrast to an upward trajectory after the Model was curtailed (post-Model). When the Model was in place, there was a downward trajectory with a negative 134.63 gradient in Stream 1 job seekers’ service fees. There was an approximate monthly decrease of $160,000 service fees over the period when the
Model was in place. This contrasts with an upward trajectory with a positive 1.726 gradient in Stream 1 job seekers’ service fees post-Model once the time periods were standardised. It means that there was an approximate monthly increase of $1,000 in service fees during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean service fee for Stream 1 job seekers when the Model was in place. The mean service fee for Stream 1 job seekers was $272,477 when the Model was in place in comparison to $218,688 mean service fees post-Model – a 20 per cent reduction in mean service fees post-Model which equates to approximately $53,789 fewer mean service fees after the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

Although the mean score in service fees is higher for Stream 1 job seekers when the Model was in place, the difference is not deemed significant as mean score analysis is secondary to trend line analysis. The upward trajectory once the Model was curtailed shows that the Model does not work well in terms of generating service fees for Stream 1, indicating an increase in Stream 1 job seeker commencements that was better for business after the Model was curtailed (post-Model). This was to be expected – as discussed in Chapter 4, the Model was not designed to support work-ready job seekers in Stream 1. These job seekers would not have needed the Model’s holistic case management intervention to help them with finding employment. As there was an upward trajectory post-Model, this suggests that the increase may have been associated with the curtailment of the Model. The Model may not be suitable as a business model for Stream 1 job seekers.
Cost of Services by month Total Job Seekers

Cost of services includes wage subsidies, vocational and non-vocational assistance for job seekers and employers.

Appendix 5 – Figure 31 goes here

Figure 31 shows that there was an upward trajectory in JSA cost of services for Total Job Seekers when the Model was in place, in contrast to a downward trajectory after the Model was curtailed (post-Model). When the Model was in place, there was an upward trajectory with a positive 63.983 gradient in JSA cost of services for Total Job Seekers. There was an approximate monthly increase of $80,000 JSA cost of services for Total Job Seekers over the period when the Model was in place. This contrasts with a downward trajectory with a negative 31.082 gradient in JSA cost of services for Total Job Seekers post-Model once the time periods were standardised. It means that there was an approximate monthly decrease of $38,000 in JSA cost of services for Total Job Seekers during the post-Model period.

There was a higher mean JSA cost of services for Total of Job Seekers when the Model was in place. The mean JSA cost of services for Total of Job Seekers was $52,722 when the Model was in place in comparison to $38,292 mean JSA cost of services post-Model – a 27 per cent reduction in mean JSA cost of services which equates to approximately $14,431 less mean JSA cost of services after the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

We can see that when the Model was in place, the JSA cost of services for Total Job Seekers was higher and that it reduced when the Model was curtailed. This was to be expected, as the Model’s holistic case management approach was designed to assist individuals in their progress towards self-sufficiency, with additional expense to purchase assistance that would be required to address vocational and non-vocational
barriers of job seekers that would overcome their barriers. It is reasonable to assume that with the Model’s better assessment there would be higher expenditure for interventions that would assist the job seekers with their barriers to employment.

**Program Profitability by month**

**Appendix 5 – Figure 32 goes here**

Figure 32 shows that there was a downward trajectory in profit across both periods. When the Model was in place, there was a downward profit trajectory with a negative 96.194 gradient. There was an approximate monthly decrease of $125,000 profit over the period when the Model was in place. This compares with a downward profit trajectory with a negative 18.712 gradient post-Model once the time periods were standardised. It means that there was an approximate monthly further decrease of $20,000 in profit during the post-Model period.

There was a slightly lower mean profit when the Model was in place. The mean profit was $152,816 when the Model was in place in comparison to $153,816 mean profit post-Model – a 0.52 per cent increase in mean profit which equates to approximately $799 more mean profit after the Model was curtailed (post-Model).

Although both trend lines show a decline, the downward trajectory was less significant in the post-Model period. In addition, there was a slightly higher mean score in the post-Model period; the results above show that the JSA program was more profitable for the organisation after the Model was curtailed (post-Model). However, the fact that when the Model was in place, profitability peaked in 2011 and thereafter started to spiral downwards, recovering inconsistently throughout the post-Model period, indicates that the organisation was facing some issues. If the Model’s implementation was the cause of the decline, profitability should have improved after the Model was curtailed. The rate of decline slowed but the financial situation did not improve
significantly. This suggests that the decline may not have been associated solely with the Model. It would also indicate that there is a need to discuss the impact of the other variables, which is the operating expenditure.

**Operating Expenditures**

The operating expenditure figures provided by the host organisation were whole-of-organisation figures, that is, JSA program figures were not separately identified. The analysis of the operating expenditure can provide an indication of the organisation’s business framework whilst noting the results will not provide explicit proof of the Model’s impact. Nevertheless, the JSA program revenue was, on average 47 per cent of the organisation’s total revenue – the analysis can at least provide an indication of whether operating expenditures have an impact on the implementation of the Model. In any case, the impact of operating expenses on profitability would have been felt in both the Model and post-Model period.

This study has looked at the changes in the host organisation’s distribution of operating expenses across the six years of the JSA program. The operating expenditures analysed in detail for this study included: salary expenses, occupancy expenses, IT, and marketing expenses and all other expenditures. The study also compared the host organisation with not-for-profit providers with similar business profiles, which were operating the JSA program as their principal activities in the last two financial years, FY 2013-2014 and FY 2014-2015, (see Appendix 6) that were publicly available. The industry comparison in the post-Model period provides a general indication if the decision to curtail the Model had make an impact on the business model. However, the lack of industry financial data means that it is not possible to fully understand if the impact was similar when the Model was in place.
The largest cost item for the industry are salary expenses, which is typical of a social service industry that requires a significant amount of face-to-face contact, skills and competency in working with disadvantaged client groups. The mean salary of the organisation as a percentage of operating expenditure was 62.5 per cent when the Model was in place, in comparison to 60.4 per cent in the post-Model period. Across both periods, several similar employment programs (i.e. JSA and DES) were sharing centralised corporate services functions. When the Model was curtailed, marking the post-Model period, several resources within the programs were further combined including management teams, reverse marketing staff and a centralised Customer Service Centre (call centre) that replaced the role of post placement support officer at sites. When the Model was in place, the mix of employees across the organisation consisted predominantly of full-time employees, followed by casual employees and part-time employees. This distribution changed significantly post-Model to full-time employees, followed by a higher number of part-time employees and a significantly lower number of casual employees. In the comparison with five not-for-profit providers with similar business profiles in the post-Model period, the total revenue per employee ratio of the host organisation was lower than three of the other providers (see Appendix 7). When comparing this ratio against similar companies in the same industry, it can denote the productivity levels of the employee and effective use of the organisation’s resources. The lower total revenue per employee ratio of the host organisation in the post-Model period in comparison with the industry indicates that operational changes made as the Model was curtailed may have been ineffective in significantly improving the productivity of the employees.

The providers also had to rent sufficient offices in convenient locations close to public transportation and local services to appeal to the client group, which were often costlier due to their location. Several similar programs (i.e. JSA, DES, Partners in Recovery
and Personal Helpers and Mentors) were sharing the same office space, which enabled the host organisation to cost-share the occupancy and resources of the programs. The mean occupancy cost as a percentage of total operating expenditure was 8.4 per cent when the Model was in place in comparison to 10 per cent post-Model. This is a 19.5 per cent increase in mean occupancy cost as a percentage of total operating expenditure after the Model was curtailed. In the comparison with five not-for-profit providers with similar business profiles, the occupancy cost for the host organisation across programs was the second highest of the providers (see Appendix 6).

The organisation had increased its IT expenditure from 1.6 per cent of total operating expenditure in the first year of the contract in Financial Year (FY) 2009–2010, ending with 4.7 per cent of total operating expenditure in FY 2014–2015, warranting a closer look at this operating expenditure. The mean IT as a percentage of total operating expenditure was 2.3 per cent when the Model was in place compared to 4.2 per cent post-Model. This is an 84.7 per cent increase in mean IT as a percentage of total operating expenditure after the Model was curtailed. In the comparison with three similar not-for-profit providers, the IT cost for the host organisation across programs was the highest of the providers (see Appendix 6). The host organisation had third-party software that was shared across the employment services program(s) (i.e. JSA and DES). None of the other providers had a third-party software provider integrating with their programs unlike the host organisation.

In contrast, the organisation had reduced its marketing expenditure from 1.8 per cent of total operating expenditure in the first year of the contract in FY 2009–2010, ending with 0.5 per cent of total operating expenditure in FY 2014–2015. The marketing and communication costs as a percentage of total operating expenditure were 1.1 per cent when the Model was in place in comparison to 0.5 per cent of total operating
expenditure post-Model. This is a 54 per cent reduction in mean marketing and communication cost as a percentage of total operating expenditure after the Model was curtailed. In the comparison with five similar not-for-profit providers, the marketing and communication cost for the host organisation across programs was the third lowest of the six providers (see Appendix 6).

All other expenditures in the organisation besides the above mentioned, had reduced from 15.9 per cent of total operating expenditure in the first year of the contract in FY 2009–2010, ending with 9.7 per cent of total operating expenditure in FY 2014–2015. The analysis of the host organisation’s operating expenditure is relevant to the evaluation of the Model as much of the operating expenditures was shared across the employment services program(s) (i.e. JSA and DES), which accounts for more than 80 per cent of the organisation’s revenue. The information provides a trend insight and when other factors are analysed can provide information that can improve business performance.

**Summary**

This study investigated the effectiveness of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model (Model) as a business model. The value of the Model as a business model was examined through the comparison of the two time periods using data pertaining to the JSA program. This included program revenue, service fees, cost of services and profitability as the key indicators of business performance. Ideally, the changes in the distribution of operating expenditure from the JSA contract perspective that can impact on the business model would be investigated. However, as the operating expenditure provided by the host organisation was not allocated by the program, the changes in the distribution of the operating expenditure from the organisation’s perspective was investigated to infer the impact on the business model.
The analysis of the trend lines shows that there was a downward trajectory in program revenue and profitability across both periods. The program revenue and profitability increased with a distinct peak at month 21 (March 2011), when the Model was in place. However, the level of revenue was not sustained; it gradually decreased and mid-point in the contract at month 36 (June 2012), program revenue and profitability fell to its lowest at almost 40 per cent of the peak level. This might have been a factor that prompted the organisation to consider major changes – as mentioned in Chapter 3 Study 2 – whereby there were significant changes in operational structure, scaled-down training, and the loss of support for a holistic case management approach by the end of 2012, which marks the post-Model period. Interestingly, a labour market with increasing national unemployment rates should increase job seeker participation in the JSA program. However, across both periods the Total Job Seeker Commencements continued to decline. As expected, there was a higher JSA cost of services when the Model was in place in comparison to the post-Model period. It is reasonable to assume that the higher cost associated with the higher revenue is an additional expense to purchase assistance that would be required to address vocational and non-vocational barriers of job seekers with the holistic case management approach of the Model. If the Model’s implementation was a cause of the decline, it could have been assumed that cost of services would have been reduced and revenue and profitability would have improved after the Model was curtailed. However, the program’s revenue and profitability continued to decline even after the Model was curtailed. The rate of decline slowed but the financial situation did not improve. This suggests that the decline may not have been associated solely with the Model. It would also indicate that there is a need to discuss the impact of other variables, which is the operating expenditure.
Further analysis of service fees by stream indicated that service fees declined over time throughout both periods – with the exception of Stream 1 work-ready job seekers during the post-Model period, which increased after the Model was curtailed. In Stream 2 and Stream 3, the decline in service fees was more significant when the Model was in place whilst decline in the service fees for Stream 4 was more significant post-Model. This was to be expected, as the Model’s holistic case management approach would have significantly impacted on job seekers with the highest support needs in Stream 4. As expected, the Model would not be suitable as a business model for Stream 1, 2 and 3 job seekers. Nevertheless, the Model might have more impact as a business model for organisations with specific focus on people with higher and more complex needs – similar to the job seekers in Stream 4.

Across the whole organisation, there were indications of rising operating expenditures in salary, occupancy, and IT costs, compounded by lower marketing expenditure across both periods that may have impacted negatively on revenues and profitability. However, the lack of data at program level for operating expenditures, and the compounding effect of other rising operating expenditures, makes it impossible to explicitly assess the effectiveness of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as a business model.
Chapter 6

Discussion
This last chapter discusses the findings of the preceding chapters in investigating the efficacy of Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model (Model) towards self-sufficiency for the long-term unemployed. Three studies were conducted according to organisational context, service model and business model. This chapter summarises and discusses the findings of each study, the relevance/value of the Model as applied within an employment services context and the associated theoretical and practical implications. The theoretical and practical implications of the Model will be discussed, as well as how key variables influence the Model’s success. Finally, the discussion highlights the limitations of this research and informs the future directions for the Model to be used in more effective ways.

Summary and Discussion of the Findings

Study 1: The host - an organisation in context

Description

The host organisation has grown and evolved since 1992 with core programs in employment and related services funded by the Australian Government. Hence, the journey of the host organisation closely aligned with the evolution of employment services in Australia since the privatisation of Commonwealth Employment Service in the 1990s as described in Chapter 2.

Part 1 of the organisation context study described the host organisation and how government programs have influenced its operational structure and service model throughout the years. Although structurally the government contracts seem to have changed, the fundamental principles of the contracts remained the same. These contracts were characterised by an outcome-based revenue, an intensive compliance regime, performance monitored through a star rating system and a competitive
tendering process with a guiding principle in the selection of tenderers to be value for money to the Australian Government.

In 2009, the introduction of the Job Services Australia (JSA) program offered providers an opportunity to better address the barriers to employment for long-term unemployed job seekers. In line with this new program, the host organisation introduced the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as a competitive strategy in their response to the government purchasing process. In bidding to deliver the program, past performance account for a third of the weighting assigned whilst the rest were based on the Tenderers understanding and general strategies at the organisational level, strategies in local labour market in an ESA and Tenderer’s management and corporate governance arrangements for the program. The tender also informs the Tender to make realistic assumptions about project cash flows and its working capital requirements through the contract period as business levels will be subject to a degree of client choice and dependent on client needs (DEEWR, 2008). This place the onus of financial viability for the proposed service model on the provider. The host organisation exceeded expectations, doubling their contracts to 10 Employment Service Areas and expanding their coverage into another two states. This was remarkable considering that at the time of tender submission, only 44 per cent of the host organisation’s program was above the average 3 Star Rating performance, and the number of providers was reduced by more than 50 per cent in the change to the JSA contract (as illustrated in Chapter 2, Table 6).

Part 2 of the organisation context study described the host’s journey of adapting and introducing the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model. The initial challenges were in adapting the USA based model to the Australian context and the changes needed in the operational structure to support the Model. The initial process was widely
supported by senior managers and operation managers, and it brought about intensive collaboration between different parts of the organisation.

One major change was the introduction of tiered levels of Case Managers, instead of the generic Employment Consultant position that the host organisation had been accustomed to for many years. The more experienced role of Case Manager Level 2 was remunerated with a higher salary, had lower caseloads and worked with job seekers with moderate to severe barriers to employment (Stream 3 and Stream 4 job seekers). In addition, there were new roles of Community Engagement Consultants and an increased number of Post Placement Officers at sites. Interestingly, staff viewed the new structure of diverse roles and tiered levels in case management as an opportunity for career progression.

The initial training package for the Model was comprehensively designed with significant contributions from staff and external expertise. In fact, it was improved from the original USA Model with the integration of case management training developed to the National Standards of Practice for Case Management and the paper-based assessment tools were converted into electronic matrix forms through third-party software providers.

The Model’s electronic matrix form was a practical assessment tool, unlike other models. Although the case managers could apply this electronic assessment tool to individual job seekers, unfortunately the third-party software providers were unable to convert the data into reportable format for analysis and could not build reports to demonstrate how successful the Model had been for clients, over time, in relation to each of the ten life domains. This limited the host organisation’s ability to provide empirical evidence to demonstrate whether the Model progresses the lives of individual job seekers towards true self-sufficiency.
There were suggestions that it would be more cost and operationally effective for the host organisation to develop the assessment tool as a standalone tool through specialists with expertise in developing similar software. It would also mean that the electronic matrix form and database would not be affected if the host organisation decided to change third-party software providers due to contractual changes, as was the situation in this study. The technological complexity was also compounded by the Australian Government software and tools that required providers to document information in delivering the contract. The case managers had to navigate between the Government IT system and the third-party client management software. In developing a standalone assessment tool, it may increase the level of difficulty for the case managers unless there was integration with the existing systems to ensure process efficacy and reduction of duplication.

The integrity of the Model was compromised by the end of 2012, the diverse and tiered operational structure reverted back to a previously applied flat structure of ‘employment consultants’. The comprehensive training modules were significantly reduced and ongoing support for the utilisation of the Model was outsourced to the third-party software provider. The reasons for the structural change were not clear; however, one assumption was that it was done to reduce salary expenses which are often the largest cost in an industry that is delivering social services.

Discussion

Although government programs have positively influenced the organisation’s operational structure and service model throughout the years, the change in 2012 did not seem to have followed the same principles. As the organisation moved away from case management and self-sufficiency for all job seekers, in contrast, the government introduced new measures to emphasise case management for Stream 4 job seekers.
including a change to components of social outcome measures in their star rating measurement, encouraging providers to address barriers to employment of Stream 4 job seekers (as illustrated in Chapter 2, Table 6). The results from the self-sufficiency assessment tool could have been used to improve job seeker barriers. Instead of such a significant structural change in service delivery model, the host organisation could have adjusted the ratio of staff to job seekers, limiting the Model to specific streams or changed the site based staff to regional based staff.

Without the emphasis on case management and the philosophy of the Model to progress job seekers along the continuum to true self-sufficiency, the case managers deemed the assessment tool as an additional administrative task. Even if they were to identify job seeker barriers, they did not have the time or the resource to further assist the job seekers in overcoming their barriers. In addition, their performance measures were linked only to securing employment for the job seekers and hence the other life domains within the Model was not an objective for them. The organisations with objectives to better the lives of their participants holistically (to combat poverty and remain financially viable), often struggles with the government contracts with a narrow focus (i.e. employment services), as is the weakness of most government funded programs (i.e. accommodation, drug and alcohol services). The program objectives of an employment service are heavily weighted towards job outcomes and not their impact on other policy arenas like justice, health, mental health, drug and alcohol services, family services and homelessness. Yet, research has shown that people who are long-term unemployed often experience multiple problems from homelessness, substance abuse, criminal records, mental health and physical health issues, disability issues, social exclusion and had experience of violent, abusive or disrupted family or personal relationships (Dean, 2003; Kieselbach, 2003). A cost-benefit analysis that calculates the impact on government resources (i.e. reduction in government
expenditure and welfare dependency), may substantiate the holistic approach of the Model. Similarly, measuring the impact of a not-for-profit organisation’s accomplishment in their mission is a complex problem (Helmig, Ingerfurth, & Pinz, 2014). This Model has the potential to substantiate an organisation’s fulfillment of their mission by measuring the progress of an individual’s life domain.

Organisational culture can positively influence an organisational performance, long-term financial success, employee productivity and commitment (Cameron & Quinn, 2006). As a business grows, the culture inevitably changes which can strongly influence an organisation’s potential for success or failure. The organisational values, beliefs and assumptions form overtime leading to shared ideologies, understanding and expectations that actuates into day-to-day activities to become routinized (Buick & Carey, 2017). There were indications that the organisation’s efforts and significant investments into human resource and technology in the adaptation and implementation of the Model were comprehensive and commendable. However, closer attention was needed on effective communication, opportunities for dialogues and integration strategies to enhance cultural learnings across the organisation (Buick & Carey, 2017). The organisation had increased staff levels by almost 35 percent from FY 2009 to FY 2012 (as illustrated in Appendix 7). With a large number of new staff, introducing competency training with strong targeted communication campaigns and clear strong senior management commitment is critical in embedding a strong organisational culture. This was not apparent in the expansion strategy of the host organisation’s journey.

Interestingly in an industry that experiences high turnover of staff at an average of 28.3 per cent staff turnover, the host organisation’s staff turnover was 18 per cent from 2009 – 2012 when the holistic case management approach, specifically the self-sufficiency
of job seekers (the Model) was in place. This placed them within the top 41 per cent of organisations with staff turnover of less than 20 per cent (NESA, 2010). There were indications in the first two years that the program revenue and profitability increased and mid-point in the contract at month 36 (June 2012), program revenue and profitability fell to its lowest at almost 40 per cent of the peak level (as discussed in Chapter 5, Study Two). After 2012, when the host organisation reorganised its operational structure, staff turnover increased to above 30%.

One of the keys to successful business growth is the alignment of strategy and organisational capabilities through leadership and people. The organisation had grown rapidly over a relatively short timeframe through strategic acquisition and tendering success. This would have placed significant demands on the management team and operational systems. Any structural changes can have disruptive effects on an organisation, the short- to medium-term effects can include poor staff morale, loss of managerial expertise due to increased turnover, cost overruns, distraction from the core purpose of the service provision, work overload and service user disorientation and disaffection (Andrews & Boyne, 2012). A change as significant as the introduction of the Model involve adopting new mindsets, processes, policies, practices and behaviours. The subsequent abandonment of the Model was also a subtle, unannounced and informal process. The management team and front-line managers have a critical role to play in communicating and upholding any changes within an organisation. The organisation may have been challenged by ‘growing pains’ and the additional complexity that growth brings, thus impeding their ability to focus on the customers (contract changes, staff and client needs).

A stronger change management process documenting the case for the change, setting clear long-term objectives and outcome measurements, with risk analysis in the
implementation and utilisation of the Model might have helped to prepare the organisation. The long-term objectives could have been based on the length of the contract and risk analysis could have helped the host organisation prepare for all reasonable eventualities. Scoping out the likely impact of the change and the strategies could also have helped to align the leadership team and the organisation to reinforce and sustain the change.

A recurring theme in the successful implementation of the Model was the importance of long-term commitment from the leadership team in the organisation and aligning the workforce, performance measures, and the operational framework with the service delivery model. Although remnants of the Model were evident for a time after January 2013, the significant change in operational structure, scaled-down training and the lack of support for the Model, all signal the clear shift back. As described above, this was driven by a loss of faith in the Model and focus on employment outcomes away from a holistic case management model.

Study 2: Effectiveness of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as a service model

Description

The value of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as a service model was examined by comparing the two time periods, when the Model was in place and post-Model using data pertaining to each of the three contract performance criteria: job placements, 13 week employment outcomes, and 26 week employment outcomes of all job seeker service streams (Stream 4 to Stream 1, indicating the highest to lowest job seeker support needs respectively).

From a whole program perspective, we can see that when the Model was in place, according to the three performance criteria, the Model worked better at placing and
keeping job seekers in sustainable employment for Total Job Seekers, then the post-
Model period. Further analysis of the performance by stream indicated that the Model
worked better at placing job seekers into employment across all four service streams
than did the post-Model period. It also indicated that the Model worked better at
keeping job seekers in employment for 13 week and 26 week outcomes, especially for
job seekers with higher support needs in Streams 2, 3 and 4 than those work ready job
seekers in Stream 1.

The Model was more effective for job seekers in Streams 2 through 4 with increasing
degree of success for job seekers with higher support needs in Streams 3 and 4. As
expected, the Model did not benefit Stream 1 job seekers in sustaining employment.
This group of job seekers were work ready and deemed by the assessment that they
did not require the higher level of assistance as the other streams of job seekers. They
would have been assessed as at ‘Safe’ or ‘Stable’ stages of the Model and would not
have needed case management intervention to achieve self-sufficiency (as described
in Chapter 2). The fact that the Model had no discernible effect for Stream 1 supports
the theory that it was designed for individuals with higher support needs where
addressing barriers to employment is a critical pathway towards achieving sustainable
employment.
The integrity of the Model was compromised by operational changes made at the end of 2012. One of the major structural changes was in centralising the function of post placement, which is an essential part of the Model in job seekers achieving sustainable employment. In the new centralised Customer Service Centre, staff were office-bound with the responsibility of verifying the employment status of job seekers with employers. Unlike other streams, Stream 1 job seekers were not obligated to meet with their case managers during the first three months of participation in employment services as they were considered work ready and not to be requiring the same level of assistance as the other streams. Many of them would not have felt the need to inform the provider if they had found employment but would have just carried on with their employment. The centralised Customer Service Centre was more efficient in obtaining verification and, hence, outcome claims from these Stream 1 job seekers – which could also explain the significant increase in the 13 and 26 week outcome claims post-Model.

In contrast, many of the job seekers with higher needs (Streams 2 to 4) had non-vocational barriers and employment issues that would need continual intervention strategies as they coped with the stress of work. The centralised Customer Service Centre function would not have been sufficient to support these job seekers or their employers to overcome these issues. The service performance data shows that as the organisation moved further away from the period when the Model was in place, the lower the performance results. This suggested a residual effect of the Model dissipating over time.

The data on the performance of Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as a service model did not support the decision by the organisation in 2012 to switch back to focusing on employment outcomes for all job seekers. The organisation was not able to recognise the benefits of the Model to job seekers with higher needs from the analysis of the service performance data. This could have been because the Model was
ineffective for Stream 1 work ready job seekers, which at 52.3 per cent represented the largest group of job seekers on the host organisation’s caseload.

**Discussion**

Unquestionably, as a service model, the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model worked effectively for an organisation in the delivery of employment services for job seekers with higher support needs, even if the program objectives were specific with an intensive compliance regime, such as the JSA program. This was to be expected, as the Model’s holistic case management approach was designed to assist individuals in their progress towards self-sufficiency, with specific interventions that would overcome their barriers. It is reasonable to assume that job seekers experiencing more barriers would benefit from this holistic case management approach and additional support if they found employment. Nevertheless, the Model might have more impact on organisations with a specialist focus on people whose needs are higher and more complex – similar to the job seekers in Streams 3 and 4.

The key objectives of the Model are fundamental to individuals progressing along the continuum towards true self-sufficiency. Its application is sufficiently robust and can have broader applications for organisations delivering social services to clients with multiple and complex barriers in the Health and Community Services sector (e.g. Accommodation, and Drug and Alcohol services). Ideally, the program funding model would also provide sufficient incentives in progressing an individual along the self-sufficiency continuum.

The big issue is that for a model on a program to be successful, the integrity must be maintained. There is a lesson here – when key elements of the model were curtailed, the performance declined in its application. Another lesson is the importance for the
model to fit the client group. The Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model designed for high support need clients, worked for those job seekers who had high support needs but not for the work ready job seekers. There was a need for another model for half the job seekers in the program. There was also a need to analyse performance on a deeper level, not just on the whole of program but on the subsets of the client group.

**Study 3: Effectiveness of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as a business model**

**Description**

The value of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as a business model was examined by comparing two time periods using data pertaining to the JSA program. This included program revenue, service fees, cost of services, operating expenditures and profitability as the key indicators of business performance.

In the six-year contract, the host organisation’s JSA program revenue steadily increased to its peak in the first 21 months. However, the level of revenue was not sustained; subsequently it decreased mid-point in the contract at month 36 (June 2012), program revenue fell to its lowest, almost 40 per cent lower than the peak level. The program's revenue continued to decline even after the Model was curtailed. As expected there was a higher cost of services when the Model was in place in comparison to the post-Model period. Similar to revenue, the profitability of the program declined over time throughout both periods, with the exception of financial year 2010-2011 where there was a peak in profit when the Model was in place. The program's profitability continued to decline even after the Model was curtailed. The rate of decline slowed but the financial situation did not improve. The revenue affected the profitability of the program more than the cost of services.
Further analysis of service fees by Stream indicated that as expected the Model would not be suitable as a business model for Stream 1 work ready job seekers, as the service fees increased associated with an increase in Stream 1 job seeker commencements after the Model was curtailed. In contrast, service fees for Stream 4 job seekers significantly declined post-Model. This was to be expected as the Model’s holistic case management approach would have significantly impacted on job seekers with the highest support needs in Stream 4. The Model might have more impact as a business model for organisations with specific focus on people with higher and more complex needs – similar to the job seekers in Stream 4.

Across the whole organisation, there were indications of rising operating expenditures in salary, occupancy, and IT costs, compounded by lower marketing expenditure across both periods. The organisation’s salary expenses, which was the largest cost item of expenditure, indicated that when the Model was in place, the number of employees grew within a year by more than 30 per cent in FY 2011-2012. Subsequent years saw a similar reduction in number of employees through significant changes in operational structure by the end of 2012, (that is, by the beginning of the post-Model period in this thesis). The occupancy cost of the organisation increased significantly after the Model was curtailed, though the cost of occupancy and some resources were shared across several similar programs. The IT expenses as a percentage of total operating expenditure increased significantly in both time periods. The increase in IT expenditure during implementation was to be expected for a new program, however, it should have stabilized or decreased post-Model. In contrast, the organisation kept a relatively low level of marketing and communication expenses throughout both periods, although it was higher when the Model was in place. All other expenditures in the organisation besides the above mentioned, had reduced 6.2 per cent in the six-year from the first financial year of the contract.
Discussion

The analysis of the organisation’s operating expenditures is relevant to the evaluation of the Model as the impact of operating expenses on profitability would have been felt in both the Model and post-Model period. Many of the operating expenditures were shared across the employment services program(s) (i.e. JSA and DES), which accounts for more than 80 per cent of the organisation’s revenue. The curtailment of the Model in scaling down resources should have improved the financial situation if the Model’s implementation was the main cause of the decline in profitability. However as stated earlier, the program’s revenue and profitability continued to decline even after the Model was curtailed.

In a business environment where a job seeker can choose a preferred employment service provider, a good marketing and communication strategy could be critical in attracting clients to the service and, hence, contribute to the bottom line with a continual stream of service fees and potential revenue from outcomes. The question is whether the organisation could have spent more on marketing and communication strategies to increase job seeker awareness for the program and hence increase service fees and potential revenue from outcomes. It was also not evident in the information provided that sufficient consideration was given to strategic planning, cost-benefit analysis, review of key processes for integration and whether the technology introduced was capable of achieving the objectives of the strategic plans that impacted on the implementation of the Model.

What opportunities was the organisation missing by not continuing with their existing business model if the financial situation of the organisation did not improve significantly after the Model was curtailed? Did the organisation consider the other market influences that could have affected the revenue? It would also seem that the
distribution of the organisation’s operating expenditure was also a contributing factor in the profitability of the program, especially when program revenue was better when the Model was in place, with a distinct peak in profit in the financial year 2010-2011. In the decision to curtail the Model, the organisation might not have equipped itself with the necessary information to analyse the Model, or considered what alternative business models might mean.

For a business model to be effective, there needs to be a long-term plan, risk mitigation and a structured approach to help align the business framework of the organisation across the areas of expenditure that impact on the organisation’s business model and business performance. Confounding the effect of rising operating expenditures in salary, occupancy and IT costs, and the lower marketing expenditures across the whole organisation may have impacted negatively on revenues and profitability. However, using the “whole of business” figures for the operating expenditures makes it impossible to explicitly assess the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model’s value as a business model. The lack of data at program level only allows for an estimate, inferring the impact on the business model. Even so, as a business model, there was evidence to suggest that the Model worked financially more effectively for an organisation in the delivery of employment services for job seekers with higher support needs. Nevertheless, the effectiveness and profitability could have been improved through integrating fundamentals of business operations such as managing and developing people, cultivating customer relationships through marketing and communication, and providing adequate facilities and effective equipment for staff.

**Theoretical Implications**

Acceptance of a new Model by an organisation is essential to its successful implementation. The host organisation provided an ideal environment to introduce and
test what is a unique case management model. The journey of the organisation indicated that they have an adaptive ability to grow and diversify in dynamic operating environments. The organisation had operated a service model predominately based on the Work First model that was a popular strategy within welfare-to-work programs in the early 1990s. This provided a contrast to a new progressive-developmental model, such as the Self-Sufficiency Case Management model. The new Model required a significant shift in the mindset and organisational structure of staff and managers within the organisation. The concept of self-sufficiency resonated well with the organisation’s managers, with perceived benefits to job seekers, and an alignment with the organisation’s values. To some extent, this was to be expected as the philosophy of the Model is a “whole of person” over time model. The likelihood of clients finding and keeping a job can be significantly influenced by their barriers to employment. A person with multiple barriers faces significant challenges from the stability of health and medical issues to routine tasks such as personal hygiene and obtaining appropriate work clothes. Addressing barriers to employment is a critical pathway towards achieving sustainable employment and true self-sufficiency. However, there were multiple challenges in implementing and operating within a self-sufficiency framework.

The Model is effective as a service model for clients with high support needs (in this case, job seekers with moderate to severe barriers to employment), measured through the specific outputs of the program. The Model has no discernible effect on job seekers without vocational or non-vocational barriers. This is as designed and intended, as the core philosophy of the Model focuses on the ten life domains deemed to have significant impact on an individual’s self-sufficiency (namely the domains of Housing, Employment, Health and Wellbeing, Transport, Education and Training, Drugs and Alcohol, Ex-Offender History, Mental Health, Disability, and Language, Literacy and
Numeracy). The application of the Model needs to be restricted to clients with moderate to severe barriers to employment.

The self-sufficiency framework is a long-term process that requires sufficient funding, resources and acknowledgement, as well as reinforcement through program and staff performance measures, and the journey along the continuum varies from one individual to another. These findings were also reported by previous case studies on the self-sufficiency methodology by Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development (Massachusetts DHCD, 1999). Most of the current welfare programs do not adequately fund the case management component or adequately recognise addressing client barriers towards progressing along the self-sufficiency continuum as a performance measure. Often the fees and performance measures are weighted heavily towards specific outputs of the programs (i.e. employment outcomes and training). In an environment where the performance measures for staff were based on achieving program outcomes, the self-sufficiency continuum could be viewed as an additional administrative burden. In part, the current welfare programs and organisations may also not have the tools to measure progress or quality of service, rather they focus on specific outputs of the programs. The matrix-based system of the Model provides a measurement tool to report on the progress of individuals towards self-sufficiency and offers welfare programs an opportunity to monitor performance and prioritise funding. Similarly, the organisations can use the Model’s matrix-based system to assess and incentivise a case manager’s performance in progressing individuals in the self-sufficiency continuum. However, the Model’s matrix-based assessment tool generates a significant amount of data over time as it focusses on ten life domains that need updating as an individual’s circumstances are assessed. This presents a significant challenge to collecting and reporting on the data manually and
can only be managed effectively by a data warehouse, which can be resource and cost intensive.

In saying that, ultimately the Model needs to also benefit the organisation financially. Future research on welfare programs should extend beyond measuring the traditional specific output of the programs to include business modelling. As a business model, there were indications that the Model was more effective for clients with high support needs (in this case, job seekers with severe barriers to employment). However, the lack of operating expenditure data at program level, made it impossible to explicitly assess the effectiveness of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model as a business model.

Most of the literature on welfare methodology focuses on the benefits to clients, measuring the specific outputs of the programs, but lacks mentions of business modelling. As an example, the previous case studies on the self-sufficiency methodology in 1999 discussed that one of the most significant barriers was the lack of funding; many of these organisations had funded their work through a patchwork of private, philanthropic and state funds (Massachusetts DHCD, 1999). The research methodology did not include assessing the Model from a business model perspective – in fact, the report lacked any financial impact assessment of the Model. This was similar in the later study in 2012 whereby only the program outputs from client’s perspective were discussed. In fact, the research methodology did not take into consideration any implementation and funding issues from the organisation’s perspective (Endres, J., 2016).

The business model can be defined as a combination of three elements: a value proposal to the customer (i.e. the Self-Sufficiency Case Management model), making this value proposal (i.e. implementation costs and benefits of the Model) and a
corresponding revenue model (Sahut, Hikkerov, & Khalfallah, 2013). The amalgamation of a service model with a business modelling framework can provide valuable feedback towards whether a model is working but it can also test the operational decisions and initiatives to revise the service model when necessary. Operational changes may at times not be perceived as a change to the architecture of the Model. A business modelling framework can develop various business scenarios for consideration by including the Model’s architecture, resources, costs, performance data and assumptions of customer behavioural patterns in the labour market.

The architecture of the Model isn’t just the philosophy of the Model, the resources, the processes, or the technology but a combination of these elements. The Model’s application is resource intensive requiring a case management structure, competency training for staff with strong targeted communication campaigns and commitment from senior management, as discussed in Chapter 3 (Part 2 of the organisation context study). Significant operational changes may impact the service model architecture even if the concept of the Model continues to be valued within an organisation. Innovative new concepts such as the application of the Model are often highly valued for the potential to improve efficiencies, reduce cost and/or improve outcomes. As a new concept, evaluating the delivery of the Model can be a critical step in understanding the issues and adjusting to improve the Model.

When a Model fails to fully achieve its intended outcomes, program logic modelling (i.e. focus/target, input, output, direct outcomes and broad, indirect or cumulative outcomes) may identify where a breakdown may occur (Centre for Community Child Health, 2010). The implementation of any Model should include adequate resourcing and early planning for monitoring, reviewing and evaluation. Many of the organisations in the Health and Community Services sector do not have the time,
resources or expertise to implement such a systematic approach. Often the organisations are also limited by the data collection, what data is available and if it is accessible. One of the key performance measures of the Model will be to track the progression of clients along the self-sufficiency continuum of five stages (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, and Thriving in relation to the life domains. As a new concept, the technology was not readily available for data collection in the application of the Model. The evaluation of the Model was dependent on specific outputs of the programs, limiting the analysis of the Model. Similar to the findings of previous case studies on the self-sufficiency methodology by the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development, the concept of the Model was well-accepted but many of the organisations lacked the capacity to implement and operate within this approach (Massachusetts DHCD, 1999).

Companies with expansion strategies would often replicate a working service model to maximise economies of scale. The challenge would be to determine how much of the service model needs to be adapted and/or standardised for it to work across geographical boundaries and market conditions (Ghemawat, 2003). The initial implementation of the Model with significant changes to staffing arrangements, developing the training packages and integrating the Model with the IT systems, would have a significant financial and resource impact on an organisation. A positive trend in program revenue and profitability would be an indication of a working service model, providing an organisation with the confidence to plan future levels of staffing, invest in the program and plan its future strategies with confidence. However, as pressures of contract and market condition changes, modifications might be required to some aspects of the Model. The largest cost item of the employment placement and recruitment services industry in Australia is salary expenses estimated at 63.8 per cent in 2015/2016 (Allday, 2016). The modifications can be in terms of changing staffing
ratio such as adjusting the ratio of staff to job seekers, reducing the number of staff by site to regional support if geographically suitable, limiting the Model to specific streams or functional changes (e.g. a combination of a centralised Customer Service Centre for some clients and Post Placement Support Officer at sites for clients with multiple and complex barriers). Other strategies could include reducing operational fixed costs or increasing marketing expenses to attract clients. If, with suitable modifications or even curtailment of the Model, the revenue and profitability does not improve this would indicate that there may be other variables impacting on the financial situation apart from the service model itself, such as operating expenditure and other market influences.

The Model attributes long-term unemployment as an individual’s responsibility (as in most case management models), rather than considering the systemic failure with deficient demand in macroeconomic systems that constrains employment opportunity as a contributing factor (Mitchell and Muysken, 2008). There were indications of structural changes in the labour market (i.e. the impact of Global Financial Crisis of 2007–2009), from increasing unemployment rate (about 12 job seekers competing for each vacancy), economy of steadily declining manufacturing and agriculture jobs, and conversely the steadily increasing growth of the service sector, that might have required a different strategy (ABS, 2010 and (DoJSB, 2018))?

**Practical Implications**

The initial adaptation and implementation of a Model requires upfront investment and resources that can be a challenge for community organisations. The development of resources for the Model need to translate sufficiently into a service delivery plan with specific outcomes and program risks. This plan can then be assessed in terms of effectiveness in achieving specific outcomes. For community organisations, the task
to create, deploy and maintain a long-term and comprehensive reporting system can be an expensive and daunting task. Often, they are limited by their financial capacity, technical expertise and the complexity of amalgamating technology with welfare models. This limits the analysis of the service model’s performance at a more in-depth level, without the definitive evidence on the quality of their service model and to holistically measure the impact and outcomes of their services (Infoxchange Australia et al., 2016). From a broader perspective, it further limits the ability for developing a performance measurement system for the staff, or the program, that would improve staff and program performance. Unless funding bodies are willing to invest in the use and implementation of the Model, the impact of the Model may not be fully tested or realised.

Another practical implication is that an organisation using this Model needs to match the Model to the client or consumer groups for which it was designed and intended, that is disadvantaged clients with multiple and complex barriers. The impact of the Model’s holistic case management framework increases in effectiveness for disadvantaged individuals with increasing multiple and complex barriers to employment. In contrast, the work ready clients might be more suited to the Work First model that focuses on job search as a central activity, encouraging the unemployed to enter the labour market as quickly as possible. The ‘one size fits all’ approach would simply not be effective as a service or business model for all client or consumer groups.

Part of the issue is that most funding bodies do not stipulate a particular service delivery model, it is often the organisation’s responsibility to implement a model that would meet the specific output of the contract. It is often easier for organisations to have a common approach to a service delivery model across a contract rather than have different approach to different clients or consumer groups. It is interesting to note that government contracts, specifically the next reiteration of the JSA, outlined that
providers had to demonstrate their commitment to delivering the service delivery model as specified in their proposal (DoE 2014).

The other practical implication is an organisation needs to match the Model with a contract as well that provides sufficient funding, resources and suitable timeframe to apply the holistic case management approach. There needs to be funding to support the case management components, as well as access to assistance for addressing vocational and non-vocational barriers. The case management component and achievement of progress along the self-sufficiency continuum in the life domains needs to be recognised as a performance measure. The funding body’s client management system should enable organisations to have a ‘single view’ of the clients they support and easy access to a data warehouse. As a whole of life model for employment, the contract needs to allow for funding longer support periods for clients as there may be a need to continue interventions for all the life domains that impact on the client’s ability to maintain their employment (e.g. accommodation issues and health and wellbeing issues).

The application of the Model is cost intensive requiring protracted delivery time as it focusses on multiple life domains deemed to have significant impact on an individual’s self-sufficiency. This requires experienced case managers with techniques to assess and provide suitable support services and interventions for sustainable change in an individual’s life domains. In addition, there are other support staff such as activities coordinator, job placement specialist, and post-placement support officers to provide ongoing support that would improve the probabilities of sustainable employment. The complexity and intensity of the individualised case management approach meant that the case managers often had to have lower caseloads whilst ongoing post-placement support required onsite visitations for it to be effective. This contrasts with
contemporary models that focus solely on employment such as in a Work First model, or modified employment arrangements such as Social Enterprises and Customised Employment Model. On the other hand, the cost of the Model would be less than other models such as the Formal Assessment Model or Integration and/or Co-location Model that emphasise assessments of physical, attitudinal and psychological impact to identify employment barriers to develop a return to work plan. The assessments in these models are often more complex and clinical, and have to be administered by accredited personnel such as an occupational therapist or psychologist.

The Model can have broader application in social services for disadvantaged clients with multiple and complex barriers in the Health and Community Services sector (e.g. accommodation, drug and alcohol services). The Model advocates understanding the inter-relationships among these life domains, as interventions for a single life domain is insufficient to move a participant from poverty to self-sufficiency. A combination of the life domains needs to be addressed, prioritising the interventions based on the five stages (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, and Thriving). In fact, the eleven community action agencies in Massachusetts that piloted the Self-Sufficiency Scales and Ladders Assessment Matrix were applying the model in a variety of social services in the Health and Community Services sector including housing, employment, workplace training, financial literacy, childcare services and self-employment (Massachusetts DHCD, 1999). This is because the USA version of the Model measured 25 life domains – as described in Chapter 1 – A Context for the Research and Case Management Models (Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model). The Model in this thesis has a customised self-sufficiency matrix to the ten life domains relevant to the Australian context, in line with government contractual requirements for an employment-focused program – as also described in Chapter 1 (Description of the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model). Fundamentally, the principles of self-
sufficiency and its application are sufficiently robust with the flexibility for broader applications in the Health and Community Services sector.

The Model implemented from a quality management perspective can deliver advantages ranging from delivering a consistent service framework to bottom-line operational savings. For organisations with quality management systems in place, the implementation of the Model could be aligned or integrated with its quality management systems to benefit from the guidance and tools already existing. The principles of a quality management system include a strong customer focus, active involvement of top management, a process approach (i.e. Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle), risk-based thinking, open two-way communication, performance evaluation and continual improvement (Standards Australia Limited and Standards New Zealand, 2016). As the implementation of a Model requires regular communication and information sharing, this may also provide reflection and enable processes to be put in place for issues that may arise. The outcome measures need to be comprehensive, monitoring all aspects of the Model including an individual’s journey on the five-stage continuum, with corresponding financial outcomes specific to the program. The information from the assessments could be used to inform and adjust the service delivery to better achieve the objectives of the Model and the program. Often the issue is that a service delivery model is not valued as the core principle of an organisation. This is understandable as community organisations are often dependent on the direction of government policies and program changes in designing their service models.

Data is an important corporate asset as it can be used to establish business trends, develop strategies for the future and determine the viability of a business decision – in this case, the effectiveness of the Model (Geiger, 2004). Most community
organisations’ technology challenges relate to funding, knowledge and capability (Infoxchange Australia et al., 2016). The training and licences for a client management information system software can also be a costly factor. In addition, the funding bodies (especially government contracts) usually mandate community organisations to access and utilise customised IT systems. Interface for third-party systems data integration with government IT systems are often limited to specific terms and conditions that makes it a challenging task. Often information has to be entered multiple times and most of the organisations do not have a single client (or stakeholder) view, inhibiting these community organisations from reporting and measuring the impact and outcomes of their services (Infoxchange Australia et al., 2016). The other challenges relate to backup and recovery of the data, data archiving and restoration as most government contracts require all personal records of the clients to be retained by the provider for a period of no less than seven years after the creation of the record.

Application of the Model should achieve a good result if the Model is limited to a client group with multiple and complex barriers to employment. The contract’s performance measurements and funding need to take into consideration the cost of a holistic case management approach and the cost of vocational and non-vocational interventions as these clients progress along the continuum in the life domains. As the Model is a ‘whole of life’ approach, there also needs to be flexibility for a longer period of support for the clients. In addition, the training, reference guides and licences for an integrated client management information software for the Model needs to be affordable within the contract funding.

Limitations

There was relatively low participation for staff in this research due to high staff turnover in the organisation. Initially, more than 50 case managers were identified for
participation due to their higher usage of the assessment tool that was part of host organisation’s Model. However, at the time of data collection, many of these case managers had already left the organisation. Hence, only a third of the case managers participated in the study. Many of these case managers were part of the initial group that had the comprehensive practical group-based training. As such, they would have a better understanding in the philosophy and competency in the use of the Model. However, the fact that all the participants recognised the importance of the Model in achieving overall self-sufficiency, indicated that the Model’s philosophy is logical and has a simplicity that was not lost to the participants. As discussed, high turnover rates were typical in this industry, although this may have gradually improved through the years.

Opportunity to conduct specific analysis of job seekers’ progress along the self-sufficiency continuum was limited due to software issues. The initial assessment tool based on the ten life domains (The Self-Sufficiency Matrix) was originally developed as a paper-based format with calculations made using an Excel spreadsheet. However, the format was deemed too manual and lacked efficiency in tracking multiple job seekers for case managers. Subsequently, the assessment tool was integrated into the third-party software client management system for data entry with graphical representation. The electronic assessment tool had ease of data entry and graphical representation of the individual job seeker’s progress were well received by the case managers. However, at the back end, the conversion of data into a reportable format for analysis was incomplete and could not report on how successful the Model has been for clients, over time, in relation to each of the ten life domains. This study has used specific outputs of the program and financial information to substantiate the Model’s efficacy; however, the lack of data relating to the progress of job seekers in the self-sufficiency continuum did not help in providing definitive evidence to support
the Model. The data would have substantiated the effectiveness of the Model in relation to each of the ten life domains, determining if these life domains were applicable to an employment program.

There were limited opportunities to conduct a detailed analysis of program operating expenditure as some costs were shared across the whole organisation. The data provided by the host organisation on operating expenditure were for the whole organisation rather than JSA-specific figures. To some extent it would have been challenging to denote a cost to individual programs as much of the operating expenditures (e.g. occupancy, administration, marketing, centralised customer service centre) and functions were shared across the employment services programs (i.e. JSA and DES), which accounts for more than 80 per cent of the organisation’s revenue. As this still represents a significant percentage of the organisation’s financial environment, the analysis of operating expenditure provided a trend insight and can still infer the impact of the performance of the Model as a business model. A detailed analysis of the program operating expenditure would have better informed future design of the Model.

It was necessary to extrapolate financial information in the post-Model period forward by 12 months for analysis as the Model was operating longer than the post-Model period. The host organisation’s Model was in place for the first 42 months (July 2009 to December 2012) and the 30 months (January 2013 to June 2015) after the use of the Model was curtailed (post-Model) in the six years’ JSA contract. In assessing the Model as a business model, the post-Model period trend line was extrapolated forward by 12 months in line with the 42 months when the Model was in place to standardise the two time periods. This technique is often done in forecasting financial positions of a company so that they can continually budget and plan in advance.
There was a lack of comparative data at the time of writing as the Model’s use in the community sector was limited. Although the philosophy of self-sufficiency was well-accepted, the Model’s application in welfare programs was limited to that in Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development and California Department of Social Services, Office of Child Abuse Prevention (Massachusetts DHCD, 1999; California Department of Social Services, 2012). As these were government funded program, the information provided was limited. This is typical of most government funded programs whereby access to data and information is limited to what is publicly published. If comparative data was available, this would have provided the thesis with an impact analysis of implementing the Model for various organisations with different structure and cultures.

**Future Directions**

The Model can be modified to focus on specific disadvantaged groups with multiple and complex barriers, over a longer time frame and with a standardised research methodology to establish evidence-based research for future welfare programs. The Model has shown that its holistic case management approach would have significant impact as a service and business model for organisations with specific focus on clients with higher and more complex needs. More research should be conducted to demonstrate the long-term reduction in welfare dependency that might justify the higher cost in service delivery. The cost may be higher, but an individual may achieve sustainable progress along the self-sufficiency continuum, breaking the cycle of welfare dependency. In addition, a cost-benefit analysis tailored to social purposes – such as a Social Return on Investment – can be conducted to assess the impact of the Model by placing a monetary value on the social and economic change and comparing it with cost of operating the Model (Social Ventures Australia Consulting, 2012; Fujiwara et al., 2017).
There are signs that government bodies are receptive to a case management approach with tools to assist community organisations. The Department of Employment is currently funding a similar concept in the “ParentsNext” program for a specific group of disadvantaged job seekers at risk of long-term welfare dependency (in this case, parents of children under school-age), in areas with high social and economic disadvantage. The program has a strong focus on preparation for employment, early intervention to identify education and employment-related goals and to connect parents to local services to help address barriers to employment. The funding is a flat fee with a specific number of participants and revenue is not based on specific outputs of the program. The organisations have been given three months to establish the program and two years (2016-2018) to operate it, and funds can also be used to purchase capital items or assets each financial year. More importantly, the Department provides a standardised work readiness assessment tool in Work Star™ (The Outcomes Star for work and learning) that has to be incorporated into the service planning and delivery settings, with pre-requisite introductory training and licences arranged by the Department. The information collected as part of this program will inform case studies and contribute to future program monitoring and evaluation. Unlike other funding, the providers will not be performance managed on the Work Star™ scores for participants (DoE, 2016).

The Model’s philosophy and tools can be used beyond the labour market programs that could help identify factors contributing to joblessness and improving the long-term impact of the labour market programs. The information about the long-term impact of people after they have received labour market program assistance (e.g. government employment and training programs) is limited. Most of the evaluations are limited to the specific outputs of the program and participants exit the program after they have secured employment up to 26 weeks even though barriers to
employment can continue to persist. As discussed by the Social Inclusion Board (2011), some aspects of understanding social inclusion may be the fact that it is difficult to measure, frequently are not measured, and/or are not measurable. Even after receiving labour market assistance, very few long-term unemployed people will be fully employed or be self-sufficient individuals or families (Social Inclusion Board, 2011). The Model’s philosophy and tools can be used to monitor the progress along the self-sufficiency continuum in a longitudinal cohort study. The assessment tool based on the life domains (the Self-Sufficiency Matrix) measures incremental progress, stabilisation or decline of the specific scale of the client, and this would provide data for the client’s over time of the analysis.

From the literatures and preliminary analysis of this research, organisations with the principles of moving clients from poverty to self-sufficiency have yet to fully utilise this Model. Many of the organisations in the literature have attempted to implement the Model and the host organisation in this research curtailed the Model after an initial 42-month period. However, there was evidence that the Model had advantages for clients with multiple and complex barriers despite the multiple challenges in implementing and operating within a self-sufficiency framework.

The findings in this research can be considered by policy-makers and community organisations in developing new programs and funding that is flexible enough to address the underlying problems of the growing proportion of unemployed who are highly disadvantaged with significant barriers to employment.
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Appendices
Appendix 1 – Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model Assessment Tool

The Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model assessment tool described in detail

The following provides a detailed description of the scales and measures that comprise the assessment frameworks of Self-Sufficiency Matrix assessment tool.

The Self-Sufficiency Matrix is an electronic form consisting of thirteen onscreen pages, covering the ten Life Scales as well as three pages for general information (personal referral details, cultural details, and comments). This electronic assessment tool enables Case Managers to assess the job seekers’ baseline barriers to employment, tracks their job seeker’s progress and also presents them with suggestions of appropriate actions and interventions available to assist individual job seekers, and which can inform the negotiation of Employment Pathway Plans.

The Self-Sufficiency Matrix was initially developed as a paper based package, consisting of five one-page forms, landscape oriented, each of which provided an evaluation grid by defining each scale with measures along the five-stage assessment system (in crisis; at risk; safe; stable; thriving). The forms were to be used in face-to-face meetings with participants, using an interview format. That is, case managers would frame questions using the wording on the forms as cues and then determine which box to check based on the participant’s responses. After the interview, case managers needed to manually calculate the numerical self-sufficiency score in each particular scale before plotting it onto the appropriate range on the Self-Sufficiency Assessment Results and Historical Status graph on an excel spreadsheet.

This format of utilising the matrix was discussed with case managers. They indicated that the manual form and interview format was acceptable and could be integrated into their daily operational routine. But questions were raised on the practicality of manual
calculations, plotting the graphs into excel, and as to how results would be stored and updated as the job seeker progressed on their self-sufficiency journey.

It was in these discussions that the idea of an electronic matrix form accessible from their existing client based system was conceptualised. The host organisation utilized a customised client management information system to support their core business functions including job seeker management and support, employer management and time tracking, referral management with funding bodies, assessments, action plan and reporting on management requirements (including support for evaluation and monitoring activities). The system was customisable to create forms, fields and to capture additional information that was specific to their business.

The electronic matrix idea was discussed with the software provider and host organisation. The host organisation was already utilising the customised forms and fields function, converting many of its paper based forms into electronic forms. The conversion of the paper based matrix was similar, but the checked boxes would have additional commands to automatically calculate the numerical scores and generate required graphs. As the host organisation had changed two software providers in the last ten years, there was concern regarding the transferability of the form if they were to switch to another provider in the future. This was openly discussed with the software provider and host organisation and it was agreed that as customisation of electronic forms were common function within most software available on the market, this would not be a major challenge if it were to happen.

With that, the Self-Sufficiency Matrix was converted into an electronic form consisting of thirteen onscreen pages, covering the ten Life Scales as well as three pages for General Information (personal referral details, cultural details, and comments). The Self-Sufficiency Assessment Results and Historical Status graph were generated
automatically upon each update of the form made by the case manager. The ten scales of the Self-Sufficiency Matrix range from: English Language, Literacy and Numeracy; Housing and Living Arrangements; Employment; Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Education and Training; Drug and Alcohol History; Ex-offender History; Mental Health; and Disability Assessment. Within each scale there are three to five measures which are used to determine the job seeker’s circumstances plotted on a five-stage assessment system:

There are statements associated with each of the stage of an individual for the particular scale. Definitions are provided against each of the individual statements. The statements are arranged in the order of In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, and Thriving stages.

The principle underlying the Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model is complemented by an emphasis on establishing the initial relationship with frequent contact between job seeker and case manager. Participants in the In Crisis/At Risk stage will have intensive contact and monitoring up to several times a week and as often as daily, decreasing progressively to fortnightly as the situation settles; whilst job seekers in the Safe/Stable stage will be case managed with a minimum of fortnightly contacts.
Case managers will establish the individual’s baseline situation using the Self-Sufficiency Matrix tool to ascertain the barriers to employment according to the ten scales of Language Literacy and Numeracy, Housing, Employment, Health and Wellbeing, Transport, Education and Training, Drug and Alcohol History, Ex-Offender History, Mental Health, and Disability. In situations where job seekers are assessed as being at an In-Crisis stage in a particular scale, these barriers will be addressed immediately and stabilised. Once immediate crisis barriers are addressed, these job seekers will progress to At-Risk, Safe, Stable, and Thriving.

Scale 1: Language, Literacy and Numeracy assesses the English Literacy, English Language and Numeracy abilities of participants.

Measures (Three): English Literacy, English Language and Numeracy

Since the late 1980s there is increasing recognition that the lack of literacy and numeracy skills may contribute to, and in fact may cause, unemployment (Black, 2004). Similarly, the ABS Adult Literacy and Life Skills Survey indicates that 40 per cent of employed Australians and 60 per cent of unemployed Australians have a level of literacy below the accepted standard needed to work in the emerging knowledge-based economy (ABS, 2008).

Language is defined as the understanding and use of spoken and written English. Literacy is defined as the ability to read and use written information as well as to write appropriately, it involves the integration of listening, speaking, reading, writing and critical thinking. It includes the cultural knowledge that enables a speaker, writer or reader to recognise and use language appropriate to different social situations. Numeracy is defined as the ability to use mathematics effectively to meet the general demands of life at home, in paid work and for participation in community and civic life.
This assessment will determine the participant’s present status in relation to this scale (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, or Thriving stages) and identifies if the participant is able to participate effectively at work or will benefit from training. For example, if a participant is assessed as In Crisis or At Risk in this scale, the case manager will then be able to refer participants to an Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) provider for English Tuition, vocational English language course or community based English conversation groups (for example, at neighbourhood community houses or libraries).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Literacy</td>
<td>Cannot read or write English.</td>
<td>Can read and write a few English words but cannot read a whole basic document or complete a basic written task e.g. fill in a form.</td>
<td>Can read and write English for everyday needs e.g. read service guarantee and fill in a form.</td>
<td>Can read most written documents and complete most written tasks e.g. can competently write a cover letter without assistance.</td>
<td>Can read any written document and complete any written task e.g. write a business document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language</td>
<td>Cannot speak English and does not have family or friends who can interpret for them.</td>
<td>Can speak a few English words and a family member or friend can interpret for them approx. 25 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Can hold a basic conversation, has family or friends who can interpret for them when needed and knows how to access interpreters for Government services.</td>
<td>Can hold a conversation in most situations but may struggle with a few words or to make themselves understood approx. 10 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Can speak English in all situations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>Cannot complete numeracy tasks for everyday life e.g. a simple addition or subtraction, interpreting a bank statement or phone bill.</td>
<td>Can complete some simple numeracy tasks but not all required for everyday needs.</td>
<td>Can complete basic numeracy tasks meeting all everyday needs.</td>
<td>Can complete most numeracy tasks.</td>
<td>Can complete advanced numeracy tasks e.g. complex calculations, using spreadsheets, understanding statistics and graphs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale 2: Housing assesses the ability of the participant to obtain appropriate housing of choice based on their circumstances.

Measures (Four): Security, Affordability, Quality and No. of times moved

Adequate shelter and security is a basic human need and decent housing is a universal goal which has a favourable influence on labour productivity, health, and social and economic aspirations associated with improved housing (Richards, 1979).

Homelessness can be defined as: Primary homelessness – people without conventional accommodation, such as rough sleepers, squatters; Secondary homelessness – people who frequently move between temporary accommodations, emergency shelters, or sleeping on couches; and Tertiary homelessness – people who have insecure tenure and may be staying long term in boarding houses where they do not have private bathroom or kitchen facilities.

In 2010, adults who had been homeless in the last 10 years were more likely to report being unemployed (9 per cent) than those who had never been homeless (3 per cent). They were also more likely to not be in the labour force (41 per cent compared with 31 per cent) (ABS, 2012).

A lack of suitable housing impacts on the capacity of a person to participate in the labour market as routine tasks such as personal hygiene and cleaning clothes on a regular basis makes it difficult for the person to meet work requirements. In addition, the lack of a fixed address, computer access or accessible phone number can make it difficult for a job seeker to communicate with potential employers on interviews, shifts or other workplace information. (Mavromaras et al., 2011)

This assessment will determine the participant’s present situation in relation to this
scale (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, or Thriving) and identifies if the participant is at risk of homelessness or currently experiencing homelessness by providing an overview of the different types of housing available; this will provide informed decision about the type of support service that will best suit their situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>Living in temporary accommodation e.g. crisis accommodation, friends or family's couch or floor, temporary hostel accommodation, motel/hotel/inn, sleeping rough.</td>
<td>Living in short-term accommodation e.g. transitional community housing, rooming house, shared housing, rented caravan, and are at risk of needing to move.</td>
<td>Living in public or community housing without risk of having to move OR living in private rental housing with a 3-6 months lease or other medium-term accommodation.</td>
<td>Living in own home with mortgage or living in private rental housing with &gt;12 months lease or other long-term accommodation without risk of needing to move.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
<td>They cannot afford to pay for any housing.</td>
<td>Rent payments are more than 30 per cent of income and they have difficulties paying this 50-75 per cent of the time. They are receiving Government assistance e.g. rent assistance.</td>
<td>Mortgage or rent payments are more than 30 per cent of income and they have difficulties paying this approx.10 per cent of the time. They are receiving Government assistance e.g. rent assistance.</td>
<td>Mortgage or rent payments are affordable at 20-30 per cent of income.</td>
<td>Full home ownership (without mortgage) or rent payments are less than 20 per cent of total income.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td>Temporary accommodation is risk to health and safety e.g. exposed to cold, in disrepair, no cooking facilities, dirty, infested with vermin.</td>
<td>Housing does not have enough bedrooms for all family members e.g. 2 parents and 3 children 5-18 years, 2 bedrooms (parents share, 2 children share, 1 child sleeping in lounge room), 20+ mins walk to shops, transport, schools etc with 3-4 safety or security risks.</td>
<td>Housing may not have enough bedrooms for occupants e.g. 2 parents and 3 children &lt;18 years, 2 bedrooms (parents share, 2 children share, infant sleeping in parent's room), 15-20 mins walk to shops, transport, schools etc with 1-2 safety or security risks.</td>
<td>Housing has enough bedrooms for all occupants e.g. 2 parents and 3 children &lt;18 years, 3 bedrooms (parents share, 2 children share, 1 child own bedroom), 10-15 mins walk to shops, transport, schools etc without safety hazards and adequate security.</td>
<td>Housing in area of choice with ample bedrooms for all occupants and &lt;10 mins walk to shops, transport, schools etc, without safety hazards and adequate security.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of times moved</strong></td>
<td>Has moved 4 or more times in the last 12 months.</td>
<td>Has moved 3 times in the last 12 months.</td>
<td>Has moved twice in the last 12 months.</td>
<td>Has moved once in the last 12 months.</td>
<td>Has not moved in last 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale 3: Employment assesses the nature of the job or career in which the participant is employed and considers the permanency and stability of the employment, as well as the benefits that accompany the employment.

Measures (Four): Employment Status, Work History, Work-related Skills and Career Management Skills

Employment is defined as the status of a person who is in paid work and is engaged in the mainstream workforce, in a commercial setting. Different types of employment such as full-time, part-time and casual will be suitable for different job seekers (taking into account their participation requirements and capacity). Part-time or casual work can provide a stepping stone towards full-time work and may be combined with part-time education or training or other approved activities.

This assessment will determine the participant’s present situation in relation to this scale (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, or Thriving) and identifies if the participant’s unemployment and severity of non-vocational barriers are resulting in low employability for the person; as well as identify if they have work-related skills, an up-to-date resumé, or good job search and interview skills. Case managers are then able to provide employment assistance to improve their employability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>Unemployed and severity of non-vocational barriers is resulting in low employability for the person e.g. health problems/disability including mental health, drug and alcohol dependence, homelessness, no/unreliable transport, no/unreliable childcare.</td>
<td>Unemployed and looking for employment or a work experience placement.</td>
<td>In casual or temporary employment, seeking longer-term contract or permanent employment.</td>
<td>Employed in a 12+ months contract role with at least a 75 per cent chance of the contract being renewed.</td>
<td>Employed in a permanent role in their chosen career. The role is not at risk of redundancy or retrenchment and the employer is stable i.e. not at risk of bankruptcy or closure in the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>In Crisis</td>
<td>At Risk</td>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Thriving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work History</td>
<td>Has not been employed before.</td>
<td>Previous employment has been casual or temporary lasting 3 months or less OR they have not worked in the last 2 years.</td>
<td>Previous employment in the last 2 years has been part-time or casual lasting &gt;3 months.</td>
<td>Previous employment has included at least 1 full-time permanent or contract role lasting &gt;12 months which finished within the last year.</td>
<td>Previous employment has included 2 or more full-time permanent or contract roles lasting &gt;12 months and most recent finished within last 6 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-related Skills</td>
<td>Does not have any work-related skills.</td>
<td>Has 1-2 skills transferable to work developed in non-work activities e.g. time management.</td>
<td>Some work-related skills are outdated or underdeveloped e.g. technical knowledge.</td>
<td>Has strong work-related skills in 1-2 areas relevant in current job market and to their career goals and others which can be developed further.</td>
<td>Has advanced work-related skills e.g. technical knowledge, written/verbal communication, leadership relevant in current job market and to their career goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Management Skills</td>
<td>No resume, does not know how to look for jobs and does not have any interview skills.</td>
<td>No resume or out-of-date resume, only knows or uses 1 method to look for jobs and has poor interview techniques.</td>
<td>Resume needs to be updated, and the person’s knowledge and skills in looking for employment and performing in interviews can be improved.</td>
<td>Has career and education goals, an up-to-date resume, knows how to look for employment and is confident and skilled at interviews.</td>
<td>Is currently implementing their career and education goals and reviews their goals at least every 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale 4: Health and Wellbeing assesses the general physical well-being of the participant.

Measures (Three): General Health Status, General Health Treatment / Support services, and Impact.

The health and wellbeing of a person can negatively affect all areas of their life e.g. employment, family, social interaction, and finances.

This assessment will determine the participant’s present situation in relation to this scale (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, or Thriving) and identifies whether the participant’s general health and wellbeing affects their ability to job search, attend interviews and gain employment. Some common aspects of health and wellbeing may...
be lifestyle factors that present potential health risks (obesity, diabetes, fatigue, stress) or the need for life skills such as time and stress management, financial management, or level of social participation. Case managers are then able to identify, address and stabilise the health and wellbeing barriers through referral to medical services whilst working with the participant to improve their employability skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Health Status</td>
<td>Health issues are putting the person at risk of hospitalisation or confining the person to their home approx. 75 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Health issues are confining the person to their home 30-50 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Health issues are in control and affecting the person approx. 10 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Health issues are in control and affecting the person approx. 1 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>No health issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Health Treatment/Support Services</td>
<td>Not receiving treatment or attending any support groups or services for their health issues.</td>
<td>Treatment is ineffective, the person is not consistently attending support groups or services and they could benefit from different or additional services.</td>
<td>Treatment is partly effective and the person could benefit from receiving different or additional services.</td>
<td>Treatment is effective, they follow treatment recommendations and attend relevant support groups or services.</td>
<td>They do not need ongoing medical treatment or support services and have their own GP for minor health issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Health issue is negatively affecting all areas of their life e.g. employment, family, social interaction, finances.</td>
<td>Health issue has a negative effect on approx. 75 per cent areas of their life e.g. employment, family, social interaction or finances.</td>
<td>Health issue has a minor impact on 2-3 areas of their life e.g. employment, family, social interaction.</td>
<td>Health issue has a minor impact on 1 area of their life e.g. finances.</td>
<td>Health is not negatively affecting any areas of their life e.g. employment, family, social interaction, finances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale 5: Transport assesses whether or not the individual has appropriate, safe, and reliable access to transportation (whether by car, bus or reliance on friends and family).

**Measures (Two): Access and Affordability**

Having access to transport is an important aspect of getting and keeping a job, undertaking daily activities and maintaining social and community connections. Therefore, assisting those who find it difficult to access transport will help overcome key barriers to employment and social inclusion.

This assessment will determine the participant’s present situation in relation to this scale (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, or Thriving) and identifies whether or not the participant has appropriate, safe, and reliable access to transportation (whether by car, bus or reliance on friends and family) or if this is a factor in their employability.

Case managers are able to assist with transport-related costs (e.g. fares, petrol, driving lessons, work-related licensing, car repairs, insurance or registration), advise on public transport routes, or support them in obtaining their driver’s licence. For people with disability, case managers can negotiate for workplace modifications and reasonable adjustment by discussion with employers and/or access to Employment Assistance Fund e.g. vehicle modifications; permission to work from home or at an alternative work site; adjustment to start and finish times avoid peak hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 5</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Public transport is more than 20 minutes walk from home and they do not have access to a vehicle or other people who can transport them.</td>
<td>Public transport within 15 minutes walk of home only runs every 30 minutes or more and/or other means of transport are unreliable e.g. family members with vehicle.</td>
<td>Public transport is within 15 minutes walk from home and runs regularly and/or has access to a vehicle approx. 50 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Public transport is within 10 minutes walk of home and runs regularly and/or has access to a reliable vehicle approx. 80 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Public transport is within 5 minutes walk of home and runs regularly and/or has own reliable vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Can afford public transport tickets and/or vehicle costs</td>
<td>Can afford public transport tickets and/or vehicle costs approx. 50</td>
<td>Can afford public transport tickets and/or vehicle costs approx. 70</td>
<td>Can afford public transport tickets 90 per cent of the time and/or shares</td>
<td>Can afford public transport tickets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scale 5: Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 5</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approx. 30 per cent of the time or less.</td>
<td>per cent of the time.</td>
<td>per cent of the time.</td>
<td>vehicle costs with family members or other people.</td>
<td>and/or all vehicle costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale 6: Education and Training primarily assesses academic, institution-based achievements. This scale reflects some of the less structured skills that are important to career development.

Measures (Four): School Education, Post-Secondary Qualifications, Education and Training Goals, and Attitude to Learning

On average, the possession of at least Year 12 qualifications or their equivalent increases the probability of employment by around 30 per cent and reduces the risk of unemployment by about 60 per cent. In addition, the Australian Industry Group estimates that 86 per cent of occupations require a post-secondary qualification. Higher levels of educational attainment are associated with increased employment opportunities and higher wages. For these reasons, education and training is an important aspect in order to skill and prepare job seekers to be more competitive in their local labour markets (Marks & Ainley, 1999).

This assessment will determine the participant’s present situation in relation to this scale (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, or Thriving) and identifies if the participant has suitable qualifications with education or training goals. Case managers can work with participants to identify suitable training and employment strategies through a Skills Assessment and refer participants to formal education or training programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 6</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Education</td>
<td>Completed Primary School or below.</td>
<td>Left high school early before Year 10 or equivalent in Australia or overseas.</td>
<td>Has completed Year 10 high school or equivalent in Australia or overseas.</td>
<td>Has completed Year 11 high school or equivalent in Australia or overseas.</td>
<td>Has completed Year 12/13 high school or equivalent in Australia or overseas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary qualifications</td>
<td>No qualifications completed since leaving school.</td>
<td>Post-secondary qualifications completed are not relevant to roles in local labour market or the person needs to complete further training to use them for employment.</td>
<td>Post-secondary qualifications completed are current for roles available in local labour market.</td>
<td>Post-secondary qualifications completed are current for roles which are in demand in the local labour market.</td>
<td>Post-secondary qualifications completed are current for roles on the National Skills Needs List or for local labour market skills shortages or skills in demand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training Goals</td>
<td>Cannot name any education or training goals and the person does not know how to achieve education or training goals.</td>
<td>Education or training goals named are not realistic and the person does not know how to achieve education or training goals.</td>
<td>Can name some education or training goals when asked but is unsure how to achieve these e.g. how to research relevant courses, how to enrol.</td>
<td>Has education and/or training goals and knows how to achieve these e.g. research relevant courses, get assistance with enrolment etc.</td>
<td>Has education and/or training goals and has taken steps towards achieving these e.g. researched learning opportunities, scheduled a course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude to learning</td>
<td>Finds learning difficult and therefore does not enjoy or cannot successfully participate in formal education or training.</td>
<td>Does not see the value in learning and dislikes participating in formal education or training.</td>
<td>Not motivated to participate in formal education or training.</td>
<td>Enjoys learning and is motivated to participate in learning opportunities.</td>
<td>Enjoys learning and takes steps to participate in learning opportunities ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale 7: Drug and Alcohol History assesses whether or not the individual is using alcohol and/or prescription drugs in an appropriate manner. Persistent use of illicit drugs is considered In Crisis or At Risk.

Measures (Three): Current Status, Treatment and Support Services, and Impact

Drug and Alcohol dependency is characterized by the person needing more of the alcohol/drug over time and getting less effect with repeated use, the person experiencing withdrawal symptoms such as sweating, shaking and cravings when they don’t use drugs or alcohol, and the continued drug use or alcohol consumption despite
experiencing its ill effects.

This assessment will determine the participant’s present situation in relation to this scale (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, or Thriving) and identifies the regularity of the participant’s addiction (drugs or alcohol abuse once a week or more), if they are receiving treatment or attending any support groups or services, and if it negatively affects the person's life such as health, family, employment, housing, transport. Case managers are able to assist with referrals to counselling, rehabilitation programs, complementary therapies and/or peer support groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 7</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol History</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Abuses drugs or alcohol once a week or more.</td>
<td>Abuses drugs or alcohol approx. once a fortnight.</td>
<td>Follows rehabilitation plan most of the time but fails to comply approx. once every 3 months.</td>
<td>Has followed rehabilitation plan for 3-12 months.</td>
<td>Has followed rehabilitation plan for &gt;12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment/Support Services</td>
<td>Not receiving treatment or attending any support groups or services.</td>
<td>Fails to follow treatment or attend support group or service approx. once every month.</td>
<td>Fails to follow treatment or attend support group or service approx. once every 3 months.</td>
<td>Is receiving appropriate treatment and attending a support group or service and is committed to remain free of addiction.</td>
<td>Is not at risk of relapse, attends a support group or service as required and is firmly committed to remain free of addiction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Use of drugs and/or alcohol is negatively affecting all areas of the person's life such as health, family, employment, housing, transport.</td>
<td>Use of drugs and/or alcohol is negatively affecting approx. 75 per cent areas of the person's life such as health, family, employment, housing, transport.</td>
<td>Use of drugs and/or alcohol is having a minor impact on 2-3 areas of the person's life such as health, family, employment, housing, transport.</td>
<td>Previous use of drugs and/or alcohol is having a minor impact on 1 area of the person's life e.g. health.</td>
<td>Previous use of drugs and/or alcohol is not affecting any areas of the person's life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale 8: Ex-Offender History

Measures (Three): Status, Community Reintegration, and Support Networks

The term “ex-offender” generally refers to those job seekers who have been released from prison, served a non-custodial sentence (for example, home detention) or have been released from custody on parole which can present a significant barrier to employment. Ex-offenders are likely to face multiple issues, including risks related to re-offending and difficulties in being able to re-establish themselves into society.

The 2003 Department of Justice Victorian Prisoner Health Study reported on the poor health of prisoners with complex of social and psychological factors: 79 per cent have a medical condition, high levels of addiction (smoking, gambling, drugs and alcohol); 13 per cent with a mental illness (30 per cent with schizophrenia); and 25 per cent of prisoners taking psychiatric medication (Deloitte Consulting, 2003).

This assessment will determine the participant’s present situation in relation to this scale (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, or Thriving) and identifies if the participant has non-vocational barriers associated with incarceration, including addiction habits with drugs and/or alcohol that can negatively affect all areas of the person's life and likelihood of the person re-offending (e.g. habits, friendships, untreated mental health conditions, attitudes and if they have support from family members and friends).

Given that ex-offenders may have a range of complex issues, some case managers may have to prioritise non-vocational interventions (e.g., referral to drug and alcohol counselling, independent living skills, literacy and numeracy, anger management, presentation skills, communication skills, motivation and self-esteem, and money management.)
### Scale 8: Ex-offender History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>Several factors are indicating a high likelihood of the person re-offending e.g. habits, friendships, untreated health conditions such as mental health, attitude.</td>
<td>1-2 factors indicate that the person is at risk of re-offending e.g. habits, friendships, untreated health conditions such as mental health, attitude.</td>
<td>No factors indicate the person is at risk of re-offending.</td>
<td>No factors indicate the person is at risk of re-offending and their actions show that they are unlikely to revert to unlawful activities.</td>
<td>Has not been at risk of re-offending for &gt;12 months and their actions clearly show that they would not revert to unlawful activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Reintegration</strong></td>
<td>Facing difficulties in all relevant areas of community life or is still incarcerated pending release.</td>
<td>Facing difficulties in most relevant areas of community life such as maintaining social networks, suitable housing, employment or volunteer activities, abiding by the law, paying bills etc.</td>
<td>Participating in some relevant areas of community life but facing difficulties in 1-2 areas e.g. social isolation, stable employment.</td>
<td>Participating in all relevant areas of community life such as maintaining social networks, suitable housing, employment or volunteer activities, abiding by the law, paying bills etc. but there is scope to increase this in some areas.</td>
<td>Functioning very well in all relevant areas of community life such as maintaining social networks, suitable housing, employment or volunteer activities, abiding by the law, paying bills etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Networks</strong></td>
<td>Family members and friends do not support them or are not living nearby and they are not receiving support from other services.</td>
<td>Family members and friends are usually not supportive or are not living nearby and the person is not engaging well with support from other services e.g. welfare groups.</td>
<td>They have 1-2 main sources of consistent support which may be family, friends or other services e.g. welfare groups.</td>
<td>Family members, friends and other services e.g. welfare groups provide consistent support.</td>
<td>All family members and friends strongly support them and they are well-supported by other services e.g. welfare groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scale 9: Mental Health History assesses the emotional wellbeing of the client.

**Measures (Three): Mental Health Status, Treatment / Support Services, and Impact**

Unemployment and poor mental health are related, and it has been found that poorer mental health is associated with longer durations of unemployment for both men and women (Butterworth et al., 2012). On the other hand, it has been reported that there is a significant improvement in mental health when an individual gains employment; this supports a focus on addressing mental health problems in mainstream employment programs.
There is strong evidence that long-term unemployment or inactivity is bad for one’s health, in particular mental health, and that returning to work is generally associated with an improvement in one’s health (OECD, 2010).

This assessment will determine the participant’s present situation in relation to this scale (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, and Thriving stages) and identifies if the frequency at which the participant experiences symptoms of mental illness negatively affects other areas of the person's life, and if they are receiving treatment or attending any support groups or services. Case managers are able to assist with referrals to counselling programs and advise on appropriate steps to eliminate and minimise health and safety risks in the workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 9</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Status</td>
<td>Experiences symptoms of mental illness most of the time (very high level of psychological distress or &gt;2 episodes over the last month).</td>
<td>Experiences symptoms of mental illness frequently (high level of psychological distress or 1-2 episodes over the last month).</td>
<td>Experiences symptoms of mental illness occasionally (moderate level of psychological distress over the last month).</td>
<td>Experiences symptoms of mental illness rarely (low psychological distress over the last month).</td>
<td>Not experiencing any symptoms of mental illness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment/Support Services</td>
<td>Not receiving treatment or attending any support groups or services.</td>
<td>Treatment is ineffective, the person is not consistently attending support groups or services and they could benefit from different or additional services.</td>
<td>Treatment is only partly effective and the person could benefit from receiving different or additional services.</td>
<td>Treatment is effective and the person follows treatment recommendations and attends relevant support groups or services 90 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Treatment is effective; the person is following all treatment recommendations and attending relevant support groups or services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mental health condition is negatively affecting all areas of the person’s life.</td>
<td>Mental health condition is negatively affecting approx. 75 per cent of areas of the person's life e.g. health, family, employment, interpersonal relationships.</td>
<td>Mental health condition is having a minor impact on 2-3 areas of the person's life e.g. health, family, employment.</td>
<td>Mental health condition is having an impact on 1 area of the person's life e.g. interpersonal relationships.</td>
<td>Mental health condition is not affecting any areas of the person's life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale 10: Disability
Measures (Three): Treatment/ Support Services, Overall Impact, and Effect on Employment/Training

The OECD reports that employment rates of people with disability are 40 per cent below the overall level on average and unemployment rates are typically twice the overall level. People on disability benefits have a much lower income and are twice as likely to face risks of poverty as the general population in some countries.

More people with disability would be able to work if they were assessed on their work capacity rather than their disability and could be provided with adequate employment supports and improved employability skills including necessary labour market qualifications and recent work experience (OECD, 2010).

This assessment will determine the participant’s present situation in relation to this scale (In Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable, or Thriving) and it identifies if the participant’s disability is negatively affecting other areas of the person's life (e.g. employment, family, social interaction, housing, transport). It also assesses whether their disability prevents the person from working or participating in training and if they are following their medical practitioner's treatment or advice or attending other recommended support services. Case managers are able to work with medical practitioners to motivate and refer suitable employment and training programs with reasonable adjustments to enable a person with disability to increase their participation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 10</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>In Crisis</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment/Support</td>
<td>Not following medical practitioner's treatment advice or attending</td>
<td>Following medical practitioner's treatment advice and attending support services approx. 25 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Following medical practitioner's treatment advice and attending support services approx. 75 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Following medical practitioner's treatment advice and attending support services approx. 90 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Following all medical practitioners’ treatment advice and attending all recommended support services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>recommended support services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall impact</td>
<td>Disability is negatively affecting all areas of the person's life e.g. employment, family, social interaction, housing, transport.</td>
<td>Disability is negatively affecting approx. 75 per cent areas of the person's life e.g. employment, family, social interaction, housing, transport.</td>
<td>Disability is negatively affecting 2-3 areas of the person's life e.g. employment, family, social interaction, housing, transport.</td>
<td>Disability is negatively affecting 1 area of the person's life e.g. employment, family, social interaction, housing, transport.</td>
<td>Disability is not affecting any areas of the person's life e.g. employment, family, social interaction, housing, transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect on Employment/</td>
<td>Disability is currently preventing the person from working or participating in training.</td>
<td>Disability is affecting most aspects of the person's participation in employment/training e.g. attendance, performance of tasks, concentration, motivation approx 80-90 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Disability is affecting 1-2 aspects of the person's participation in employment/training e.g. attendance, performance of tasks, concentration, motivation approx 30 per cent of the time.</td>
<td>Disability is affecting one aspect of the person's participation in employment/training e.g. attendance, performance of tasks, concentration, motivation approx 10 of the time.</td>
<td>Disability is not affecting the person's participation in employment/training e.g. attendance, performance of tasks, concentration, motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Study One [Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model Evaluation Questionnaire: Case Manager]

Contact Registration #………………… Interview Date …………..

Interviewer …………………………………………………………………………

Section A: BACKGROUND

Q1. Gender: Male/Female

Q2. Age in Years:

Q3. Length of time with host organisation:

Q4. What is your role in the organisation?

Q5. How long have you been in that position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section B: host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix PROGRAM - Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6. From your perspective, what are the key elements of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix case management model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. How does the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix case management model differ from other case management models you are familiar with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. From your perspective, what advantages or benefits does the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model of case management offer to clients?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. From your perspective, are there any disadvantages or weaknesses in the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model of case management? Please elaborate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. In your opinion, are the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix client outcome objectives realistic? Please elaborate.

| Q11. What does this model offer in terms of ‘best practice’ in case management? |
| Q12. Can you describe the host organisation Self-sufficiency scale and how it is applied? What advantages or disadvantages do you think apply to this measure? |

### Section C: host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix PROGRAM – Record Keeping

| Q13. From your point of view, how easy or difficult is it to track client progress toward self-sufficiency using this scale? |
| Q14. From your perspective, how easy or difficult is it to record and track client progress on this measure using the host organisation data base? What improvements, if any, could be made to record keeping using the host organisation data base? |

### Section D: host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix PROGRAM - Training

<p>| Q15. Can you give a brief description of the preparation and training you received in relation to the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix case management model? |
| Q16. Was the training sufficient in terms of the length of time of delivery and the program materials? If not, how could these aspects of training be improved? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17. From your point of view, did the training adequately address the philosophical and practical aspects of program delivery? What, if any, improvements to program material would you recommend?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18. From your point of view, did the training adequately prepare you for implementing the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix approach to case management? Please elaborate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section E: host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix PROGRAM – Delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19. What, if any, on-going support have you received in the delivery of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix case management model? Has this support been adequate? Please elaborate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q20. From your point of view, what improvements could be made to the content or training in order to improve delivery of this case management approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. Case management requires on-going relationships and support with other service providers and agencies. Have these relationships been impacted in any way by the implementation of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model? If so, in what way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22. What might be done to improve those relationships and enhance client outcomes as they relate to the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model of case management?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section F: host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix PROGRAM - Outcomes**

| Q23. How do you think the key elements of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix case management model will assist clients to achieve self- |
sufficiency and influence life circumstances (e.g., employment, education, financial conditions, health outcomes)?

Q24. From your point of view, how important is each of these factors to achieving overall self-sufficiency?

Q25. Can you provide any examples of how clients have been impacted positively by the implementation of this model compared with the former model used by host organisation?

Section G: host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix PROGRAM - Effectiveness

Q26. Can you comment on the effectiveness of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix case management model to date?

Q27. Based on your experience to date, would you recommend the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix case management model to other community service organisations? Please elaborate.

Q28. Are you aware of any difficulties with the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix case management model?

Q29. In your opinion, what could be done to enhance or improve the host organisation Self-Sufficiency Matrix case management model?

Q30. Is there anything else that you would like to say?
Q31. How long have you been using the host organisation Self Sufficiency matrix?

Thanks for your time.

Would you like a copy of this interview transcript?
Appendix 3 - Study One [Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model Evaluation Questionnaire: Implementation Team]

Contact Registration #………………… Interview Date …………

Interviewer ………………………………………………………………………

Section A: BACKGROUND

Q1. Gender: Male Female
Q2. Age in Years:
Q3. Length of time with host organisation:
Q4. What is your role in the organisation?
Q5. How long have you been in that position?

Section B: Initial Concepts and Considerations

From your perspective:

Q6. What are the key elements of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model?

Q7. Why was this framework implemented in host organisation?

Q8. What were the barriers to using the framework?

Q9. What were the benefits to using the framework?

The self-sufficiency continuum framework assumes a broad view of workforce development. The thinking is that even support services provided at the point when
an individual is “In-Crisis” or “At-Risk” can be viewed (and counted) as promoting that person’s initial progress toward self-sufficiency.

Q10. Based on your experience, is it logical to be thinking about workforce development when providing support services to an individual “In-Crisis”?

Further, the framework assumes that it can be equally important to provide support services after an individual’s situation has improved, for example he/she is now holding a job. The thinking here is that securing a job is not necessarily the end of the journey and a need for support services continues.

Q11. Does your experience indicate that there is a need to continue providing support services after a client has found work that puts that client and their family in a “Safe” or “Stable” situation?

Q12. Is it feasible to provide support services after the client has found work, given the way host organisation programs/contracts are organized and the demands on available resources?

Initial research has identified community-based organizations that are achieving success with approaches similar to the framework for implementing workforce development programs. But the research also indicates that using this framework demands a strong commitment to this broader view of workforce development.

Q13. If you agree that this framework might help improve current approaches, what were the principal challenges to implementing the framework?

Section C: host organisation SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM - Content

Q14. Are you familiar with other case management models? If so, how does the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model differ from other case management models you are familiar with?
| Q15. From your perspective, what advantages or benefits does the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model offer to clients? |
| Q16. From your perspective, are there any disadvantages or weaknesses in the host organisation Self-Sufficiency model of case management? Please elaborate. |
| Q17. In your opinion, are the host organisation Self-Sufficiency client outcome objectives (defining true self-sufficiency - progressing in the ten life domains from In-Crisis, At Risk, Safe, Stable and Thriving) realistic? Please elaborate. |

**Section D: host organisation SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM – Record Keeping**

| Q18. From your point of view, how easy or difficult is it to track client progress toward self-sufficiency using this scale? |
| Q19. From your perspective, how easy or difficult is it to record and track client progress on this measure using the host organisation data base (third party software)? What improvements, if any, could be made to record keeping using the host organisation data base? |

**Section E: host organisation SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM - Training**

| Q20. Can you provide information on the preparation and training that was provided to staff in relation to the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model? |
| Q21. Was the training sufficient in terms of the length of time of delivery and the program materials? If not, how could these aspects of training be improved? |
From your point of view, did the training adequately address the philosophical and practical aspects of program delivery? What, if any, improvements to program material would you recommend?

From your point of view, did the training adequately prepare the staff for implementing the host organisation Self-Sufficiency approach to case management? Please elaborate.

Section F: host organisation SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM – Delivery

What, if any, on-going support was provided to staff in the delivery of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model? Has this support been adequate? Please elaborate.

Case management requires on-going relationships and support with other service providers and agencies. Have these relationships been impacted in any way by the implementation of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency model? If so, in what way?

What might be done to improve those relationships and enhance client outcomes as they relate to the host organisation Self-Sufficiency model of case management?

Section G: host organisation SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM - Outcomes

How do you think the key elements of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model will assist clients to achieve self-sufficiency and influence life circumstances (e.g., employment, education, financial conditions, health outcomes)?
Q28. From your point of view, how important is each of these factors to achieving overall self-sufficiency?

---

**Section H: host organisation SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM - Effectiveness**

Q29. Can you comment on the effectiveness of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model to date?

---

Q30. Based on your experience to date, would you recommend the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model to other community service organisations? Please elaborate.

---

Q31. In your opinion, what could be done to enhance or improve the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model?

---

Q32. Is there anything else that you would like to say?

---

*Thanks for your time.*

*Would you like a copy of this interview transcript?*
Appendix 4 - Study One [Self-Sufficiency Case Management Model Evaluation Questionnaire: Management Team]

Contact Registration #.................. Interview Date ..............

Interviewer .................................................................

Section A: BACKGROUND

Q1. Gender: Male  Female

Q2. Age in Years:

Q3. Length of time with host organisation:

Q4. What is your role in the organisation?

Q5. How long have you been in that position?

Section B: Initial Concepts and Considerations

From your perspective:

Q6. What are the key elements of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model?

Q7. Why was this framework implemented in host organisation?

Q8. What were the barriers to using the framework?

Q9. What were the benefits to using the framework?

The self-sufficiency continuum framework assumes a broad view of workforce development. The thinking is that even support services provided at the point when an individual is “In-Crisis” or “At-Risk” can be viewed (and counted) as promoting that person’s initial progress toward self-sufficiency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10. Based on your experience, is it logical to be thinking about workforce development when providing support services to an individual “In-Crisis”?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further, the framework assumes that it can be equally important to provide support services after an individual’s situation has improved, for example he/she is now holding a job. The thinking here is that securing a job is not necessarily the end of the journey and a need for support services continues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. Does your experience indicate that there is a need to continue providing support services after a client has found work that puts that client and their family in a “Safe” or “Stable” situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. Is it feasible to provide support services after the client has found work, given the way host organisation programs/contracts are organized and the demands on available resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial research has identified community-based organizations that are achieving success with approaches similar to the framework for implementing workforce development programs. But the research also indicates that using this framework demands a strong commitment to this broader view of workforce development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13. If you agree that this framework might help improve current approaches, what were the principal challenges to implementing the framework?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section C: host organisation SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM - Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14. Can you comment on the effectiveness of the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model to date?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q15. Based on your experience to date, would you recommend the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model to other community service organisations? Please elaborate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q16. In your opinion, what could be done to enhance or improve the host organisation Self-Sufficiency case management model?

Q17. Is there anything else that you would like to say?

Thanks for your time.

Would you like a copy of this interview transcript?
Appendix 5 – Figures 10 to Figures 32

**Figure 10: Placement by month (Total Job Seekers)**

**Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)**

- Placement by Month
- Mean = 627

**Post-Model (January 2013–June 2015)**

- Placement by Month
- Mean = 556

**Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 598**

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 11: 13-week outcomes by month (Total of Job Seekers)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)

Mean = 229

Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 213

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 12: 26-week outcomes by month (Total Job Seekers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 155</td>
<td>Mean = 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 13: Placement by month (Stream 4)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)

Mean = 112

Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 112


Mean = 113

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 14: 13-week outcomes by month (Stream 4)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)


Mean = 43

Mean = 40

Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 42

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 15: 26-week outcomes by month (Stream 4)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)


Mean = 27

Mean = 22

Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 25

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 16: Placement by month (Stream 3)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)


Mean = 111

Mean = 89

Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 102

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
**Figure 17: 13-week outcomes by month (Stream 3)**

**Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)**

Mean = 47

**Post-Model (January 2013–June 2015)**

Mean = 36

**Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 43**

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 18: 26 week outcomes by month (Stream 3)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)


Mean = 30

Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 27

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 19: Placement by month (Stream 2)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)

Mean = 259

Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 241

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 20: 13-week outcomes by month (Stream 2)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)

Mean = 127

Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 113

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.


Mean = 93
**Figure 21: 26-week outcomes by month (Stream 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 90</td>
<td>Mean = 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 22: Placement by month (Stream 1)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)


Mean = 145

Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 143

Mean = 140

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 23: 13-week outcomes by month (Stream 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 11</td>
<td>Mean = 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 24: 26-week outcomes by month (Stream 1)

**Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)**

Mean = 8

Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = 10

**Post-Model (January 2013–June 2015)**

Mean = 13

Note: The months of November, December and January usually have lower rates of placements, 13-week and 26-week outcomes for job seekers as reflected in the graph, which shows significant decline during those months. Hiring usually slows down end of the year as employers take the opportunity for a longer holiday break and JSA providers are closed for two weeks between Christmas holidays and New Year’s Day.
Figure 25: Program Revenue by month Total Job Seekers and Total Job Seeker Commencements

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)

Mean of Program Revenue = $1,566,173
Standard Deviation = $314,071


Mean of Program Revenue = $1,318,991
Standard Deviation = $193,730
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Mean of Program Revenue (July 2009–June 2015) = $1,463,181</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean of Total Job Seeker Commencements = 1,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation = 1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean of Total Job Seeker Commencements (July 2009–June 2015) = 1,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 26: Service Fees by month (Total Job Seekers (JSA Stream 1 – 4))

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)

Mean of Service Fees = $812,584
Standard Deviation = $200,127
Overall of Service Fees Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = $740,875


Mean of Service Fees = $640,482
Standard Deviation = $126,305
Figure 27: Service Fees by month (Stream 4)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)

Mean = $227,984
Standard Deviation = $39,040
Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = $202,035


Mean = $165,706
Standard Deviation = $39,601
Figure 28: Service Fees by month (Stream 3)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)

Mean = $104,713
Standard Deviation = $30,097
Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = $96,654


Mean = $85,373
Standard Deviation = $18,495
Figure 29: Service Fees by month (Stream 2)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)

Stream 2 Service Fees

Mean = $207,409
Standard Deviation = $62,113
Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = $192,120


Stream 2 Service Fees

Mean = $170,716
Standard Deviation = $36,319
Figure 30: Service Fees by month (Stream 1)

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)


Mean = $272,477
Standard Deviation = $150,982
Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = $250,065

Mean = $218,688
Standard Deviation = $43,919
**Figure 31: Cost of Services by month Total Job Seekers**

**Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)**

Mean = $52,722  
Standard Deviation = $75,445  
Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = $46,710

**Post-Model (January 2013–June 2015)**

Mean = $38,292  
Standard Deviation = $42,594
Figure 32: Program Profitability by month

Period of Model (July 2009–December 2012)

Profitability

Mean = $152,816
Standard Deviation = $185,368
Overall Mean (July 2009–June 2015) = $153,149


Profitability

Mean = $153,615
Standard Deviation = $108,162
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;A Revenue</td>
<td>$17,156,967</td>
<td>$22,622,902</td>
<td>$17,734,348</td>
<td>$16,223,882</td>
<td>$16,831,687</td>
<td>$15,489,907</td>
<td>$14,480,625</td>
<td>$14,649,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Expenses</td>
<td>42.50%</td>
<td>42.60%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>59.50%</td>
<td>61.00%</td>
<td>60.78%</td>
<td>64.30%</td>
<td>72.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Services</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>13.48%</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
<td>16.50%</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Expenses</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>14.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Expenses</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>14.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expenses</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Development Expenses</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Expenses</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff Expenses</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Prof Development</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Expenses</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Costs</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Expenses</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Expenses</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit</td>
<td>$1,562,023</td>
<td>$2,136,070</td>
<td>$392,422</td>
<td>-$763,847</td>
<td>-$649,218</td>
<td>-$764,463</td>
<td>$475,131</td>
<td>-$4,334,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Margin %</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>-1.13%</td>
<td>-1.24%</td>
<td>-1.11%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Information of Annual Financial Reports were obtained from the host organisation and the Australian Charities and Not-for-profit Commission Register.
### Appendix 7 - Total revenue per employee ratio of the host organisation and not-for-profit providers with similar business profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>Host Organisation</th>
<th>Provider 1</th>
<th>Provider 2</th>
<th>Provider 3</th>
<th>Provider 4</th>
<th>Provider 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-2010</td>
<td>$41,803,654</td>
<td>$54,983,127</td>
<td>$54,794,889</td>
<td>$50,691,538</td>
<td>$48,980,343</td>
<td>$49,346,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$64,568,025</td>
<td>$67,492,427</td>
<td>$88,957,000</td>
<td>$98,655,000</td>
<td>$33,572,825</td>
<td>$22,877,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Full time employees</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Part time employees</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Casual employees</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of unpaid volunteers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of employees</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per paid employee</td>
<td>$76,007</td>
<td>$106,971</td>
<td>$73,748</td>
<td>$94,222</td>
<td>$75,704</td>
<td>$84,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average revenue per paid employee</td>
<td>$79,885</td>
<td>$157,638</td>
<td>$135,813</td>
<td>$61,775</td>
<td>$102,250</td>
<td>$77,469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>