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Homelessness has multiple causes. Some of the social and personal factors associated with homelessness include a shortage of affordable housing, family and relationship breakdown, unemployment and financial hardship, mental health problems, and drug and alcohol abuse (COAG Reform Council 2010).

Australian, State and Territory governments fund services to assist people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Between 1985 and 2009, the Australian Government and State and Territory governments funded the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) to alleviate the difficulties of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness and reduce the potential for their recurrence. The SAAP was the main governmental response to homelessness during this period. It provided emergency accommodation as well as support services to people experiencing, or at risk of, homelessness. SAAP services provided assistance to individuals and families who were in crisis or experienced difficulties that hindered personal or family functioning. The SAAP concluded on 31 December 2008 at the expiry of the SAAP V Multilateral Agreement.

The National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA) commenced on 1 January 2009 as part of the Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations. The NAHA is associated with the National Affordable Housing Specific Purpose Payment, which is an indexed ongoing payment by the Australian Government to the states and territories to be spent in the housing and homelessness sector. To support the NAHA, the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH) commenced on 1 July 2009. Government funding for specialist homelessness services is provided through the National Affordable Housing Specific Purpose Payment.

The NAHA and NPAH provide the framework for Australian Government and State and Territory governments to work together to reduce homelessness and improve housing outcomes for Australians. Under the NAHA, governments have committed to undertake reforms in the housing sector to improve integration between homelessness services and mainstream services, and reduce the rate of homelessness.

Under the NAHA, and the NPAH in particular, Australian, State and Territory governments agreed to a number of outcomes relating to homelessness, including that:

* fewer people will become homeless and fewer of these will sleep rough
* fewer people will become homeless more than once
* people at risk of or experiencing homelessness will maintain or improve connections with their families and communities, and maintain or improve their education, training or employment participation
* people at risk of or experiencing homelessness will be supported by quality services, with improved access to sustainable housing.

The initial NPAH (2009–2013) was a $1.1 billion partnership with states and territories. Under the initial agreement, which concluded on 30 June 2013, more than 180 initiatives provided housing and support services for people who would otherwise have been homeless.

The 2009–13 NPAH reflected a major reform of the way the Australian Government and State and Territory governments worked together to tackle homelessness. As part of wider Council of Australian Governments (COAG) reforms, the NPAH clarified that States and Territories were responsible for day to day delivery of services, as they are best placed to consider local context. One of the critical features of the new COAG approach was that the achievement of outcomes would not be narrowly defined, but focused on improving the delivery of services to prevent and respond to homelessness.

A one year transitional NPAH commenced on 1 July 2013. It will deliver $159 million of Australian Government funding, which includes a $43 million Commonwealth commitment to the Development Fund for capital and development projects. States and territories are required to match this funding, and some may exceed this requirement.

This chapter presents data on government-funded specialist homelessness services and the people accessing these services. Homelessness services that do not receive government funding and other non-specialist homelessness services are not included in Report.

Data from the Specialist Homelessness Services data collection (SHSC) commenced in 2011–12 and are included in this Report. The SHSC replaced the SAAP National Data Collection which concluded in 2010–11. SAAP data are included in earlier Reports.

Major improvements in reporting on specialist homelessness services in this edition include:

* most 2011–12 SHSC data published in the 2013 Report have been revised for this Report. The greater level of reporting by agencies in 2012–13 necessitated an adjustment to the weighting methodology used in 2011–12 to improve comparability across the two reporting years. All revisions are reflected in this chapter and in attachment 18A
* enhanced data quality for the ‘access of special groups to homelessness services’ indicator, resulting in a change from not complete or not directly comparable to comparable (subject to caveats) and complete across jurisdictions over time.

## 18.1 Profile of homelessness services

### Services to assist people who are homeless or at imminent risk of becoming homeless

Specialist homelessness services aim to provide support to people who are homeless or at imminent risk of becoming homeless as a result of a crisis, including women and children escaping domestic and family violence.

Some of the main developments of SAAP that have influenced the current service environment include:

* expansion of target groups and increasing specialisation of services
* the provision of non-accommodation support services
* responding to the individual needs of clients through an emphasis on case management and an integrated service response — a form of service delivery that involves an assessment process to identify the specific needs of clients and to connect them with appropriate services (AIHW 2011).

Government and non-government service providers (including community organisations) deliver a variety of homelessness services to clients, including supported accommodation, counselling, advocacy, links to housing, health, education and employment services, outreach support, brokerage and meals services, and financial and employment assistance.

### Homelessness services and the link with other services

Close links exist between homelessness services and other forms of housing assistance reported in the Housing chapter of this Report (chapter 17). Some individuals and families access both homelessness and housing services, as people can move from homelessness to social housing, or might be in receipt of homelessness services and accommodated in social housing.[[1]](#footnote-1). The Housing and homelessness sector overview provides some information on the interconnections between these and other services.

### Size and scope

#### Definition of homelessness

Data on homelessness from the 2011, 2006 and 2001 Census are based on the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) methodology (ABS 2012a) and statistical definition of homelessness (ABS 2012b), which were both developed following consultation with the homelessness sector.

When a person does not have suitable accommodation alternatives they are considered homeless if their current living arrangement:

* is in a dwelling that is inadequate; or
* has no tenure, or if their initial tenure is short and not extendable; or
* does not allow them to have control of, and access to space for, social relations (ABS 2012b).

This definition applies to the general population and includes aspects of adequacy, security, stability and privacy (ABS 2012b).

In 2011, 105 237 people were estimated to be homeless on Census night (ABS 2012c).

Data on homeless people are categorised by the ABS according to homelessness operational groups. The majority of homeless people in 2011 were ‘persons living in severely crowded dwellings’[[2]](#footnote-2) (39 per cent). Homeless people who were staying in supported accommodation accounted for 20 per cent of the homeless population. Similar proportions of homeless people were staying temporarily in other households (17 per cent) and in boarding houses (17 per cent). Only 6 per cent of homeless people were in improvised dwellings, tents or sleepers out and 1 per cent were in other temporary lodgings on Census night.

Estimates of homelessness from the Census provide a point-in-time prevalence measure of homelessness and information about the characteristics of those who were likely to have been homeless. However, estimates of people who are homeless on Census night may be over‑ or under‑estimated if the data collected about a person are not sufficient to be certain about whether or not they were homeless on Census night, or under-enumerated (not counted in the Census at all). Rough sleepers and people staying in supported accommodation for the homeless are at particular risk of being under‑enumerated, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are more likely to be both under‑enumerated and overrepresented in the homeless population (ABS 2012c).[[3]](#footnote-3)

All clients of specialist homelessness services are either homeless or at risk of homelessness. ‘Homeless’ status is derived for a client based on the client’s housing circumstances at the beginning of their first support period in 2012–13 (or at the beginning of 2012–13 for clients who were existing clients on 1 July 2012). All other clients not meeting these criteria are considered to be at risk of homelessness (excluding clients who did not provide sufficient information to make this assessment).

A client in the SHSC is considered ‘homeless’ if their housing situation was any of the following:

* dwelling type was caravan, tent, cabin, boat, improvised building/dwelling, no dwelling/street/park/in the open, motor vehicle, boarding/rooming house, emergency accommodation, or hotel/motel/bed and breakfast, or
* dwelling type was house/townhouse/flat and condition of occupancy was couch surfing, or
* dwelling type was house/townhouse/flat and tenure type was ‘no tenure’ and conditions of occupancy were not couch surfing, or
* tenure type was renting or living rent-free in transitional housing, caravan park, boarding/rooming house, emergency accommodation/night shelter/women’s refuge/youth shelter.

Homeless status in the SHSC is determined by aligning as closely as possible with the ABS’s statistical definition of homelessness (ABS 2012c).

Nationally, specialist homelessness services agencies provided support to 244 176 people in 2012–13 (table 18A.1). Besides general services (91.5 per cent), services commonly provided included accommodation (36.4 per cent), assistance to sustain housing (24.1 per cent), domestic violence services (21.7 per cent), and other specialist services (13.5 per cent). These results varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.1).

Figure 18.1 Composition of support provided, all clients, 2012–13
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| --- |
| Figure 18.1 Composition of support provided, all clients, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.1.

### Funding

Government funded specialist homelessness services are jointly funded by the Australian Government and State and Territory governments, through the NAHA and NPAH.

Direct expenditure on specialist homelessness services is undertaken by State and Territory governments. Recurrent government expenditure on specialist homelessness services for 2012–13 was $591.2 million, compared to $575.9 million in 2011–12 (2012–13 dollars) (table 18A.3). Most of this expenditure (97.4 per cent) was funding provided to agencies to deliver services for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, while the remaining expenditure (2.6 per cent) was attributed to State and Territory governments’ administration costs (table 18A.2).

Nationally, real recurrent funding per person in the population was $26 in 2012–13, though the amount of funding per person varied across jurisdictions (table 18A.4).

In addition to funding provided under the NAHA and NPAH, State and Territory governments contribute extra funding to specialist homelessness services.

## 18.2 Framework of performance indicators for government funded specialist homelessness services

The performance indicator framework for government funded specialist homelessness services is based on shared government objectives for homelessness services delivered under the NAHA (box 18.1).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.1 Objectives for government funded specialist homelessness services |
| The overall aim of specialist homelessness services is to provide transitional supported accommodation and a range of related support services, to help people who are homeless or at imminent risk of homelessness to achieve the maximum possible degree of self-reliance and independence. Within this aim, the goals are to:   * resolve crises * re-establish family links where appropriate * re-establish the capacity of clients to live independently, achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion * provide homelessness services in an equitable and efficient manner. |
|  |

COAG has agreed six National Agreements to enhance accountability to the public for the outcomes achieved or outputs delivered by a range of government services (see chapter 1 for more detail on reforms to federal financial relations).

The NAHA covers the areas of housing and homelessness services. The NAHA includes sets of performance indicators, for which the Steering Committee collates performance information for analysis by the COAG Reform Council (CRC). Performance indicators reported in this chapter are aligned with the homelessness-related performance indicators in the NAHA. The NAHA was reviewed in 2012 and 2013, resulting in changes that have been reflected in this Report, as relevant.

The performance indicator framework provides information on equity, efficiency and effectiveness, and distinguishes the outputs and outcomes of government funded specialist homelessness services (figure 18.2). The performance indicator framework shows which data are complete and comparable in the 2014 Report. For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report-wide perspective (see section 1.6).

The Report’s statistical context chapter contains data that may assist in interpreting the performance indicators presented in this chapter. These data cover a range of demographic and geographic characteristics, including age profile, geographic distribution of the population, income levels, education levels, tenure of dwellings and cultural background (including Indigenous and cultural status) (chapter 2 ).

Figure 18.2 Government funded specialist homelessness services performance indicator framework
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| Figure 18.2 Government funded specialist homelessness services performance indicator framework   More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

## 18.3 Key performance indicator results for government funded specialist homelessness services

Data reported in this section are for government funded specialist homelessness services delivered under the NAHA and NPAH. Data are sourced from the SHSC, which reports the number of clients and the number and types of services provided to clients (box 18.2).

Further information on the SHSC is available in the data quality information (DQI) accompanying this chapter. DQI is being progressively introduced for all indicators in the Report. The purpose of DQI is to provide structured and consistent information about quality aspects of data used to report on performance indicators. DQI in this Report covers the seven dimensions in the ABS’ data quality framework (institutional environment, relevance, timeliness, accuracy, coherence, accessibility and interpretability) in addition to dimensions that define and describe performance indicators in a consistent manner, and note key data gaps and issues identified by the Steering Committee.

All DQI for the 2014 Report can be found at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.2 Specialist homelessness services collection (SHSC)  Specialist homelessness services collection (SHSC) data are collected by specialist homelessness agencies for all clients, and reported each month to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Data are collected about the characteristics and circumstances of a client when they first present at an agency, and further data — on the assistance the client receives and the client’s circumstances at the end of the month — are collected at the end of every month in which the client receives services, and at the end of the support period.  Specialist homelessness agencies that are funded under the National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA) and the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH) are in scope for the collection. Those agencies that are expected to participate in the SHSC are identified by State and Territory departments responsible for the delivery of services.  All specialist homelessness agencies participating in the collection report a standard set of data about the clients they support each month. Data are collected about the characteristics and circumstances of a client when they first present at an agency, and on the assistance they receive, their circumstances at the end of each month and at the end of the support period.  The data collected by agencies are based on support periods, or episodes of assistance provided to individual clients. |
|  |

### Outputs

Outputs are the actual services delivered (while outcomes are the impact of these services on the status of an individual or group) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

#### Equity — access

Equity and access indicators are indicators of governments’ objective to ensure that all clients have fair and equitable access to services on the basis of relative need and available resources.

##### Access of special needs groups to homelessness services

‘Access of special needs groups to homelessness services’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to ensure all Australians have equitable access to accommodation services on the basis of relative need (box 18.3).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.3 Access of special needs groups to homelessness services |
| ‘Access of special needs groups to homelessness services’ is the comparison between the representation of Indigenous people and people born in non-main English speaking countries (non-MESC) among all people whose needs for accommodation and other services were met, and the representation of these groups in the population.  This indicator is defined by three measures:   * the number of Indigenous/non-MESC clients whose demand for accommodation was met divided by the total number of clients whose demand for accommodation was met * the number of Indigenous/non-MESC clients whose demand for services other than accommodation was met divided by the total number of clients whose demand for services other than accommodation was met * the representation of Indigenous/non-MESC clients in specialist homelessness services compared with their representation in the population.   Use by special needs groups is a proxy indicator of equitable access. In general, usage rates for special needs groups similar or higher to those for the broader service population are desirable. Several factors need to be considered in interpreting the results for this set of measures. In particular, cultural differences can influence the extent to which Indigenous/non-MESC clients use different types of services.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |

##### Access of Indigenous people to homelessness services

Nationally, Indigenous people made up 25.3 per cent of all clients who received accommodation assistance, and 14.1 per cent of all clients who received services other than accommodation in 2012–13. These results varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.3).

Figure 18.3 Proportion of Indigenous clients whose needs for accommodation and services other than accommodation were met, 2012–13
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| Figure 18.3 Proportion of Indigenous clients whose needs for accommodation and services other than accommodation were met, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.5.

Nationally in 2012–13, Indigenous people had a higher representation amongst all people accessing specialist homelessness services (22.5 per cent) than their representation in the population (3.0 per cent) (table 18.1).

Table 18.1 **Proportion of Indigenous people represented in specialist homelessness services and in the population, 2012–13 (per cent)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *NSW* | *Vic* | *Qld* | *WA* | *SA* | *Tas* | *ACT* | *NT* | *Aust* |
| In specialist homelessness services | 24.6 | 8.9 | 32.5 | 35.1 | 24.3 | 15.7 | 15.9 | 76.0 | 22.5 |
| In the population, 2011 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 29.8 | 3.0 |

*Source*: ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) 2013, *Australian Demographic Statistics, March 2013*, Cat. no. 3101.0, Canberra; AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.7

##### Access of people born in non-main English speaking countries to homelessness services

Nationally, people born in non-main English speaking countries made up 10.6 per cent of all clients who received accommodation assistance and 10.3 per cent of all clients who received services other than accommodation in 2012–13. These results varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.4).

Figure 18.4 Proportion of clients born in non-main English speaking countries whose needs for accommodation and services other than accommodation were met, 2012–13**a**
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| --- |
| Figure 18.4 Proportion of clients born in non-main English speaking countries whose needs for accommodation and services other than accommodation were met, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Non-main English speak countries are all countries except Australia, United Kingdom, Republic of Ireland, New Zealand, Canada, United States of America and South Africa.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.6.

Nationally, people born in non-main English speaking countries had a lower representation amongst all people accessing specialist homelessness services (12.0 per cent) than this group’s representation in the population (23.7 per cent) (table 18.2).

Table 18.2 **Proportion of people born in non-main English speaking countries represented in specialist homelessness services and in the population, 2012–13 (per cent)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *NSW* | *Vic* | *Qld* | *WA* | *SA* | *Tas* | *ACT* | *NT* | *Aust* |
| In specialist homelessness services | 10.8 | 17.3 | 7.8 | 11.6 | 6.5 | 3.8 | 18.2 | 3.5 | 12.0 |
| In the population, 2011 | 24.6 | 25.4 | 19.8 | 29.2 | 21.5 | 11.3 | 23.5 | 15.2 | 23.7 |

*Source*: ABS 2012, *2011 Census of Population and Housing, Australia, States and Territories, Basic Community Profile, Table B09 — Country of birth of person by sex*, Cat. no. 2001.0, Canberra; AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.7.

Additional data on representation of special needs groups in specialist homelessness services are presented in tables 18A.5–7.

Data for 2011‑12 are included in tables 18A.5–7.

##### Unmet demand for homelessness services

‘Unmet demand for homelessness services’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to ensure all Australians have equitable access to accommodation services on the basis of relative need (box 18.4).

Unmet demand occurs when a homeless person or a person at risk of homelessness expressly asking for assistance cannot be provided with that assistance.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.4 Unmet demand for homelessness services |
| Specialist homelessness agencies in Australia provide a wide range of services to a large number of people every day. However, agencies cannot always meet the requests for assistance they receive. Unmet demand for homelessness services occurs when a homeless person or a person at risk of homelessness asks for assistance from an SHS agency but cannot be provided with that assistance.  Information on unmet demand is collected for people who seek services from specialist homelessness agencies but receive no assistance (unassisted requests for services), and for the clients who have some, but not all, of their needs met. These two components are part of the overall picture of unmet demand for specialist homelessness services.  Unmet demand is defined by two measures:   * Unmet demand for accommodation * the number of average daily unassisted requests with a need for accommodation * the number of clients who requested short-term or emergency accommodation or medium or long term housing who were not provided or referred to these services, divided by the number of clients who had a need for short-term or emergency accommodation or medium or long term housing. * Unmet demand for services other than accommodation * the number of average daily unassisted requests without a need for accommodation but with a need for other services * the number of clients who did not request accommodation but did request another type of service who were not provided or referred to any of these services, divided by the number of clients who had a need for a service other than accommodation.   A low or decreasing proportion of clients with unmet demand is desirable.  Jurisdictions with central intake agencies such as Victoria and the ACT may record a low number of unassisted requests for services and a high number of clients with unmet need for services. This is because clients whose needs cannot be met immediately are placed on a waiting list and provision of service is determined by priority of need. A client is generally only referred to a service provider when a suitable service is secured for them by the central intake service. Data for these jurisdictions may not be directly comparable to data for other jurisdictions.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |

Nationally in 2012–13, clients with unmet need for accommodation accounted for 22.1 per cent of the total demand for accommodation, compared with 19.8 per cent in 2011–12 (table 18A.9). This result varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.5).

Nationally, clients with unmet demand for services other than accommodation accounted for 1.0 per cent of the total demand for services other than accommodation in 2012–13, compared with 1.4 per cent in 2011–12 (table 18A.9). This result varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.5).

Figure 18.5 Proportion of clients with unmet need for accommodation and services other than accommodation, 2012–13**a, b, c**
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| Figure 18.5 Proportion of clients with unmet need for accommodation and services other than accommodation, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a For unmet demand for clients Victoria and ACT have central intake models which mean that their data are not directly comparable with other states and territories. b Data for ‘services other than accommodation’ for SA are nil or rounded to zero. c See notes to table 18A.9 for more details.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.9.

The number of average daily unassisted requests for accommodation and services other than accommodation are included in table 18A.8.

#### Effectiveness — appropriateness

Effectiveness indicators measure how well the outputs of a service reflect the stated objectives of that service. The reporting framework groups effectiveness indicators according to characteristics that are considered important to the service. These characteristics may include access, appropriateness and/or quality.

##### Development of a case management plan

‘Development of a case management plan’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide high quality services that are appropriately targeted to the needs of clients (box 18.5).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.5 Development of a case management plan |
| ‘Development of a case management plan’ is defined as the number of clients with closed support periods only with an agreed case management plan divided by the total number of clients. Data are reported for all clients, and separately for Indigenous clients.  A high or increasing proportion of clients with agreed case management plans is desirable. However, in some instances, a support plan may be judged to be inappropriate (such as when a support period is short term, for example 24 hours, or in the case of jurisdictions with central intake agencies such as Victoria and the ACT, where the client’s needs have been assessed and they are waiting for a service to be available that will further address their needs).  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |

Nationally, there was an agreed case management plan for 55.2 per cent of clients in 2012–13 (compared with 64.0 per cent for Indigenous clients). These proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.6 and tables 18A.10–11).

Figure 18.6 Proportion of clients with a case management plan, all clients, 2012–13**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 18.6 Proportion of clients with a case management plan, all clients, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Victoria and ACT have central intake models which mean that their data are not directly comparable with other states and territories. b See notes to table 18A.9 for more details

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.10.

Data on clients with a case management plan for 2011–12 are included in tables 18A.9–10.

##### Match of needs of clients

‘Match of needs of clients’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to ensure that services meet clients’ individual needs (box 18.6).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.6 Match of needs of clients |
| ‘Match of needs of clients’ is defined by five measures:   * number of clients with closed support periods who needed homelessness services and who were provided with at least one service in at least one support period during the reference year by the agency visited, and not referred, divided by the total number of clients with closed support periods who needed homelessness services * proportion of clients with closed support periods who needed homelessness services and who were referred to another agency, divided by the total number of clients with closed support periods who needed homelessness services * proportion of clients with closed support periods who needed homelessness services and who were provided with those services by that agency and referred to another agency, divided by the total number of clients with closed support periods who needed homelessness services * proportion of clients with closed support periods who needed homelessness services and who were not provided with those services or referred to another agency, divided by the total number of clients with closed support periods who needed homelessness services * proportion of clients (12–18 years) with closed support periods who needed education and/or training assistance who were undertaking formal study or training at the end of support, divided by the total number of closed support periods for clients (aged 12–18 years) who needed education and/or training assistance.   The range of services needed by clients is broad (ranging from meals to laundry facilities to long term accommodation), so the effect of not providing these services varies.  Holding other factors constant, a high or increasing proportion of clients who received services they needed, or who were referred to another agency, is desirable.  Jurisdictions with central intake agencies such as Victoria and the ACT may record a relatively high number of clients with unmet need for services because all eligible clients receive an assessment but the provision or referral of service is determined by their level of need relative to other clients. A client is generally only referred to a provider when a suitable service is secured for them by the central intake service.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions   The basis on which this indicator is enumerated has changed from the 2013 Report. Data for 2011-12 have been revised to reflect this change.  Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |

Nationally in 2012–13, 53.3 per cent of all clients with closed support periods who needed homelessness services were identified as needing accommodation or accommodation-related assistance. Agencies were able to directly provide or directly provide and refer these services to most of the clients seeking this type of service (59.7 per cent). A further 15.3 per cent of these clients were referred to other organisations for this assistance (figure 18.7 and table 18A.12). Specialist homelessness agencies were able to directly provide or directly provide and refer assistance to sustain tenure to most clients seeking this type of service (81.4 per cent), and directly provide or directly provide and refer domestic and family violence-related assistance to 92.2 per cent of clients seeking this type of service (figure 18.7).

Figure 18.7 Closed support periods — support needs of all clients, 2012-13**a**
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| --- |
| Figure 18.7 Closed support periods — support needs of all clients, 2012-13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Victoria and ACT have central intake models which mean that their data are not directly comparable with other states and territories.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.12.

Nationally in 2012–13, 57.0 per cent of all Indigenous clients who needed homelessness services were identified as needing accommodation or accommodation-related assistance. Agencies were able to directly provide or directly provide and refer these services to most of the clients seeking this type of service (69.3 per cent). A further 14.4 per cent of these clients were referred to other organisations for this assistance (figure 18.8 and table 18A.13). Specialist homelessness agencies were able to directly provide or directly provide and refer assistance to sustain tenure to most clients seeking this type of service (82.1 per cent) and directly provide or directly provide and refer domestic and family violence-related assistance to 91.2 per cent of clients seeking this type of service (figure 18.8).

Figure 18.8 Closed support periods — support needs of Indigenous clients, 2012–13
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| Figure 18.8 Closed support periods — support needs of Indigenous clients, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.13.

The support needs of clients born in non-main English speaking countries are included in table 18A.14.

Data for 2011–12 are included in tables 18A.12–14.

Nationally, of young clients (aged 12–18 years) who needed assistance to obtain or maintain education and/or training in 2012–13, 67.9 per cent were undertaking formal study or training after support, compared with 66.5 per cent in 2011–12 (table 18A.15). Amongst this 67.9 per cent, the proportion of clients who were in vocational education/training increased from 6.4 per cent before support to 9.4 per cent after support. The proportion of clients who were in secondary school decreased from 51.7 per cent before support to 46.6 per cent after support. These proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.9).

Figure 18.9 Closed support periods — proportion of clients aged 12 to 18 years who needed education and/or training assistance who were undertaking formal study or training after support, status before and after support, 2012–13

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 18.9 Closed support periods — proportion of clients aged 12 to 18 years who needed education and/or training assistance who were undertaking formal study or training after support, status before and after support, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.15.

Additional data on the education and training status of clients before and after support are presented in table 18A.15, including data for 2011–12.

#### Effectiveness — quality

##### Client satisfaction

‘Client satisfaction’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to provide high quality services that meet the needs of clients (box 18.7).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.7 Client satisfaction |
| ‘Client satisfaction’ is defined as the extent to which clients find homelessness services and programs to be helpful and of a high standard.  This indicator and associated measures are under development. |
|  |

#### Efficiency

Expenditure data for these indicators are provided by State and Territory governments, while data on the number of support periods, support days and clients are drawn from the SHSC.

Across jurisdictions, there may be varying treatments of expenditure items (for example, superannuation) and different counting and reporting rules for generating financial data. Differences in expenditure data across jurisdictions may reflect to some extent differences in the way these data are compiled rather than true variations in expenditure.

##### Cost per completed support period

‘Cost per completed support period’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to maximise the availability and quality of services through the efficient use of public resources (box 18.8).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.8 Cost per completed support period |
| ‘Cost per completed support period’ is defined as total recurrent expenditure on homelessness services divided by the number of completed support periods.  A low or decreasing cost per completed support period may represent an improvement in efficiency, but may also indicate lower service quality or relatively short support periods.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, the recurrent cost per completed support period was $1683 in 2012–13, compared with $1731 in 2011–12 (table 18A.16). This cost varied significantly across jurisdictions (figure 18.10).

Figure 18.10 Real recurrent cost per completed support period, 2012–13 dollars**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 18.10 Real recurrent cost per completed support period, 2012–13 dollars  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Time series financial data are adjusted to 2012–13 dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (2012–13 = 100) (table 2A.53). The GGFCE replaces the Gross Domestic Product implicit price deflator used in previous editions. See Chapter 2 (section 2.5) for details. b See notes to table 18A.16 for more information.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; Australian, State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 18A.16.

##### Cost per client

‘Cost per client’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to maximise the availability and quality of services through the efficient use of public resources (box 18.9).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.9 Cost per client |
| ‘Cost per client’ is defined as total recurrent expenditure on homelessness services divided by the number of clients provided with a service.  A low or decreasing cost per client may represent an improvement in efficiency, but may also indicate lower service quality or relatively short support periods.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable within jurisdictions over time but are not comparable across jurisdictions * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |

Nationally, the recurrent cost per client accessing homelessness services was $2421 in 2012–13, compared with $2436 in 2011–12 (table 18A.17). This cost varied significantly across jurisdictions (figure 18.11).

Figure 18.11 Real recurrent cost per client accessing homelessness services, 2012–13 dollars**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 18.11 Real recurrent cost per client accessing homelessness services, 2012–13 dollars  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Time series financial data are adjusted to 2012–13 dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (2012–13 = 100) (table 2A.53). The GGFCE replaces the Gross Domestic Product implicit price deflator used in previous editions. See Chapter 2 (section 2.5) for details. b See notes to table 18A.17 for more information.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; Australian, State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 18A.17.

##### Cost per day of support

‘Cost per day of support’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to maximise the availability and quality of services through the efficient use of public resources (box 18.10).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.10 Cost per day of support |
| ‘Cost per day of support’ is defined as total recurrent expenditure on homelessness services divided by the number of days of support for clients receiving support and/or supported accommodation.  A low or decreasing cost per day of support may represent an improvement in efficiency, but may also indicate lower service quality or relatively short support periods.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable within jurisdictions for the current reporting period but are not comparable across jurisdictions * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |

Nationally, the recurrent cost per day of support for clients averaged $29 in 2012‑13. This cost varied significantly across jurisdictions (figure 18.12).

Figure 18.12 Real recurrent cost per day of support for clients, 2012–13**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 18.12 Real recurrent cost per day of support for clients, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a The number of support days for 2011-12 are not available. b See notes to table 18A.18 for more information.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; Australian, State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 18A.18.

### Outcomes

Outcomes are the impact of services on the status of an individual or group (while outputs are the actual services delivered) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

An important outcome of homelessness services is clients’ achievement of self‑reliance and independence. Characteristics that may indicate whether clients can live independently include their income, housing status and workforce status. These characteristics are recorded at the end of a client’s support period.

##### Achievement of employment on exit

‘Achievement of employment on exit’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to enable clients to participate as productive and self-reliant members of the community at the end of their support period (box 18.11).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.11 Achievement of employment on exit |
| ‘Achievement of employment on exit’ is defined by three measures:   * number of clients, with closed support periods only, with an identified need for employment and/or training assistance and whose labour force status was ‘employed full-time’ or ‘employed part-time’ at the end of support, divided by the number of clients, with closed support periods only, with an identified need for employment and/or training assistance * number of clients, with closed support periods only, with an identified need for employment and/or training assistance whose labour force status was unemployed at presentation; and whose labour force status was ‘employed full-time’ or ‘employed part-time’ at the end of support, divided by the number of clients, with closed support periods only, with an identified need for employment and/or training assistance who were unemployed at presentation * number of clients, with closed support periods only, with an identified need for employment and/or training assistance whose labour force status was ‘not in the labour force’ at presentation; and whose labour force status was ‘employed full-time’ or ‘employed part-time’ at the end of support, divided by the number of clients, with closed support periods only, with an identified need for employment and/or training assistance who were not in the labour force at presentation.   Holding other factors constant, a high or increasing proportion of clients achieving employment after support is desirable.  Data are reported for all clients, and separately for Indigenous clients.  This indicator compares clients’ employment status before and after support and relates to relatively short term outcomes — that is, outcomes for clients immediately after their support period. Longer term outcomes are important, but more difficult to measure.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, of those clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain employment and training when entering homelessness services in 2012–13, 18.8 per cent were employed either part-time or full-time after support, compared with 11.4 per cent before support. Amongst the 18.8 per cent employed after support, 5.6 per cent were employed full-time and 13.2 per cent were employed part time after support. Proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.13 and table 18A.19).

Nationally, of those Indigenous clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain employment and training when entering homelessness services in 2012–13, 15.2 per cent were employed either part-time or full-time after support, compared with 11.3 per cent before support. Amongst the 15.2 per cent employed after support, 4.4 per cent were employed full time and 10.7 per cent were employed part time after support. These proportions varied across jurisdictions (table 18A.20).

Figure 18.13 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who needed employment and/or training assistance, by labour force status before support, and by full/part time employment after support, 2012–13**a**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Before support**   Figure 18.13 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who needed employment and/or training assistance, by labour force status before support, and by full/part time employment after support, 2012–13  (a) Before support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image.   1. **After support**b   Figure 18.13 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who needed employment and/or training assistance, by labour force status before support, and by full/part time employment after support, 2012–13  (b) After support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a See notes to table 18A.19 for more information. b Data for ‘Employed full time’ for Tasmania are not published.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.19.

Nationally, of those clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain employment and training when entering homelessness services in 2012–13, and were unemployed before support, 4.5 per cent were employed full time and 8.1 per cent were employed part time after support (figure 18.14 (a) and table 18A.21).

Nationally, of those clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain employment and training when entering homelessness services in 2012–13, and were not in the labour force before support, 3.0 per cent were employed full time and 8.2 per cent were employed part time after support (figure 18.14 (b) and table 18A.21).

Figure 18.14 Closed support periods — labour force status of clients after support who were unemployed or not in the labour force before support 2012–13

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Unemployed before support**a, b   **Figure 18.14 Closed support periods — labour force status of clients after support who were unemployed or not in the labour force before support 2012–13  (a) Unemployed before support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image.**   1. **Not in the labour force before support** c, d   Figure 18.14 Closed support periods — labour force status of clients after support who were unemployed or not in the labour force before support 2012–13  (b) Not in the labour force before support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a ’Employed full time after support’ is nil or rounded to zero for SA. b Data for Tasmania are not published. c Employed full time after support’ is nil or rounded to zero for Tasmania. d Data for ‘employed full time after support’ for the ACT are not published.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.21.

Data for 2011–12 are included in table 18A.21.

##### Achievement of income on exit

Achievement of income on exit’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to enable clients to participate independently in the community at the end of their support period (box 18.12).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.12 Achievement of income on exit |
| ‘Achievement of income on exit’ is defined as the number of clients with closed support periods only, who needed income assistance and exited homelessness services with an income source, divided by the total number of clients with closed support periods only, who needed income assistance.  Holding other factors constant, a high or increasing proportion of clients who needed income assistance and exited homelessness services with an income source is desirable.  This indicator compares these clients’ income status before and after they received support. It is assumed that a client’s independence and self-reliance is enhanced when the client experiences a positive change in income source (for example, from having no income support to obtaining some income, including wages and/or benefits) on exit from services.  Data are reported for all clients, and separately for Indigenous clients.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, of clients who needed income assistance when entering homelessness services in 2012–13, 93.9 per cent had an income source after support, compared with 94.5 per cent in 2011–12 (table 18A.22). Amongst the 93.9 per cent, the proportion whose source of income was a government pension/allowance increased from 75.0 per cent before support to 81.9 per cent after support and the proportion of clients whose source of income was employee/business income increased from 6.0 per cent before support to 7.2 per cent after support. Proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.15).

Nationally, of Indigenous clients who needed income assistance when entering homelessness services in 2012–13, 95.2 per cent had an income source after support, compared with 96.2 per cent in 2011–12 (table 18A.23). Amongst the 95.2 per cent, the proportion whose source of income was a government pension/allowance increased from 84.7 per cent before support to 88.9 per cent after support. The proportion of clients whose source of income was employee/business income increased from 3.1 per cent before support to 4.0 per cent after support. Proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.16).

Figure 18.15 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who needed income assistance and who had an income source after support, by income source, 2012–13

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Source of income before support**   Figure 18.15 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who needed income assistance and who had an income source after support, by income source, 2012–13  (a) Source of income before support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image.  **(b) Source of income after support**a  Figure 18.15 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who needed income assistance and who had an income source after support, by income source, 2012–13  (b) Source of income after support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a ‘Awaiting benefit’ is nil or rounded to zero for SA.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.22.

Figure 18.16 Closed support periods — proportion of Indigenous clients who needed income assistance and who had an income source after support, by income source, 2012–13

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Income source before support**a, b, c   Figure 18.16 Closed support periods — proportion of Indigenous clients who needed income assistance and who had an income source after support, by income source, 2012–13\  (a) Income source before support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image.  **(b) Income source after support**c, d, e**Figure 18.16 Closed support periods — proportion of Indigenous clients who needed income assistance and who had an income source after support, by income source, 2012–13\  (b) Income source after support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image.** |

a Data for ‘Awaiting benefit’ for SA are not published. b Data for ‘Employee/business income’ for SA, Tasmania and the ACT are not published. c ‘Awaiting benefit’ is nil or rounded to zero for SA and Tasmania. d Data for ‘Employee/business income’ for Tasmania are not published. e ‘No income’ is nil or rounded to zero for the ACT.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.23.

##### Achievement of independent housing on exit

‘Achievement of independent housing’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to enable clients to participate as productive and self-reliant members of society at the end of their support period (box 18.13).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.13 Achievement of independent housing on exit |
| ‘Achievement of independent housing’ is defined by three measures:   * number of clients with closed support periods only, who identified a need for assistance to obtain ‘long term housing’; or ‘sustain tenancy or prevent tenancy failure or eviction’; or ‘prevent foreclosures or for mortgage arrears’, and had achieved independent housing at the end of support, divided by the number of clients with closed support periods only, who identified a need for assistance to obtain ‘long term housing’ or ‘sustain tenancy or prevent tenancy failure or eviction’, or ‘prevent foreclosures or for mortgage arrears’ * number of clients with closed support periods only, who on presentation, were living in non-independent housing and achieved independent housing at the end of support, divided by the number of clients with closed support periods only, who at presentation were living in non-independent/supported housing * number of clients with closed support periods only, who achieved independent housing at the end of support, and who did not present again with a need for short-term, medium-term, long term housing, assistance to sustain tenancy or prevent tenancy failure or eviction or assistance to prevent foreclosures or for mortgage arrears again during the reference year, divided by the number of clients with closed support periods only, who had requested assistance with obtaining or maintaining independent/non-supported housing, and who had independent/non-supported housing at the end of support.   Data are reported for all clients, and separately for Indigenous clients.  Holding other factors constant, a high or increasing proportion of closed support periods in which clients achieve independent housing is desirable.  This indicator compares the proportion of clients who were in independent housing before and after they received support from homelessness services. It relates to relatively short term outcomes — that is, outcomes for clients immediately after their support period. Longer term outcomes are also important, but more difficult to measure.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, of clients who needed assistance with obtaining or maintaining independent housing 61.2 per cent achieved independent housing in 2012–13, compared with 58.0 per cent in 2011–12 (figure 18.17). This included clients who moved or returned to private rental housing (37.3 per cent), and to public or community rental housing (20.9 per cent) (table 18A.24).

Nationally, of Indigenous clients who needed assistance with obtaining or maintaining independent housing 58.0 per cent achieved independent housing in 2012–13, compared with 52.7 per cent in 2011–12 (figure 18.18). This included clients who moved or returned to private rental housing (25.1 per cent), and to public or community rental housing (30.2 per cent) (table 18A.25).

Clients who did not achieve independent housing included those who moved to, or continued to live in, short to medium term accommodation provided by homelessness services and other forms of non‑independent accommodation (tables 18A.24 and 18A.25).

Figure 18.17 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing and who obtained or maintained independent housing after support**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 18.17 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing and who obtained or maintained independent housing after support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a SA collection methodology for 2011-12 does not allow for this type of analysis. b See notes to table 18A.24 for more information.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.24.

Figure 18.18 Closed support periods — proportion of Indigenous clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing who obtained or maintained independent housing after support**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 18.18 Closed support periods — proportion of Indigenous clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing who obtained or maintained independent housing after support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a SA collection methodology for 2011-12 does not allow for this type of analysis. b See notes to table 18A.25 for more information.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.25.

Data for 2011–12 are included in tables 18A.24–25.

Amongst clients who were living in non-independent housing and who needed assistance to obtain independent housing, 33.0 per cent achieved independent housing in 2012–13, compared with 27.2 per cent in 2011–12 (table 18A.26). This included clients who moved to private rental housing (9.5 per cent), and to public (8.1 per cent) or community rental housing (8.4 per cent) (figure 18.19).

Figure 18.19 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who were living in non-independent housing before support who obtained independent housing after support, by tenure type, 2012–13**a**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Before support**   Figure 18.19 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who were living in non-independent housing before support who obtained independent housing after support, by tenure type, 2012–13  (a) Before support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image.   1. **After support**   Figure 18.19 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who were living in non-independent housing before support who obtained independent housing after support, by tenure type, 2012–13  (b) After support  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a See notes to table 18A.26 for more information.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.26.

Nationally, 60.8 per cent of clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing and who achieved independent housing after support, and did not present again for accommodation in 2012–13, went in to private rental after support.

Figure 18.20 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing who achieved independent housing after support, and did not present again with a need for accommodation, by tenure type, 2012–13**a**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 18.20 Closed support periods — proportion of clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing who achieved independent housing after support, and did not present again with a need for accommodation, by tenure type, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a See notes to table 18A.27 for more information.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.27.

Data for 2011–12 are included in table 18A.27.

Data for Indigenous clients are included in table 18A.28.

##### Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness

‘Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to enable clients to participate independently in society at the end of their support period (box 18.14).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.14 Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness |
| ‘Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness’ is defined as the number of SHS clients who change status from ‘homeless’ to ‘not homeless’ and back to ‘homeless’, divided by the number of SHS clients who experienced homelessness at any time during the reporting period.  The measure under this indicator is a *proxy* as it only captures homeless people who access SHS (ie, homeless people who do not access homelessness services are not identified).  Holding other factors constant, a low or decreasing proportion of clients who more than once required housing or accommodation support specifically is desirable.  Data reported for this indicator are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, 4.0 per cent of all clients who experienced homelessness at some time in 2012–13, had more than one period of homelessness compared with 4.7 per cent in 2011–12 (figure 18.21 and table 18A.29). The proportion of Indigenous clients who experienced homelessness at some time in 2012–13 and who had more than one period of homelessness decreased from 5.2 per cent in 2011–12 to 4.9 per cent in 2012–13. These proportions varied across jurisdictions (figure 18.21 and table 18A.30).

Figure 18.21 Clients who had more than one period of homelessness, all clients and Indigenous clients

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 18.21 Clients who had more than one period of homelessness, all clients and Indigenous clients  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; tables 18A.29–30.

##### Goals achieved on exit from service

‘Goals achieved on exit’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to ensure homelessness services meet the needs and expectations of clients (box 18.15).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18.15 Goals achieved on exit from service |
| ‘Goals achieved on exit from service’ is defined as the proportion of clients in a given period who reported that their case management goals were ‘all’, ‘some’ or ‘none’ achieved by the end of their support period.  This indicator should be interpreted in conjunction with the ‘development of an agreed case management plan’ indicator which identifies the proportion of case management plans developed.  Holding other factors constant, a high or increasing proportion of achieved goals is desirable.  Data reported for these measures are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period. All required (2012–13) data are available for all jurisdictions   Data quality information for this indicator is under development. |
|  |

Nationally, some or all case management goals were achieved by the end of the support period for 93.0 per cent of clients in 2012–13 (figure 18.22 and table 18A.31).

Figure 18.22 Goals achieved on exit from homelessness services, 2012–13**a**

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 18.22 Goals achieved on exit from homelessness services, 2012–13  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a See notes to table 18A.31 for more information.

*Source*: AIHW (unpublished) *Specialist Homelessness Services Collection: National Data Collection annual report*, Australia; table 18A.31.

## 18.4 Future directions in homelessness services performance reporting

### Homelessness data developments

From 1 July 2011, the SAAP data collection was replaced by the SHSC which will continue to be the primary source for reporting on the performance indicators for specialist homelessness services in the future editions of the Report.

The 2015 Report and later editions will continue:

* developing and refining performance measures
* lengthening time series data in attachment tables
* developing data quality information for performance indicators.

## 18.5 Jurisdictions’ comments

This section provides comments from each jurisdiction on the services covered in this chapter.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Australian Government comments | **”** |
| Following the expiry of the 2009–2013 National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH) on 30 June 2013, a new one year transitional NPAH with states and territories commenced on 1 July 2013. Under the transitional NPAH, funding of $159 million was invested by the Australian Government for a range of homelessness initiatives, including $111.7 million to maintain service delivery levels, $43.2 million for capital developments projects and $4 million for research purposes.  Jurisdictions are matching the Australian Government contribution for service delivery and capital projects. The 2013–14 NPAH was funded to ensure that service delivery levels were maintained while all parties worked towards a long term response to homelessness for beyond 2014.  The Department of Social Services (DSS), through the Reconnect program, provides community-based and family focused early intervention program supporting young people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. In partnership with the Department of Human Services, DSS also delivers the ‘HOME Advice’ program to assist families facing difficulty to maintain tenancies or home ownership.  DSS managed the National Homelessness Research Agenda 2009–13, which had three components: the Research Partnership Agreement, the Discrete Research Projects and Journeys Home. The Research Partnership Agreements, worth $4 million and an additional 16 discrete projects worth $1.4 million, finished on 30 June 2013. Forty-four research projects in total were completed, and will contribute to the design and implementation of evidence‑based policy and support services for the homeless. All research reports have been released on the Australian Homelessness Clearinghouse.  DSS is also funding Journeys Home: Longitudinal Study of Factors Affecting Housing Stability which aims to improve our understanding of, and policy response to, the diverse social, economic and personal factors relating to homelessness and the risk of becoming homeless. The survey has six waves, running from September 2011 to the second half of 2014. Four waves have been completed and a research report for Waves 1–4 is due in late 2013.  The Prime Minister’s Council on Homelessness (established 2009) provided advice to government on progress, risks and emerging issues in homelessness. The Council’s final term concluded on 30 June 2013. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | New South Wales Government comments | **”** |
| The delivery of the right services to people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness is important for protecting some of the most vulnerable people in NSW and breaking the cycle of disadvantage.  The NSW Homelessness Action Plan (HAP) puts NSW and national homelessness policy into action and reinforces the NSW Government’s commitment to the NSW 2021 plan targets and the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH). The HAP provides the direction for effort in NSW to reduce and prevent homelessness.  NSW allocated $134.4 million in 2012–13 from the National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA) to Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) to assist people who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. Almost 52 000 people received SHS support, including crisis and transitional support and practical assistance to help break the cycle of repeat homelessness.  NSW is working to improve the capacity of the Specialist Homelessness Services sector to deliver better outcomes for people who are homeless including better aligning resources to need.  In addition to funding under the NAHA, the NPAH provided a joint Commonwealth and NSW Government commitment to tackle the issue of homelessness, including Aboriginal homelessness.  The NSW Government’s investment has focused on continued inter-agency collaboration and driving service reform and priorities to deliver streamlined services for clients to prevent, reduce and respond effectively to homelessness.  The NSW Government’s service delivery achievements are evidence of the strong consolidation of projects that have taken place over the life of the NPAH. All projects have established service delivery regimes and built referral networks and strong interagency partnerships. Significantly, over the life of the four year agreement, 55 funded NPAH projects continued to exceed expectations, with 98 per cent exceeding their client targets.  The NSW Government signed a Transitional NPAH agreement for 2013–14 to enable a longer-term funding agreement to be negotiated. This funding will assist approximately 5000 people in NSW, spread across a range of multi-agency initiatives that place people at the centre. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Victorian Government comments | **”** |
| In 2012–13 Victoria provided over $200 million to community service organisations to support people that are homeless or at risk of homelessness.  Under the National Partnership Agreement for Homelessness, Victoria has implemented models of early intervention aimed at preventing or reducing the time spent homeless. Vulnerable young people at risk are now offered support that enables them to recognise and reach their full potential through stable accommodation linked to education and employment pathways.  Reform of family violence services continued in 2012–13. There was an increased emphasis on safely maintaining women and children in their own homes and on providing this group with a stable living environment. Two new Indigenous family violence crisis accommodation and support services were developed in rural areas. Strengthening risk management pilots continue to provide an effective and coordinated response to women and children at greatest risk of violence in two geographic areas. These pilots are demonstrating the value of multi-agency approaches involving police and the justice system and other related services.  A Place to Call Home has supported families to maintain or secure housing and connections to community supports that will sustain their tenancies and end homelessness.  Substantial work progressed in 2012–13 under the Victorian Homelessness Action Plan (VHAP) 2011–2015, which is an $82.6 million plan to reform and strengthen the response to homelessness in Victoria. Work included mapping and analysis of the current Victorian homelessness and family violence service systems as well as review of the current service system, which included consultation with the sector and clients.  As part of the VHAP, $30.9 million will be invested in Innovation Action Projects over three years. Eleven projects commenced in 2012–13 as part of stage 1 to investigate service models that focus on early intervention and prevention, Projects have operated in metropolitan Melbourne and in regional and rural locations, including major centres like Geelong, Shepparton and Ballarat.  A number of high volume entry point agencies have commenced reporting data through the Specialist Homelessness Services Collection (SHSC), joining all other funded homelessness agencies in Victoria reporting through this collection. Entry point agencies provide initial assessment of client need and arrange referrals to further support or housing. The inclusion of these agencies in the SHSC more completely measures this important aspect of service provision, and has significantly increased the number of Victorian clients in 2012–13. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Queensland Government comments | **”** |
| In 2012–13, Queensland allocated over $71 million to support the delivery of 244 specialist homelessness services for target groups, including young people, families, adults, and women and children escaping domestic and family violence.  Through the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness, the Australian and Queensland Governments have provided an additional $284.6 million over five years (2008–09 to 2012–13) to reduce homelessness in Queensland, including $149.5 million State funds and $135.1 million Australian Government funds.  Reform directions for the homelessness service system have been outlined in the *Homelessness-to-Housing Strategy 2020*. Several initiatives and reform activities have helped people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. These include:   * five *Street to Home* services assisted 1829 instances of rough sleepers and chronically homeless people to transition to stable housing * *A Place to Call Home* purchased 43 dwellings and housed 176 people * *Common Ground Brisbane* assisted 274 people who were homeless or at risk of homelessness, through its combined outreach support and the tenanting of the Brisbane Common Ground building * *HomeStay Support* services provided early intervention assistance to 4489 clients to maintain their tenancies * the *RentConnect* program provided personal assistance to 8212 clients * development of a new client assessment and referral tool.   A number of primary target groups were assisted including youth and children; people with a disability or mental health issues, those experiencing domestic and family violence; and those leaving statutory or institutional care settings. Several initiatives were put in place, including:   * *Post Care Support* provided 335 young people with a disability exiting from the Care of State with transition support * thefive *After Care Services* assisted 321 young people leaving out-of-home care at risk of becoming homeless, to find accommodation and connect with the education system * the *Integrated Transitional Support Model and Offender Reintegration Support Service* provided transitional support to 3741 people.   Emergency Department Homeless Liaison officers, located at four hospital sites, provided support on 861 occasions to people who were identified as homeless or at risk of homelessness. Significant achievements were made in service integration including enhanced local collaboration and coordination around responses to homelessness through the implementation of seven Homelessness Community Action Plans. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Western Australian Government comments | | **”** | |
| The Department for Child Protection and Family Support has lead agency responsibility for homelessness in Western Australia (WA). Through the National Affordable Housing Agreement and the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH) funding is allocated to support the delivery of specialist homelessness services across WA.  The WA Implementation Plan (IP) for the NPAH is fully operational and achieved excellent results over the life of the program. Overall, WA exceeded the targets set in the IP for 2012–13. In the reporting period, the Specialist Homelessness Services Collection data indicates WA NPAH services have assisted over 4700 clients.  An independent Evaluation of the WA NPAH IP found programs make a positive difference for the majority of people who use them. The Evaluation also found that the target of 11 per cent Indigenous participation set for NPAH programs in WA was exceeded, with 29 per cent of clients supported through the NPAH being Indigenous. Department of Housing data quoted in the Evaluation shows that 91 per cent of NPAH clients allocated Department of Housing properties retained their tenancies and were still accommodated after twelve months.  The NPAH has been an important catalyst for improving integration with mainstream services, for example:   * NPAH services have provided clients with intensive case management, including linking clients and their children with mainstream services such as education, training, employment, mental health and drug and alcohol services * the implementation of the NPAH has resulted in more effective working relationships between specialist homelessness services and mainstream agencies, for example the Department of Housing and the WA Police * integration has been assisted by the development and implementation of the State Homelessness Plan and Regional Homelessness Plans.   The NPAH also provided capital funds for a major rebuild of St Bartholomew’s House (St Bart’s) which was completed in 2012. This has resulted in one of Australia’s leading innovative social housing projects, providing a place where 148 people have the essential support they need to rebuild their lives; break the cycle of homelessness or age with dignity and comfort.  The St Bart’s facility provides new housing options for people who are homeless, including clients of Street to Home. The seven storey facility houses a combination of 40 aged care, 12 crisis, 42 transitional and 54 independent living accommodation units, along with administration offices, roof top gardens and recreation areas.  Refurbishment of the previous St Bart’s building will see the provision of accommodation for older homeless women, thus responding to the growing need in this demographic. | |
| **“** | South Australian Government comments | | **”** | |
| In 2012–13, South Australia consolidated the implementation of its state-wide reform of the homelessness sector. Consolidating both National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness and National Affordable Housing Agreement funding, allowed the delivery of coordinated homelessness outcomes as a sector-wide, integrated homelessness response to ensure people have access to safe and sustainable housing.  South Australia now has a Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) sector comprising of 76 service delivery programs delivered through 97 service outlets, that delivers a consistent suite of support and accommodation services to priority population groups in all metropolitan and regional areas. Each region is covered by local agencies catering to Generic, Youth, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Domestic and Aboriginal Family Violence target groups.  Complementing this regional structure is a state and metro-wide network of services (including three specialist gateway services) which also responds to sub-groups within the key priority populations, such as young people and adults exiting custodial settings, children with complex needs and transient Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.  The aim of the SHS sector in South Australia is to respond to clients as a single integrated sector. A client can receive an intake at one service and only be required to tell their story once as each agency acts as a gateway into the SHS sector.  This capacity is facilitated by Homeless2Home (H2H), a web-based case management and client information system which enables agencies to electronically coordinate referrals and case management, as well as collect data for monitoring sector-wide service activity and client outcomes. The investment of funding into the design and development of H2H has been a critical element of South Australia’s implementation plan. South Australia has also expended significant effort in enhancing the capacity of SHS through a dedicated professional development and training program for staff and the further enhancement of contract performance management guidelines.  A number of new South Australian developments were opened in 2012–13 for people who are homeless, or at risk of homelessness. *youth110* is a youth crisis accommodation service comprising of 30 one and two bedroom apartments for medium-term transitional accommodation. The service commenced operation in August 2012 with the facility operated by St John’s Youth Services Incorporated. *youth110* was recognised as a finalist in the 2013 National Homelessness Services Achievement Awards held in May 2013.  Common Ground Adelaide and Housing SA worked in partnership to deliver the Common Ground model of housing in Port Augusta, the first regional Common Ground model of housing in the world. Boston Street, officially opened in December 2012, provides 15 refurbished one and two bedroom units for adult tenants. | |
| **“** | Tasmanian Government comments | **”** | |
| Tasmania has the lowest homelessness rate in Australia at 32 per 10 000 of the Tasmanian population compared with the national average of 49 per 10 000, according to the 2011 census. The State Government continues to work closely with both the community sector and the Australian Government to deliver long-term solutions to homelessness.  Significant investment in housing and homelessness support services continues to deliver positive outcomes for those Tasmanians who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. A total of $5.82 million is being invested in homelessness services over the current financial year through an extension to the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness between the State and Australian Governments. Unprecedented State and national investment in affordable housing has delivered more than 1550 new affordable energy efficient homes for low income Tasmanians since January 2009 with over 1000 more due by 2016. This includes five new supported accommodation facilities across Tasmania. The $14 million Trinity Hill redevelopment in North Hobart will provide independent living for 46 young Tasmanians who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.  Housing Connect – which started on 1 October 2013 – is transforming the way housing services are provided for clients in Tasmania. The new system makes it easier and faster for Tasmanians to access housing and support needs with one assessment for everything from emergency accommodation to a long-term home. Housing Connect’s common assessments, shared waiting lists and a more integrated service system are connecting people to the right services, providing more stable social housing tenures and preventing homelessness.  Housing Connect provides immediate assistance, assessment and intake services for people who need help with housing or are homeless. Ongoing support and additional services will assist those who are at risk of returning to housing crisis, for the duration of their need. It will reform the way Specialist Homelessness Services are provided in Tasmania.  During 2012–13 the Specialist Homelessness Services system performed well and improved in a number of areas. A total of 67.2 per cent of clients had a case management plan compared with 55.2 per cent nationally. This improved from 62.9 per cent in 2011–12. During 2012–13, 72.8 per cent of clients achieved some or all case management goals, up from 68.6 per cent in 2011–12. The percentage of clients who achieved independent housing on exit from a Specialist Homelessness Service rose from 52.1 per cent in 2011–12 to 53.6 per cent in 2012-13. Only 4.6 per cent experienced repeat episodes of homelessness in Tasmania– an improvement on last year’s 5 per cent.  The performance of Tasmania’s homelessness services also improved in 2012‑13 with better employment and income outcomes for clients following support. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | Australian Capital Territory Government comments | **”** |
| The focus of 2012–13 continued to be reform, with the consolidation of reforms to youth homelessness, the continuation of reforms in response to reduction in funding through the National Affordable Housing Agreement and the final year of the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH).  The ACT Government has been working in consultation with homelessness service providers to develop and implement a new funding model. The model, developed on the basis that there will be no reduction in accommodation places for people experiencing homelessness, provides a consistent, transparent and equitable funding framework. The ACT Government has been working closely with organisations on the effect reduced funding will have on programs, staff and service delivery. New service funding agreements were finalised in November 2013 and the sector is transitioning to new models of service.  The one year transitional NPAH was finalised during 2012–13, allowing the continuation of support to key groups identified in the Homelessness White paper, including: rough sleepers, people experiencing homelessness more than once, people experiencing violence, especially women and children, children and young people including those exiting care and protection, Indigenous people, and people exiting social housing, institutional care such as health and mental health services, juvenile justice, or adult prisons. Continued reform is focussing on an effective service system that supports people across the continuum from prevention through to stabilisation and maintenance. The key strategies implemented for the final year of the NPAH included a stronger focus on early intervention and prevention; a better integrated services system; and breaking the cycle of homelessness.  First Point, the ACT’s centralised access service for people who are experiencing, or at risk of homelessness was in its second year of operation in 2012–13, managing demand through a priority waiting list that provides access to homelessness services to clients with the greatest needs. Needs based prioritisation of service means not all those seeking accommodation are able to be housed. However First Point’s policy of ‘no turn away’ for all eligible clients facilitates access to other supports for those clients. This is reflected in the strong focus on assistance to sustain existing housing. Performance indicator results should be interpreted in the light of this substantially different service model in operation in the ACT. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Northern Territory Government comments |  |
| **“** | The Northern Territory and Australian Governments invested $54.9 million over five years (2008–09 to 2012–13) to deliver 22 initiatives under the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH). This investment was strategically directed towards projects that provided significant capital growth and service model delivery in areas of greatest need. Achievements of note under the NPAH include:   * assisting over 800 households to sustain successful tenancies through the Tenancy Sustainability Program * providing a response to over 80 young people at risk of homelessness, through youth support services in Katherine, Palmerston and Tennant Creek * providing medium term transitional managed and supported accommodation in a total of 70 units in Alice Springs, and 18 beds in Darwin * providing 66 beds for short term accommodation at Akangkentye Hostel South Terrace Alice Springs.   The Northern Territory Government contributed to negotiations for a transitional NPAH, in anticipation of a longer term funding partnership being negotiated during 2013–14.  In addition, during 2012–13, the Northern Territory allocated over $6 million to support non-government organisations to deliver specialist homelessness services across the Northern Territory under the National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA). This represents a joint contribution from the Australian and Northern Territory governments.  In 2012–13, the Department of Housing continued to deliver group and intensive one-on-one training and support to over 150 homelessness service providers across the Territory participating in the Specialist Homelessness Services Collection (SHSC). The SHSC reported a total of 6959 clients assisted through homelessness services funded through the NAHA and the NPAH.  In partnership with NT Shelter, the Northern Territory Government sponsored the Homelessness Summit in October 2012. With over 140 attendees, this annual event brings together specialist homelessness service providers and other stakeholders to share ideas and strategies for reducing homelessness in the Northern Territory. | **”** |

**18.6 Definitions of key terms**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Based on the SHS client collection*** | |
| **Age** | Age is calculated as age of the client on the start date of their first support period of the reporting period or the first date of the reporting period, whichever of the two is the later date. |
| **Client** | A person who receives a specialist homelessness service. A client can be of any age―children are also clients if they receive a service from a specialist homelessness agency.  To be a client, the person must directly receive a service and not just be a beneficiary of a service. Children who present with a parent or guardian and receive a service are considered  to be a client. This includes a service that they share with their parent or guardian such as meals or accommodation.  Children who present with a parent or guardian but do not directly receive a service are not considered to be clients. This includes situations where the parent or guardian receives assistance to prevent tenancy failure or eviction. Clients can be counted differently according to the data item that is being reported:   * Clients (demographic)—For clients with multiple support periods, reported data is determined based on the information at the start date of the client’s first support period in the reporting period or the first date of the reporting period, whichever is later * Clients (counted by support periods)—For each data item, clients are counted based on support periods with distinct client information. The same client can be counted more than once if they have multiple support periods with a different response for the data item. The result is that percentages do not add up to 100 * Clients (outcomes) - Clients are counted based on closed support periods where a valid response is recorded both when presenting to an agency and at the end of support. |
| **Closed support period** | A support period that had finished on or before the end of the reporting period — 30 June 2013. |
| **Indigenous status** | In practice, it is not realistic to collect information on the community acceptance of part of ‘The Commonwealth Definition’ and therefore standard questions on Indigenous status relate to descent and self-identification only.  Where Indigenous status is not stated, the ‘not stated’ figure includes clients where contradictory Indigenous status’ were reported across multiple support periods as well as, missing, ‘not applicable’ and ‘don’t know’ responses. |
| **Labour force status** | Reported data excludes clients aged under 15. |
| **Main source of income** | Reported data excludes clients aged under 15. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Non-main English speaking countries** | Non-main English speak countries are all countries except Australia, United Kingdom, Republic of Ireland, New Zealand, Canada, United States of America and South Africa. |
| **No tenure** | A type of housing tenure recorded for clients who are sleeping rough or do not have a legal right to occupy a dwelling and may be asked to leave at any time. It includes couch surfing, living in an institutional setting, living on the streets, sleeping in parks, squatting, using cars or railway carriages, improvised dwellings or living in long grass. |
| **Non-conventional accommodation** | Non-conventional accommodation is defined as:   * living on the streets * sleeping in parks * squatting * staying in cars or railway carriages * living in improvised dwellings * living in long grass.. |
| **Ongoing support period** | A support period is considered ongoing at the end of the reporting  period if each of the following conditions is met:   * no support end-date is provided * no after-support information is provided * corresponding client data was received in the month following the end of the reporting period. |
| **Real expenditure** | Actual expenditure adjusted for changes in prices. Adjustments are made using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (2012-13 = 100). The GGFCE replaces the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) implicit price deflator used in previous editions. |
| **Recurrent funding** | Funding provided by the Australian, State and Territory governments to cover operating costs, salaries and rent. |
| **Referral** | When an agency contacts another agency and that agency accepts the person concerned for an appointment or interview. A referral is not provided if the person is not accepted for an appointment or interview. |
| **Reporting period** | For the purposes of this report the reporting period is the  financial year-to-date (FYTD):1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013. |
| **Short-term or emergency accommodation** | Short-term or emergency accommodation  includes:   * refuges * crisis shelter * couch surfing * living temporarily with friends and relatives * insecure accommodation on a short-term basis * emergency accommodation arranged by a specialist homelessness • agency (e.g. in hotels, motels etc.).   The following short-term accommodation options are not included:   * hotels, motels, caravan parks and other temporary accommodation used when a person is on holiday or travelling * custodial and care arrangements, such as prisons and hospitals * temporary accommodation used by a person while renovating usual residence or building a new residence (e.g. weekenders, caravans). |
| **Specialist homelessness agency** | An organisation that receives government funding to deliver specialist homelessness services. Assistance is provided to clients aimed at responding to or preventing homelessness. Agencies may also receive funding from other sources.  Inclusion of agencies in the SHSC is determined by the state and territory departments responsible for administering the government response to homelessness. Not all funded agencies are required to participate in data collection. |
| **Specialist homelessness service(s)** | Assistance provided by a specialist homelessness agency  to a client aimed at responding to or preventing homelessness. The specialist homelessness services that are in scope for this collection and that may be provided during a support period are:  *Housing/accommodation services:*   * short-term or emergency accommodation * medium-term/transitional housing * long-term housing * assistance to sustain tenancy or prevent tenancy failure or eviction * assistance to prevent foreclosures or for mortgage arrears.   *General assistance and support services:*   * assertive outreach * assistance to obtain/maintain government allowance * employment assistance * training assistance * educational assistance * financial information * material aid/brokerage * assistance for incest/sexual * assistance for domestic/family violence * family/relationship assistance * assistance for trauma * assistance with challenging social/behavioural problems * living skills/personal development * legal information * court support * advice/information * retrieval/storage/removal of personal belongings * advocacy/liaison on behalf of client * school liaison * child care * structured play/skills development * child contact and residence arrangements * meals * laundry/shower facilities * recreation * transport * other basic assistance.   *Specialised services:*   * child protection services * parenting skills education * child-specific specialist counselling services * psychological services * psychiatric services * mental health services * pregnancy assistance * family planning support * physical disability services * intellectual disability services * health/medical services * professional legal services * financial advice and counselling * counselling for problem gambling * drug/alcohol counselling * specialist counselling services * interpreter services * assistance with immigration services * culturally specific services * assistance to connect culturally * other specialised services. |
| **Support period** | The period of time a client receives services from an agency is referred to as a support period. A support period starts on the day the client first receives a service from an agency. A support period ends when:   * the relationship between the client and the agency ends * the client has reached their maximum amount of support the agency can offer * a client has not received any services from the agency for a whole calendar month * and there is no ongoing relationship.   Where a client has an appointment with the agency which is more than a calendar month in the future, then it is not necessary to close the support period. This is because it is expected that there is an ongoing relationship with the client. The end of the support period is the day the client last received services from an agency. |
| **Unmet demand** | A homeless person who seeks supported accommodation or support, but is not provided with that supported accommodation or support. The person may receive one-off assistance. |

**18.7 List of attachment tables**

Attachment tables are identified in references throughout this chapter by an ‘18A’ prefix (for example, table 18A.1 is table 1). Attachment tables are provided on the Review website (www.pc.gov.au/gsp).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 18A.1** | Composition of support provided, all clients |
| **Table 18A.2** | Nominal expenditure on homelessness services |
| **Table 18A.3** | Total recurrent expenditure on homelessness services (2012–13 dollars) |
| **Table 18A.4** | Real recurrent homelessness expenditure per person in the residential population (2012–13 dollars) |
| **Table 18A.5** | Proportion of Indigenous clients among all clients whose needs for accommodation and services other than accommodation were met |
| **Table 18A.6** | Proportion of clients born in non-main English speaking countries (non-MESC) among all clients whose needs for accommodation and services other than accommodation were met |
| **Table 18A.7** | Proportion of Indigenous/non-MESC clients represented in specialist homelessness services and in the population |
| **Table 18A.8** | Average daily unassisted requests for accommodation and services other than accommodation |
| **Table 18A.9** | Proportion of clients with unmet needs for accommodation and services other than accommodation |
| **Table 18A.10** | Proportion of clients with a case management plan, all clients |
| **Table 18A.11** | Proportion of Indigenous clients with a case management plan |
| **Table 18A.12** | Closed support periods, support needs of clients, all clients |
| **Table 18A.13** | Closed support periods, support needs of Indigenous clients |
| **Table 18A.14** | Closed support periods, support needs of clients born in non-MESC |
| **Table 18A.15** | Closed support periods, proportion of clients aged 12 to 18 years who needed education and/or training assistance who were undertaking formal study or training after support, before and after support |
| **Table 18A.16** | Recurrent cost per completed support period (2012–13 dollars) |
| **Table 18A.17** | Recurrent cost per client accessing homelessness services (2012–13 dollars) |
| **Table 18A.18** | Recurrent cost per day of support for clients |
| **Table 18A.19** | Closed support periods, proportion of clients who needed employment and/or training assistance, by labour force status before support, and by full/part time employment status after support |
| **Table 18A.20** | Closed support periods, proportion of Indigenous clients who needed employment and/or training assistance, and who were employed after support |
| **Table 18A.21** | Closed support periods, proportion of clients who needed employment and/or training assistance and who were unemployed or not in the labour force before support, who were employed after support, by labour force status |
| **Table 18A.22** | Closed support periods, proportion of clients who needed income assistance and who had an income source after support |
| **Table 18A.23** | Closed support periods, proportion of Indigenous clients who needed income assistance and who had an income source after support |
| **Table 18A.24** | Closed support periods, proportion of clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing, type of tenure before and after support |
| **Table 18A.25** | Closed support periods, proportion of Indigenous clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing and who obtained or maintained independent housing after support |
| **Table 18A.26** | Closed support periods, proportion of clients who were living in non-independent housing before support who obtained independent housing after support |
| **Table 18A.27** | Closed support periods, proportion of clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing and who achieved independent housing after support, and did not present again with a need for accommodation within the reporting period, by tenure type after support |
| **Table 18A.28** | Closed support periods, proportion of Indigenous clients who needed assistance to obtain or maintain independent housing and who achieved independent housing after support, and did not present again with a need for accommodation within the reporting period, by tenure type after support |
| **Table 18A.29** | Proportion of clients experiencing homelessness who had repeat periods of homelessness |
| **Table 18A.30** | Proportion of Indigenous clients experiencing homelessness who had repeat periods of homelessness |
| **Table 18A.31** | Case management goals achieved after support, all clients |
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1. Social housing includes public and community housing. For further information on these forms of housing assistance, see chapter 17 (box 17.1). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The ABS categorises a dwelling as severely overcrowded if it requires four or more extra bedrooms to accommodate the number of people who usually live there, based on the Canadian National Occupancy Standard (ABS 2012b). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Post Enumeration Survey (PES) only covers people in private dwellings at the time of the PES and therefore cannot be used to estimate underenumeration of the homeless population in the Census (ABS 2012c). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)