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We don't need RESEARCH!

We know what the PROBLEM is.

We know what the SOLUTION is!
KEY CHALLENGE:

Homelessness research has NOT had the impact on policy, practice and advocacy that it should.

HOW DO WE CREATE THE IMPACT?
Four Uses of Research

• Conceptual
• Instrumental
• Symbolic
• Process
Conceptual research

Contributes to the:
“subtle but potentially weighty shifts in knowledge, understanding and discourse, can be hugely significant in policy and practice settings, not just as a means to more instrumental impacts from research but as an end in themselves.”

(Sandra Nutley).
Conceptual research
**Instrumental use of research**

This refers to situations where research can be seen to have a direct and concrete impact on decision-making and actions by policy-makers and practitioners.

- Typically focuses on existing policies and practices
- Often involves program evaluation research that answers the questions:

  What works, for whom and in what contexts?
Hierarchy of Evidence

LEVEL 1
- Systematic Review

LEVEL 2
- Randomized Controlled Trials
- Quasi-experimental Studies

LEVEL 3
- Cost-benefit analyses
- Realist studies

LEVEL 4
- Case Studies with Evidence of Effectiveness
  - External evaluation with scientific rigour
- Case Studies with Encouraging Results
  - Internal or external evaluation that lacks scientific rigour

LEVEL 5
- Program Descriptions or reports with limited data or evidence
- Opinions, ideas, policies, editorials

BEST PRACTICES

PROMISING PRACTICES

EMERGING PRACTICES
A good example . . .
Symbolic research

... involves using research results to legitimate and sustain arguments, strategies and positions.
Symbolic research

THE REAL COST of HOMELESSNESS

Can we save money by doing the right thing?  Stephen Gaetz
Process use of research

... engaging in the research process (through program evaluation, for instance), can lead to changes in ways of thinking, alter attitudes about the use of research and raise questions about the value of different kinds of knowledge and evidence.
Research Evidence Matters!

You wouldn’t like me when I’m angry...

Because I always back up my rage with facts and documented sources.

-The Credible Hulk
Part 2

Co-Produced Pathways to IMPACT!
### 7. Evaluation

#### Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Users</th>
<th>Pageviews</th>
<th>Pages / Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98.03%</td>
<td>98.52%</td>
<td>75.04%</td>
<td>-11.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218,472 vs 110,321</td>
<td>146,146 vs 73,618</td>
<td>618,282 vs 353,224</td>
<td>2.83 vs 3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Visitor** vs **Returning Visitor**

**Jan 1, 2013 - Jan 1, 2014**

- New Visitor: 34.3%
- Returning Visitor: 65.7%

**Jan 1, 2012 - Dec 31, 2012**

- New Visitor: 34.8%
- Returning Visitor: 65.2%
Co-Produced Pathways to Impact

David Phipps, Joanne Cummings, Debra Pepler, Wendy Craig, and Shelley Cardinal
Part 3

The importance of Partnership & Collaboration
Community Engaged Scholarship (CES)

Research involving mutually beneficial partnerships with peers in other sectors is referred to as Community Engaged Scholarship. Researchers apply their knowledge, and draw on the knowledge of their peers, to address real world questions and contribute to solutions and new ways of knowing.
Research, Policy and Practice

Researchers

Policy Makers

Service Providers
Barriers to Uptake

• Limitations of conventional mechanisms of knowledge dissemination

• Barriers to utilization by potential users (policy, practice).

• Lack of meaningful engagement between these different worlds.

• Divergent & sometimes conflicting institutional cultures, goals, timelines, processes and practices.
Collaboration & Partnership
- Co-apps/Collaborators
- Institutional partners
- Decision Makers
- Policy Makers
- Lived Experience WG
- International relations
- Members/Supporters
- Funders

RESEARCH Priority Areas
1. Systems Integration and Planning
2. Housing and Models of Support
3. Youth Homelessness
4. Indigenous Homelessness
5. Prevention
6. Legal and Justice Issues
7. Measuring Progress
8. Knowledge Mobilization

KNOWLEDGE Mobilization
- Research Outputs
- Homeless Hub
- Marketing & Communications
- Sector engagement
- Government relations
- Training and Technical Assistance

RESEARCH IMPACT!
- Contributions to solutions to homelessness
- Better outcomes for people experiencing homelessness
Introducing the New Homeless Hub!

We're pleased to present the new and improved Homeless Hub website! Along with a fresh new look and more resources than ever before, we've made some structural changes to the site that make it easier to find information that is most important and relevant to you. Let's take a tour of the new Homeless Hub and its sections.

NEW!

SOLUTIONS

The information you need to make an impact on homelessness in your community.
Community Engaged Scholarship

CAEH Canadian Alliance to End Homelessness
Community Engaged Scholarship
Community Engaged Scholarship
Key priorities of our co-created Research Agenda – 2014-16

- Point in Time Count Toolkit
- Definition of youth homelessness
- Program Model Case Studies
- National Youth Homelessness Survey
- Data Management Support
- Prevention Framework
- Cost Effectiveness Study
Part 4
Youth Homelessness
Social Innovation Lab
Solving “Wicked Problems” through Social Innovation
The youth homelessness space represents an ecosystem with high potential for learning.
MAKING THE SHIFT

Youth Homelessness Social Innovation Lab
The MtS Framework for KTEE is based on the “Co-Produced Pathways to Impact” (CPPI) model, emphasizing the necessity of listening to stakeholders and valuing deep collaborations between the university and non-academic partners.
Our work focuses on a singular goal: to conduct and mobilize quality research that supports governments, communities and service providers to make the shift from managing the crisis of youth homelessness, to a focus on prevention and enabling sustainable exits from homelessness.
1. The establishment of a youth homelessness Social Innovation Laboratory to support the development of the knowledge base to help communities make the shift to prevention. This includes exploring a range of funding and relationship models, including social finance tools, to foster collaboration across sectors.

2. Conducting a series of demonstration projects on evidence-based and evidence-informed prevention interventions, including Housing First for Youth to demonstrate program model effectiveness at preventing and ending youth homelessness.
3. Providing youth participants with an intervention that will prevent and/or end their experience of homelessness. Individual outcomes include:
   - Enhanced educational participation and achievement
   - Stronger employment and labour market participation outcomes
   - Housing stability (tested quarterly)
   - Improved health and well-being
   - Strengthened family and community relations

4. Developing and disseminating to communities across Canada a comprehensive knowledge base on a range of systems-focused program models in the areas of prevention, housing and supports.

5. Informing homelessness policy and practice to support the scaling of effective youth homelessness prevention models and a Housing First model for Youth.
STRATEGIES & MULTIFACETED SOLUTIONS
PARTNERSHIPS

External to the Homelessness Sector

United Way Centraide
Canadian Mental Health Association

MaRS CENTRE FOR IMPACT INVESTING

Ontario Association of Children’s Aid Societies

Within the Homelessness Sector

American Bar Association
Baker McKenzie
UNICEF Canada
Canada
Adoption Council of Canada
Egale Canada

CAEH
Covenant House
CHRA ACHRU

National Learning Community on Youth Homelessness
Boys & Girls Clubs of Calgary

John Howard Society of Ontario
Choices for Youth
Raising the Roof
Chez Toit
Part 4
Research to Impact Cycle
Research to IMPACT Cycle

- Knowledge Synthesis
- Demonstration Projects and Evaluation
- Fostering Scale and Impact
- Knowledge Dissemination & Capacity Building

Impact Partnerships

Project Outcomes

Research IMPACT!
Knowledge Synthesis

- Assessment of current knowledge base
- Gap analysis
- Identification of innovative policy and practice
- Prioritization for:
  - Research
  - Demonstration projects
  - Resource development
What are the GAPS in knowledge?
Working with the sector ...

National Learning Community on Youth Homelessness

International scan of evidence
International scan of evidence

Preventing Youth Homelessness
An International Scan of Evidence

Kaillin Schwan, David French, Stephen Gaetz, Ashley Ward, Jennifer Akerman, & Melanie Redman
Canadian Observatory on Homelessness & A Way Home Canada
July 2018
Demonstration Projects and Evaluation

- Research and evaluation on program models
- Demonstration Projects
- Developmental and Outcomes evaluation
- Peer reviewed publication and dissemination of findings
PREVENTION

Demonstration Projects

- Enhancing Family and Natural Supports
- Youth Reconnect

Housing First for Youth Demonstration Projects

**Ottawa** - Housing First for Youth

**Toronto** - PREVENTION focus: Housing First for Youth leaving care

**Hamilton** - Housing First for Indigenous Youth (An Indigenous led project)
Program Design and Development
Research and Evaluation

Research:
- HF4Y Clinical Trial – interviews at three month intervals
- Control groups
- Quantitative and qualitative methods
- Outcomes tied to service and supports

Evaluation:
- Developmental Evaluation
- Outcomes Evaluation
“So many of our Indigenous young people have been impacted by various systems creating self doubt, low self esteem, insecurity, and a sense of worthlessness. Making the Shift has enabled us to focus on these areas to create a sense of community, an understanding of Indigenous Culture and identity and empowerment to know and feel they are not what the systems have dictated them to be”.

“Endaayaang is infused with culture from day one. Making the Shift has been very supportive in the development from grounding the project in ceremony to how the research will be captured in order to reflect a true Indigenous view.”

Sheryl Green, Aboriginal Youth in Transition Worker
Knowledge Dissemination and Capacity Development

- Resource development
  - Program Model Guides
  - Toolkits
  - Policy briefs
  - Evaluation framework
- Communities of Practice
- Training and Technical Assistance
- KTEE / Homeless Hub
- Community “Living Lab”
Resources

Program Model Toolkit

Training

FEANTSA Youth
Study Session 2017
Fostering Scale & Impact

- Communications and Marketing Strategy
- Community System Planning
- Community engagement strategy to identify local capacity and readiness
- Government relations strategy – policy & funding
- Private sector engagement & philanthropy
Implementation Science
Community System Planning

Government Relations
Research **IMPACT!**
The anticipated impact of addressing challenge(s)

**Project Outcomes**
- Research demonstrating policy and practice effectiveness
- Uptake of better policy
- Uptake of better interventions
- Supporting communities to transition from crisis response to prevention and sustainable exits from homelessness

**Research ** **IMPACT!**
- **Reduction** in youth homelessness
- Enhanced housing stability, life changes & well-being
- Inclusion and strengthened natural supports
- Enhanced participation in employment, training & education

[canadian observatory on homelessness]
[A WAY HOME | VERS UN CHEZ SOI | CAHA]
Maximizing uptake for the benefit of the Canadian population
OUTCOMES, IMPACT & BENEFITS

Where will we be in five years?

• We will be able to demonstrate the impact of our research agenda and outputs.
• We will have a solid understanding of the range of policy and practices supporting prevention and ending of youth homelessness.
• We will have conducted research and evaluation to build the knowledge base regarding what works, why, for whom and in what contexts.
• The knowledge we produce will be taken up by end users.
• We will begin to see the application of this knowledge to policy and practice.
• We will begin to see a reduction in youth homelessness
Program outcomes

1) Housing stability
   - Obtaining housing
   - Maintaining housing
   - Enhancing knowledge and skills regarding housing and independent living
   - Reducing stays in emergency shelters

2) Health and well-being
   - Enhanced access to services and supports
   - Improved health
   - Food security
   - Improved mental health
   - Reduced harms related to substance use
   - Enhanced personal safety
   - Improved self-esteem
   - Healthier sexual health practices
   - Enhanced resilience

3) Education and employment
   - Established goals for education and employment
   - Enhanced participation in education
   - Enhanced educational achievement
   - Enhanced participation in training
   - Enhanced labour force participation
   - Improved financial security

4) Complementary supports
   - Established personal goals
   - Improved life skills
   - Increase access to necessary non-medical services
   - Addressing legal and justice issues

5) Social inclusion
   - Building of natural supports
   - Enhancing family connections
   - Enhancing connections to communities of young person’s choice
   - Strengthening cultural engagement and participation
   - Engagement in meaningful activities
“Making the shift is in all aspects giving our Indigenous young people an opportunity to grow and learn the tools necessary to achieve a balanced wholistic lifestyle and ultimately paving the way to preventing adult homelessness.”

Sheryl Green, Aboriginal Youth in Transition Worker
“So many of our Indigenous young people have been impacted by various systems creating self doubt, low self esteem, insecurity, and a sense of worthlessness. Making the Shift has enabled us to focus on these areas to create a sense of community, an understanding of Indigenous Culture and identity and empowerment to know and feel they are not what the systems have dictated them to be”.

“Endaayaang is infused with culture from day one. Making the Shift has been very supportive in the development from grounding the project in ceremony to how the research will be captured in order to reflect a true Indigenous view.”

Sheryl Green, Aboriginal Youth in Transition Worker
“So many of our Indigenous young people have been impacted by various systems creating self doubt, low self esteem, insecurity, and a sense of worthlessness. Making the Shift has enabled us to focus on these areas to create a sense of community, an understanding of Indigenous Culture and identity and empowerment to know and feel they are not what the systems have dictated them to be”.

“Endaayaang is infused with culture from day one. Making the Shift has been very supportive in the development from grounding the project in ceremony to how the research will be captured in order to reflect a true Indigenous view.”

Sheryl Green, Aboriginal Youth in Transition Worker
Questions or Comments?
Checking our blind spots

November 6, 2018
CAEH
Matthew Morton, Ph.D.
March 16, 2018

The Honorable Tom Cole  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies  
House Committee on Appropriations  
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Rosa DeLauro  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies  
House Committee on Appropriations  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Cole and Ranking Member DeLauro:

In every American community, youth run away from home, are kicked out of their house, exit the juvenile justice system with nowhere to go, become orphans, or exit the child welfare system with no support to enable successful transitions to adulthood. Homeless children and youth are at high risk for developing physical, behavioral, and emotional problems and also becoming victims of sex and labor trafficking. Without assistance, homeless youth often end up in the justice system, and don’t have the means to get effective help. Addressing the needs of homeless children and youth is a critical investment in our children’s future.

A November 2017 ground-breaking report from the University of Chicago found that 4.2 million young people experienced homelessness in America over a 12-month period. This means that 1 in 10 young adults aged 18-25, and at least 1 in 30 adolescents aged 13-17, experienced some form of homelessness unaccompanied by a parent or guardian over the course of a year. Importantly, it also revealed that homelessness is just as much of a challenge in rural communities as it is in urban communities and that youth without a high school degree or GED are 4.5 times more likely to experience homelessness. Recent data from the National Human Trafficking Hotline also shows
Bring Others In
Voices of Youth Count is an national, mixed-methods research and policy initiative linking evidence to action to end youth homelessness.
22 partner communities
A multi-component approach

- **COUNTS**
  - 22 counties
  - 4k+ youth surveys
  - 500+ provider surveys

- **PREVALENCE**
  - 26k surveys
  - 150 follow-up interviews

- **INTERVIEWS**
  - 215 in-depth youth interviews

- **REVIEWS**
  - 57 evaluations
  - Policy analysis & consultations

Ending Youth Homelessness

---

CHAPIN HALL
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
Elevate the Punchlines
A broad & hidden challenge

1 in 10

Young adults ages 18 to 25 endures some form of homelessness in a year. Half of the prevalence involves couch surfing only.

1 in 30

Adolescent minors ages 13 to 17 endures some form of homelessness in a year. A quarter of the prevalence involves couch surfing only.

Rates of youth experiencing homelessness were similar in rural and nonrural areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth 13-17</th>
<th>Young Adults 18-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household prevalence in urban counties.</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population prevalence in urban counties.</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household prevalence in rural counties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: VoYC National Survey)
Rural youth homelessness looks different
Subpopulations with higher risk for homelessness

- **346%**
  - Youth with less than a high school diploma or GED had a 346% higher risk

- **162%**
  - Youth reporting annual household income of less than $24,000 had a 162% higher risk

- **83%**
  - Black or African American youth had an 83% higher risk

- **120%**
  - LGBT youth had a 120% higher risk

- **33%**
  - Hispanic, non-White youth had a 33% higher risk

- **200%**
  - Unmarried parenting youth had a 200% higher risk

(Source: VoYC National Survey)
Among youth experiencing homelessness, LGBTQ had especially high exposure to many adversities.

(Source: VoYC In-depth Interviews)
Blurry lines: youth & family homelessness

(Source: VoYC Brief Youth Surveys)
Tell a Bigger Story
3 in 4 homeless young adults first experienced homelessness as minors.

Only 1 in 3 youth assessed by homelessness systems get a housing program.

We know which youth are at greatest risk for homelessness.

The longer youth experience homelessness, the harder it is for them to exit.

Youth homelessness is the most common pathway into adult homelessness.
A public health perspective

Traditionally the focus of policy

- Prevention
- Crisis response
  - Early intervention
  - High risk & chronic
- Sustained exits
Opportunities across the continuum for research & action

- Better “front doors” & coordinated entry
- Strengths-based assessment & navigation
- Temporary housing
- Non-housing supports
- Low-barrier permanent housing options
- Ongoing support
- Cross-sector service delivery
- Address structural racism
- Reform public systems
- Screening & support
- Early intervention
- High risk & chronic
- Sustained exits

CHAPIN HALL
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
Thank you

www.voicesofyouthcount.org
e: mmorton@chapinhall.org

@mhmorton
Knowledge to Action: Mobilising Research to Impact on Policy

David Mackenzie
Upstream Project Australia [UPA]
We all work in silos

Dept of Justice
Dept of human services
Dept of Education
... researchers & academics
CHANGE MATRIX
CHANGE MATRIX

- Existing service system status quo;
- Largely crisis-oriented;
- Not involved with R or D;
- Business as usual.
### CHANGE MATRIX

**Existing service system status quo;**
- Largely crisis-oriented;
- Not involved with R or D;
- Business as usual.

**Services put up funding proposal for ‘new’ service models;**
- Not usually strongly evidence-based;
- Agency-focused.
### Change Matrix

**Existing service system status quo:**
- Largely crisis-oriented;
- Not involved with R or D;
- Business as usual.

**University research projects:**
- On service system;
- Not necessarily strong with policy recommendations;
- Weak on development.

**Services put up funding proposal for ‘new’ service models:**
- Not usually strongly evidence-based;
- Agency-focused.
CHANGE MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>RESEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing service system status quo;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Largely crisis-oriented;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not involved with R or D;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business as usual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Services put up funding proposal for ‘new; service models;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not usually strongly evidence-based;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agency-focused.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University research projects;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On service system;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not necessarily strong with policy recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weak on development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embedded R&amp;D;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University as partner;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experimental in real world – ‘living labs’;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• i.e. THE UPSTREAM PROJECTS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is a social problem?

Social problems are not just out there as objective realities; social problems are constructed by human actors making claims about what is a problem and what should be done about it.

Donileen Loseke – *Thinking about Social Problems*
Stephen Toulmin’s model
analysis of everyday argumentation

Joel Best – ‘contextual constructionism’
Cultural Definition of Homelessness?

…homelessness and inadequate housing are socially constructed cultural concepts that are located in time and in certain social and cultural contexts. The concepts are socially relative in the sense that they refer to realities that change over time, but not absolutely relative or arbitrary in a philosophical sense.

David MacKenzie & Chris Chamberlain – see Homelessness Definitions: An international Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Living Situations</th>
<th>Operational definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Housing</td>
<td>Living situations close to the margin of the minimum community cultural standard for housing and living arrangements in Australia</td>
<td>A highly overcrowded household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Living in impromptu dwellings on land the resident owns or is purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renting a dwelling not meeting regulations for a habitable dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Living in a permanently in a caravan park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Homelessness</td>
<td>People living in single rooms in private boarding houses - without a bathroom or kitchen and without security of tenure</td>
<td>Living in a boarding/rooming house with shared facilities and no security of tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent/ semi-permanent household (no members employed) renting in a caravan park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Homelessness</td>
<td>People moving between or living in various forms of temporary shelter including with friends and relatives with no where to live, emergency accommodation, crisis accommodation, hostels boarding houses used as crisis accommodation or caravan parks used as crisis accommodation</td>
<td>Transitional accommodation while waiting for access to affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary rent free occupation of house or flat by a person(s) with no other usual address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary accommodation with friends/relatives/acquaintances – ‘couch-surfing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency accommodation in hotel/motel or caravan park with a voucher from homeless agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless crisis accommodation or night shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Homelessness</td>
<td>People without conventional accommodation living on the streets, in squats, railway carriages, in cars, under bridges or in parks</td>
<td>Occupation of temporary improvised dwelling by a person with no usual address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sleeping in a disused building/ railway carriage etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sleeping in a car or van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sleeping rough in parks, on the street or under bridges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Australian cultural definition of homelessness: A revised model of homelessness based on shared community cultural standards embodied in housing practices.
HOW MANY HOMELESS YOUTH?

by David MacKenzie and Chris Chamberlain

A major problem for policymakers is how to assess the size of the homeless population. The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission report, "Our Homeless Children", suggested two estimates of the number of homeless youth on an average night: 20,000 to 25,000 based on informed guesswork, and a higher range of 50,000 to 70,000 based on a complex analysis of Australian Bureau of Statistics data. This paper attempts to adjudicate between the two estimates, by undertaking a critique of the method by which the higher figure was developed, and then producing an alternative estimate based on a new approach. The 50,000 to 70,000 figure is found to be too high, and a more realistic estimate is in the range of 15,000 to 19,000 per night.

In Australia, it is the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission report Our Homeless Children, which has set the agenda for public debate about youth homelessness in the 1990s. In the context of a wide-ranging inquiry, the commissioners ordered a specialist enquiry by Dr Rodney Fopp "to examine all available data and prepare an estimate of the numbers of homeless children and young people" (Burdeskin 1989, p.5). Fopp concluded that the minimum figure was 50,000 and that there could be as many as 70,000 homeless young people aged 12 to 24 each night (Burdeskin 1989, p.365). On the other hand, the commissioners proposed a figure between 20,000 and 25,000 (Burdeskin 1989 p.66). These dissonant estimates have created considerable confusion in the community. As Fopp has pointed out: "the press had a great deal of difficulty in coming to grips with..."
**Is it a case of Chalk and Cheese, Apples and Oranges?**

A response to David MacKenzie and Chris Chamberlain by Rodney Fopp

Dr Rodney Fopp is a senior lecturer in sociology at the University of South Australia. Dr Fopp is co-author of the 1992 publication ‘Homelessness in Australia—Causes and Consequences’.

**Introduction**

This following is a response to the paper by David MacKenzie and Chris Chamberlain entitled, ‘The Number of Homeless Young People in Australia’, published in this edition of National Housing Action. Their paper is a shortened version of a longer critique published last year in Youth Studies (MacKenzie and Chamberlain 1992).

The process adopted in this response is to deal, firstly, with the basic argument in their paper. After a brief outline of several less fundamental but nonetheless important issues, this response moves to an examination of the methodology used by David MacKenzie and Chris Chamberlain to establish their own estimate.

**David MacKenzie and Chris Chamberlain’s stated aim**

In two places in their paper, the authors state their aim. In the first instance it is ‘to assess the size of the youth homeless population using [their] definition, and to adjudicate between the estimates of 20,000 to 25,000 and 50,000 to 70,000 contained in the Burdekin Report’. (emphasis added). The second time the aim to ‘adjudicate’ occurs is in the work and Fopp’s ‘higher range of 50,000 to 70,000 ... on a complex analysis of Australian Bureau of Statistics data’. David MacKenzie and Chris Chamberlain have gone to considerable lengths to understand the methodology used to make the estimates for the Burdekin Report.

On the face of it, David MacKenzie and Chris Chamberlain seem to have a point: there does seem to be a discrepancy between the estimates made by Burdekin and Fopp. Moreover the media has used every possible variation of the figures, type of homelessness, and age, to sensationalise the issue and usually to demean and belittle young people and their parents. But who is to blame for the irresponsible coverage of the release of the Burdekin Report? Certainly, the media did not contact me.

**Responding to this adjudication**

Of central importance to this response are the estimates and the apparent discrepancy between Burdekin and Fopp. To that issue our first question is: do the estimates by Burdekin and Fopp refer to the same social reality? Or: do the two seemingly disparate estimates purport to estimate the same thing? Such questions are based on the premise
1. Name of School: 
State: [ ] Postcode: [ ]
Name of person filling out form: 
Telephone Number: 

2. Number of students in your School: 
   Males [ ]
   Females [ ]
   Total [ ]

3. Is this a rural/remote school with mainly Indigenous students? 
   YES [ ] NO [ ]
   If YES, include Indigenous young people as homeless if they move around frequently.

4. To the best of your knowledge, how many homeless students are currently attending your school? [Include those who have found accommodation, but who are in need of continuing support]
   Males [ ]
   Females [ ]
   Total [ ]

5. If you have no homeless students during census week, have you had any homeless students in the past 12 months? 
   YES [ ] NO [ ] Don't Know [ ]

6. Indicate where your homeless students are currently staying:
   A. Temporary accommodation or no conventional shelter
      Estimated numbers
      Friend's place [ ]
      Relative's place [ ]
      Moving around frequently [ ]
      Government supported accom. [ ]
      (e.g. crisis refuges, hostels, transitional housing, or SAAP community placement) [ ]
      Boarding house room [ ]
      On the streets, squat/car/tent etc [ ]
      Other [ ]
   B. Longer term arrangement, but homeless within last 3 months and needing continuing support
      Private rental flat/share house [ ]
      Boarding with friends/family [ ]
      Foster Care [ ]
      Back with parents [ ]
      Other [ ]

7. Estimate how many students are in each age group:
   Estimated number in each age group
   12 years [ ] 18 yrs [ ]
   13 yrs [ ] 19 yrs [ ]
   14 yrs [ ] 20 yrs [ ]
   17 yrs [ ] 20 yrs [ ]
   16 yrs [ ] 21 yrs + [ ]

8. Homeless students’ family situation before leaving home:
   Estimated numbers
   Biological parents together [ ]
   Single parent only [ ]
   Blended family (a parent with a new partner, either married or de-facto) [ ]
   Foster parent(s) [ ]
   Other situations [ ]
   Please specify…………………………
   • The following questions ask about factors thought to be associated with students becoming homeless.

9. How many of the homeless students in your school are Indigenous students? [ ]

10. How many of the homeless students have spent periods in the state care and protection system [currently or in the past]? [ ]

Thank you for your cooperation

Please return the Census forms on Monday August 14th 2006 to Fax (03) 9818 5249
Survey estimates 30,000 students homeless

By EMMA LONGO, social welfare reporter

Up to 30,000 young people could be homeless while trying to finish secondary school according to a national survey.

The study, by Dr Chris Chambertin, a sociologist from Monash University, and Mr David MacKenzie, of the faculty of social sciences at RMIT, found that there were 11,000 homeless secondary students at 1984 schools across Australia in that year.

In their report, the National Census of Homeless School Students, obtained by The Age, they estimated there would be between 30,000 and 35,000 homeless secondary students nationwide this year.

Most schools had more than 10 homeless students and claimed that they could not provide adequate support and welfare. Most homeless students came from one-parent families or, at least, those whose parents were in a fix or had separated. The average number of homeless was 28 in a school but some had up to 90 students without an adequate home.

Dr Chambertin and Mr MacKenzie said the main problem was that Australia lacked a national strategy on how schools should deal with the problem.

They will today call on the Federal Government and state governments for immediate action to tackle the problem, which they claim costs social, economic and geographic boundaries.

The high levels of homelessness extend to provincial cities, including Ballarat and Bendigo, not only metropolitan areas.

"Homeless youth have generally been thought of as "street kids". The fact that many young people become homeless while still at school has been overlooked," they said.

The key to tackling the problem was early intervention and prevention programs focusing on schools.

The possibility of innocence passed when homeless students dropped out of school because they lived beyond their social ties. They then ended up caught up in the homeless subculture, which involved petty crime, prostitution and drug dealing.

One per cent of government and Catholic secondary schools reported that they had had homeless students. The rest of the schools surveyed said they occasionally had homeless students.

The homeless students found:
- They lived from one to 17 per cent of all schools.
- Most were between 16 and 17 years old. The younger was 12.
- 64 per cent were living in family accommodation with friends or relatives.
- 99.9 per cent had recently become homeless.
- Eight per cent had no accommodation.

Homeless students set their sights firmly on a university place

Home-cooked meals and a good education are part of the deal for the thousands of Australian secondary students who are homeless.

Dale Mills, 16, and her friend Fiona Severson, 17, have been in their permanent family since they were in Year 11. Dale said she struggled through most of her secondary education with Government student support.

She dropped out of school soon after becoming homeless but went back when she was again motivated.

The biggest problem she faced was a secondary career without a family home was that she "had very little family support. I had to do everything with everything. I couldn't understand my studies."

She is hoping to get into an arts degree course at Melbourne University, where she has completed the VCE at the Northern Metropolitan College of TAFE, and is also hoping to get into an arts degree course. She wants to major in history and archeology.

She has been homeless since the beginning of the year because her father left Victoria for Queensland. Before that, he physically lived on the streets.

"I got my own flat for a while but that didn't last because I didn't have enough money. I lived with Hanson Youth. The services were fine but it wasn't a plan," she said. "I would get better off if I had my family around."

Trace Ho, a student at Frankston Secondary College, said that his family was not far from his father and his new family's home for two years.

She considers herself lucky than many homeless secondary students because she can go to her father's house even though he has been difficult to get along with his new family.

She has lived on her own since she was 18. "I move my dad and I do feel I've missed out on all the love and stuff like that," she said.
Homeless study shows need for school welfare

By ADELE MORIN

Up to 140 students in any typical city high school of 1,000 students are at risk of becoming homeless and up to 60 of them are at serious risk, according to a major study to be released today.

The 40 to 60 students considered at serious risk of becoming homeless would be experiencing family problems. Many of them would feel unsafe, some would have run away at least once, and most would be unhappy at home.

The study of 41,000 secondary students from 63 Australian schools reveals a higher than expected group experiencing serious family difficulties.

It shows the need for all schools to have effective welfare or pastoral care services, according to the authors, Dr Chris Chamberlain, of Monash University, and Mr David MacKenzie, of the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology.

In the Budget, the Federal Government abolished the $7 million-a-year Students at Risk program, which provided early intervention for students with family trouble.

The study, to be released at the First National Conference on Homelessness in Melbourne, also shows that in a typical country high school of 500 students, 50 to 60 students are potentially at risk of homelessness, including 20 to 30 in serious trouble at home.

The study shows that 60 per cent of the at-risk students are girls, contrary to teachers' views that boys are more in danger.

It shows that the biggest group of students - 45 per cent - is happy at home and appear in no danger of leaving or being thrown out. But a minority are at serious risk.

The students, from years seven to 12, filled out questionnaires designed to detect their vulnerability to homelessness. They were asked whether they had run away from home in the past 12 months, felt safe at home, would like to move out of home soon, felt happy at home, or got into a lot of conflict with their parents. Of the seriously at risk group, 90 per cent did not feel safe at home, 58 per cent had run away, 89 per cent reported a lot of conflict with parents, and 94 per cent felt either unhappy or ambivalent about home.

In each of the nine communities surveyed, some schools had higher or lower than the average numbers of at-risk students. But in about 80 per cent of the schools between 10 and 14 per cent of the students were potentially at risk of homelessness.

Students in middle-class suburbs were only slightly less at risk than students in working-class areas.
Homeless children on streets younger

By JULIE LEWIS
Education Writer

Homeless children in NSW are dropping out of high school younger than in other states, many to live on the streets, a new study suggests.

School support services for homeless students in NSW are “probably the least adequate in the country,” Melbourne-based researchers Mr David MacKenzie and Dr Chris Chamberlain claim in the first national census of homeless school students.

If they remain at school, the slide into a street subculture may often be averted and a return to the family is more likely, say to the researchers.

There are 2,910 homeless students in NSW high schools, according to the census figures.

While Sydney schools have 1,200 homeless students, there are also 100 in Wollongong, 200 on the Central Coast, about 120 in Newcastle and between 20 and 30 in country towns such as Wagga Wagga, Moree and Murwillumbah.

“If we don’t do something about early intervention the problem is going to get worse and worse,” Mr MacKenzie said.

The study, conducted in the final school week of May 1994, identified 10,440 homeless schoolchildren in the country. Not all students who are homeless are on the streets. They may be moving around between friends or living in refuges and temporary accommodation.

The researchers present their NSW findings for the first time today at a conference held by the Council of Social Service of NSW, titled The Home/School Divide: Where Welfare and Education Meet, at the University of Sydney.

The census of 1,948 high school students Australia-wide found that the level of homelessness among students in NSW schools was lower than the national average. Seven in 1,000 students in NSW schools were homeless compared with a national average of nine in every 1,000.

However, this was cause for concern not congratulation, Mr MacKenzie said. The researchers concluded that the lower level was due to homeless students in NSW schools dropping out sooner than in other states.

The numbers of students on benefits such as Austudy for homeless students and the homeless youth allowance in NSW also suggested the number of homeless youth overall was higher than the numbers in schools.

“When you look at statistics for benefits they don’t give any indication that homelessness in NSW is lower than other States,” he said.

He called for a school counsellor to be appointed to every school rather than one counsellor responsible for several schools, as at present.

A spokeswoman for the Minister for Education, Mrs Chadwick, strongly questioned the study’s findings.

Stressing that the minister had not seen the study, she said: “If they are saying there is one of the lowest levels of homelessness in our student population then that is good news.”

The argument that this meant homeless students in NSW were leaving school earlier than in other States “did not make sense”, she said.

The State Government had recently appointed an extra 200 counsellors and the ratio of students to counsellors, now one to 1,000, was the lowest in the history of public education in NSW.
Counting the homeless
2006
Victoria
‘a policy dark age’
National Youth Commission into Youth Homelessness

2007-2008

Launched first week of April 2008
ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION

This Project Summary represents a snapshot of the Australia’s Homeless Youth Project 2008, a collaboration between:

The National Youth Commission (NYC), the first national independent inquiry into youth homelessness since the Burdekin Inquiry in 1988. The National Youth Commission comprised of Major David Eldridge, Associate Professor David MacKenzie, Ms Narelle Clay AM and Father Wully Dethlefs. In 2007, the NYC held 21 days of hearings across all States and Territories. Altogether, 319 people gave formal evidence and 91 written submissions were received from community organisations, individuals and government departments. The NYC’s findings, including over 80 recommendations, are published in a major report, Australia’s Homeless Youth in National Youth Commission, 2008, downloadable from www.nyc.net.au

The Oasis, a major feature documentary, made by Shark Island Productions, in collaboration with ABC Television. Homeless young people participated in the film for over two years, courageously sharing their life experiences. www.theoasismovie.com.au

The Caledonia Foundation is a private philanthropic foundation with a focus on sustainable futures for young Australians, which funded the NYC, the education and outreach component of The Oasis, and the development of this report. www.caledoniafoundation.com.au

The National Youth Commission’s Australia’s Homeless Youth Report, and the feature documentary The Oasis were both launched during National Youth Week in April 2008.


AUSTRALIA IS FACING A CRISIS IN YOUTH HOMELESSNESS.

- Every night 22,000 teenagers are homeless - twice the number there was 20 years ago.
- One in two homeless youths are turned away from emergency accommodation every night because services are full.
- This is totally unacceptable in a country as prosperous as Australia.

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW.
“There is absolutely no excuse for us to be in a situation where we can talk about national policies on water and the environment, but we can't talk about some sort of coordinated and effective national policy for the most vulnerable, disadvantaged and marginalised people in our own community.”

Professor Brian Burdikin, Launch of the National Youth Commission Inquiry into Youth Homelessness, 8th March, 2007.
“It is a national disgrace that there are twice as many homeless young Australians now than in 1989 when the Human Rights Commission undertook its landmark inquiry. We need to set a national aspirational goal to address this situation. No young person should be homeless in a country as economically prosperous as Australia. Part of the economic surpluses from our prosperity needs to be used to eliminate homelessness. This is an achievable national goal.”

Associate Professor David MacKenzie, NYC Commissioner 2008.
Theory of Change: Policy Formation

RELATIVELY STABLE PARAMETERS
1. Basic attributes of problem area;
2. Basic distribution of resources;
3. Fundamental socio-cultural values and social structure;

EXTERNAL SYSTEM EVENTS
1. Changes in socio-economic conditions;
2. Changes in public opinion;
3. Changes in systemic governing coalition;
4. Policy decisions and impacts.

Degree of consensus needed for major policy change

Constrains
and
Resources
of
Subsystem
Actors

POLICY SUBSYSTEM

COALITION A

a. Policy beliefs
b. Resources

Strategy A1
Claims A1

Decisions by Government authorities

Institutional rules, resource allocations & appointments

Policy Outputs

Policy Impacts

COALITION B

a. Policy beliefs
b. Resources

Strategy A1
Claims A1
1973-1990: reports of Young people becoming homeless

1980: Senate Inquiry into youth homelessness

1985: National Homelessness Program SAAP

1994: Census of homeless school students


1997-2003: Reconnect Program

2007-2008: National Youth Commission (NYC) into Youth Homelessness

2010: The Geelong Project (TGP) begins

2018: Upstream Project Australia

2019: COSS Model scale-up beginning!

2018: NSW funding - $4.7m over 4 years

2018: TGP funded - $2.8m over 2 years
CHANGE MATRIX

RESEARCH

NO

Existing service system status quo;
Largely crisis-oriented;
Not involved with R or D;
Business as usual.

YES

University research projects;
On service system;
Not necessarily strong with policy recommendations;
Weak on development.

DEVELOPMENT

NO

Services put up funding proposal for ‘new’ service models;
Not usually strongly evidence-based;
Agency-focused.

YES

Embedded R&D;
University as partner;
Experimental in real world – ‘living labs’;
i.e. THE UPSTREAM PROJECTS.
The Geelong Project

A ‘community of schools & services’ [COSS] model

‘Collective Impact’
Foundations of the COSS Model

**COLLABORATION**

‘community of schools and services’

**COSS Model**

**EARLY IDENTIFICATION**

‘Population Screening’

**AIAD** – Australian Index of Adolescent Development

**PRACTICE FRAMEWORK**

- Multi-tiered;
- Flexible;
- Dynamic over time;

**LONGITUDINAL OUTCOMES MEASUREMENT**

- Reduced family conflicts & homelessness;
- Less early school leaving
### 'Collective Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Common Agenda</strong></th>
<th>All participants have a shared vision for change including a common understanding of the problem and a joint approach to its solution through agreed upon actions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Measurement</strong></td>
<td>Data collection and measurement of outcomes consistently across all participants to ensure efforts remain aligned and participants hold each other accountable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutually Reinforcing Activities</strong></td>
<td>The activities of participants may be different while still being tightly coordinated through a mutually agreed common plan of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous Communication</strong></td>
<td>Consistent and open communication amongst participants to build trust, assure mutual objectives and build common motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backbone Support</strong></td>
<td>A skilled staff and organisational form to build and manage the entire collective impact initiative by coordinating the participant organisations and activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The future requires
system reform

Place-based Collective Impact!

This is the Upstream Project!