Attachment 2. Evaluation plan

1.1. The evaluation approach

The approach to this evaluation drew from a combination of Developmental Evaluation and more traditional evaluative approaches. Developmental Evaluation is a useful to guide evaluations in the social innovation space, allowing for flexibility and learnings to be incorporated throughout the evaluation period. The aspects of this evaluation which are consistent with a Developmental Evaluation approach included the incorporation of a mid-point reflection meeting, and taking a flexible approach to methodology, including by adjusting the data collection tools and Key Evaluation Questions as the prototype evolved.

1.2. Purpose and audience

The purpose of the evaluation is to provide an assessment of the progress and to capture emergent outcomes and learnings from the service prototype to date. Clear Horizon worked with TACSI to evaluate **the first two** of four testing cycles, which coincided with the project reporting deadline. The evaluation audience and information needs are in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Evaluation audience

Audience	Information needs
Funder: National Disability Services (NDS)	• **Client and staff outcomes:** To understand what learning and outcomes (if any) have been achieved for staff towards increasing client and staff satisfaction. • **Business model outcomes (organisational sustainability):** How sustainable the innovation is. • **Implementation:** To understand how the social innovation process and methods applied in the project have worked (or not) to engage, set up governance and develop shared service delivery solutions.
Service delivery partners	• Similar to NDS in regards to effectiveness. • Learning from each other's practice.
TACSI	• Similar to NDS.
Clients	• **Learning:** To understand if client's needs are being met

1.3. Key evaluation questions

There are four Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs) that guide this evaluation. In forming the KEQs, particular emphasis was given to meeting the information needs of the funder. The KEQs and sub-questions fit into three areas of enquiry: client and staff outcomes, business model outcomes and implementation.

Client and staff outcomes

1. Does the prototype of the service model at least maintain the level of support for people with disabilities?

2. Does the prototype of the service model result in positive outcomes for staff?

    a. To what extent are the On-Call workers and support workers better managing rostering, client support and decision-making?

    b. To what extent is the prototype resulting in positive outcomes for Managers and Team Leaders?

Business model outcomes

3. Does the prototype of the service model contribute to the sustainability of the organisation?

    a. What is the business model and how has it changed over time?

    b. To what extent did the organisations involved learn and benefit from participation in the program?

    c. What has been learnt around what it takes to do shared service delivery between the participating organisations?

    d. What has been learnt about what it takes to do shared service delivery that can be transferred to other contexts?

Implementation

4. How well have the social innovation processes and methods worked to engage and foster learning and collaboration between participating organisations?

    a. What were the strengths and weaknesses of project design and delivery?

    b. What could be improved?

1.4. Performance expectations

At the time of evaluation, only Cycles 1 and 2 of the prototype were completed. Thus at this stage of project delivery, it is only expected that outputs and some intermediate outcomes will have been achieved from the Theory of Change (see Figure 1). To achieve the end of program outcomes, the project would need to run beyond the four test cycles for at least 12 months. For this evaluation the prototype will be judged as a success if it is on track to achieve the end of project outcomes; more specifically, if there is evidence that there is learning between organisations about feasible, desirable and viable practice leading to:

- the On-Call worker and support workers better managing rostering, client support and decision making
- Support workers beginning to demonstrate independent decision-making
- the business model and back of the envelope analysis being developed

1.5. Methodology and limitations

Methodology

The following methodology was completed for the evaluation:

5. Developing the Evaluation Plan, including clarifying the audience, purpose, program logic and KEQs.

6. Initial collection of data, including: four interviews conducted by Clear Horizon with a total of five Managers and Team Leaders from all three organisations; four interviews with support workers from across the organisations conducted by their Managers; reflection logs completed by the On-Call workers after cycle 1 (n=1) and cycle 2 (n=3); informal reflections from TACSI (by teleconference). The data collection tools are presented in Appendix 2.

7. Initial analysis of data using thematic coding and cluster analysis.

8. A reflection workshop with key leadership from the three organisations, one On-Call test worker and three TACSI staff in attendance to validate existing data, collect additional data, and draft findings. The reflection workshop agenda is presented in Appendix 3.

9. Synthesis of evidence from reflection workshop and prior analysis against key evaluation questions to form the basis of the findings.

10. Development of the Evaluation Report.

Limitations to the evaluation

Limited range of views at the reflection workshop

Managers and one Chief Executive from the three organisations, as well as one On-Call worker and three staff from TACSI were present at the reflection workshop. Greater representation from support workers and On-Call workers at the reflection workshop would have allowed for support worker and client perspectives to be better understood and incorporated into the evaluation findings.

Breadth of stakeholder interview data

It was expected that the evaluation would include firsthand feedback from clients who had participated in the prototype through interviews with Managers. Additionally, it was planned that the evaluators would conduct phone interviews with support workers. However, data could not be collected in either way. Clients were unable to be interviewed as the On-Call worker only received direct calls from one organisation and the one client who called during Cycle 1 and 2 was unable to take part in an interview. Four support workers were interviewed by Managers within the organisations. While the evaluators developed the interview guide for these interviews, there was no opportunity to further explore the support workers responses to each question which led to a limited understanding of their perspective.

Short timelines

As is common in social innovation the timelines for the evaluation were relatively short, compared with more traditional projects design processes, which left limited time for data collection, analysis and synthesis. This affected the extent to which the report could explore the prototype's outcomes.

Data collection tools

Support worker interview template

Title: Shared Services for On-call After Hours Support - support worker perspectives

Introduction

Instructions for the interviewer

The Australian Centre for Social Innovation (TACSI) is working with three disability service organisations (Community Living Australia, Lighthouse Disability and Lutheran Disability services) to deliver the Shared Services for On-call After Hours Support (SSOAHS) prototype. The SSOAHS project aims to support a higher retention of Team Leaders and support workers, and develop a service where clients are satisfied with the support they have received.

This interview is to be conducted with support workers who have spoken with the new On-Call worker in the last three weeks, since the beginning of Cycle 2 of the SSOAHS prototype. Answers are to be recorded on the interview sheet below. If necessary, the interviewer can ask follow up or prompting questions to explore the support workers' answer further. Feel free to attach additional sheets of paper if required.

The purpose of the interview is to capture support worker experiences of getting support from the new On-Call worker. Before beginning the interview, it is important that clients are read the consent information below and that verbal consent is received.

About the survey

Participation in this survey is optional and anonymous.

The purpose of this survey is to ask you to draw on your experience and perspectives about your recent experience speaking with the new On-Call worker. The information you provide will be used to inform learning and improvement for the program.

This interview is voluntary and anonymous, however due to the small amount of people being surveyed you may be able to be identified by information you provide in your answers. If you have any questions about the new on-call model or wish to withdraw your answers to the interview questions then please contact liz@clearhorizon.com.au.

Do you agree to participate in this survey?   Yes   /   No

These questions relate to your recent experience receiving support from the On-Call worker.

Question 1. Using the following multiple-choice criteria, how supported did you feel by the On-Call worker to make your own decisions about the appropriate action to take?

- € Very supported
- € Moderately supported
- € A little supported
- € Not at all supported
- € I don't know
- € N/A

Question 2. Why did you select the above answer?

Question 3. Using the following multiple-choice criteria, do you believe the support given by the On-Call worker resulted in improved support for the client(s)?

- € The level of support has significantly improved
- € The level of support has moderately improved
- € No changes to the level of support
- € The level of support has slightly worsened
- € The level of support has significantly worsened
- € I don't know
- € N/A

Question 4. Why did you select the above answer?

Question 5. Is there anything you like about the new on-call model?

Question 6. Is there anything you don't like, or you think could be improved, about the new on-call model?

Question 7. Which aspect of the on-call service is most important to you?

Question 8. Do you have any further comments?

Manager and Team Leader interview guide

Preamble

Hello, my name is [*interviewer name*] from Clear Horizon Consulting. We are working with The Australian Centre for Social Innovation (TACSI for short), to help evaluate the emergency after hours, on-call prototype which is currently being tested with three disability organisations including [name organisation].

We're looking to understand what's been working well and what could be done differently and iterated for the next prototype cycle.

We're keen to hear about your experience and perspectives on this so far.

The information you provide will be analysed together with other interviews and used to develop a short evaluation report. We won't be using people's names in the report and if there is anything you mention during the interview that later you want taken out, you can let us know and we'll do that. If there are any comments you would not like to be associated with please let me know so that I can ensure confidentiality.

Is this ok with you?

Background / introduction

11. Can you briefly outline your role both in [interviewee's organisation] and in the shared service prototype? *(Probe to test interviewer's understanding/assumptions around the prototype test)* (For Team Leaders) Could you please talk about your role in the prototype?

12. How would you describe your experience so far?

Most significant change

13. What do you think is changing as a result of the prototype?

    a. Of these changes, which is most important to you?

    b. Why?

Outcomes for clients and support workers

The next set of questions are about reflecting on the benefits (actual or potential) to support workers and clients as a result of the prototype.

14. As a result of the prototype, have you observed or are you aware of any change in the ability of support workers:

    a. To provide support to clients? *(Please describe what you've observed)*

    b. To manage shift changes (where applicable)? *(Please describe what you've observed)*

    c. To demonstrate independent decision-making? *(Please describe what you've observed)*

15. Have you observed or are you aware of any changes to client's level of satisfaction with support they've received since the prototype started? *(Please describe what you've observed)*

What's worked well and what can be done differently

The next set of questions relate to what is working well and what could be done differently for the next iteration of the on-call prototype.

16. What aspects of the shared service prototype have been working well?

17. What aspects can be done differently?

Lessons learned/improvements

18. What have you learned along the way and learned about the potential of shared service delivery:

    a. related to the three organisations involved in the prototype?

    b. in general?

19. Aside from what you have already told us, do you have any suggestions for the next iteration of the service prototype? *(Probe: are these suggestions context specific or do they apply to integrated delivery in general?)*

Closing comments

20. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make?