

The Treasury

Budget 2017 Information Release

Release Document July 2017

www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/informationreleases/budget/2017

Key to sections of the Official Information Act 1982 under which information has been withheld.

Certain information in this document has been withheld under one or more of the following sections of the Official Information Act, as applicable:

[1]	to prevent prejudice to the security or defence of New Zealand or the international relations of the government	6(a)
[4]	to prevent prejudice to the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation, and detection of offences, and the right to a fair trial	6(c)
[11]	to damage seriously the economy of New Zealand by disclosing prematurely decisions to change or continue government economic or financial policies relating to the entering into of overseas trade agreements.	6(e)(vi)
[23]	to protect the privacy of natural persons, including deceased people	9(2)(a)
[25]	to protect the commercial position of the person who supplied the information or who is the subject of the information	9(2)(b)(ii)
[26]	to prevent prejudice to the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied	9(2)(ba)(i)
[27]	to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information - would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest	9(2)(ba)(ii)
[29]	to avoid prejudice to the substantial economic interests of New Zealand	9(2)(d)
[31]	to maintain the current constitutional conventions protecting collective and individual ministerial responsibility	9(2)(f)(ii)
[33]	to maintain the current constitutional conventions protecting the confidentiality of advice tendered by ministers and officials	9(2)(f)(iv)
[34]	to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions	9(2)(g)(i)
[36]	to maintain legal professional privilege	9(2)(h)
[37]	to enable the Crown to carry out commercial activities without disadvantages or prejudice	9(2)(i)
[38]	to enable the Crown to negotiate without disadvantage or prejudice	9(2)(j)
[39]	to prevent the disclosure of official information for improper gain or improper advantage	9(2)(k)
[40]	Not in scope	

In preparing this Information Release, the Treasury has considered the public interest considerations in section 9(1) and section 18 of the Official Information Act.

Track 1 Initiative Submission Template

This template seeks a summary of Track 1 initiatives going through Budget 2017. The template is structured based on the following:

- **Blue Fields:** This should be completed by agencies and is aligned with the six key elements introduced in Section 1 (type of intervention, case for change, expected returns, confidence in evidence, implementation and scalability, and understanding and demonstrating effectiveness).
- **Grey Fields:** This will be filled out by Vote Analysts and aligns with the multi-criteria assessment framework outlined in Section 2.

Track 1 initiatives are due on 31 January 2017. Contact your Vote Analyst in the first instance with any queries.

Vote	Social Development
Responsible Minister	Minister Adams
Initiative title	Creating Positive Pathways for People with a Corrections History
Initiative description	This funding will be used to purchase additional social housing places and support services, to be provided to people with a Corrections history who have completed an applicable Department of Corrections reintegration programme.
Responsible Vote Analyst	

Funding Sought (\$m)	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22 & outyears	TOTAL
Operating	1.111	2.453	3.951	5.583	5.146	13.097
Capital	-	-	-	-	-	-

SUPPORTING INFORMATION AND CONTEXT

This initiative seeks funding to provide social housing and support services to people exiting prison

The funding sought through this initiative will be used to purchase additional IRRS places so that ex-prisoners who have served a long sentence (more than two years) or who have frequent interactions with Corrections, are able to access stable accommodation, through the provision of a social housing (IRRS) place following their completion of a Corrections reintegration programme.

Funding is also sought to provide ex-prisoners being supported through this initiative with services to address any on-going issues that may be underpinning their offending. The support provided will build on the support they have received during their time in prison, with a view to improving their longer term outcomes and reducing negative government expenditure on this cohort. This is a high-liability cohort at risk of re-offending and moving negatively along the housing continuum, without targeted housing and provision of on-going support services.

The Department of Corrections is very supportive of this bid. MSD and the Department of Corrections (Corrections) are working together to develop the detailed design aspects of this initiative, such as developing the criteria for access to this support, and clarifying the role of a Corrections Case Manager and Probation Officer in the process. Where possible, ex-prisoners eligible for this support will be identified by their Department of Corrections Case Manager during the development of their reintegration plan while they are still in prison. Eligibility and need for social housing will be assessed using MSD's

business as usual process in which need for social housing is assessed using the Social Allocation System (SAS) criteria. Only people who receive a Priority A rating will be able to receive an IRRS place that has been ring-fenced for this cohort.

The support available through this initiative will be available to an ex-prisoner during or at their completion of one of the following Department of Corrections reintegration programmes, which have been selected as they support both a mix of short and long servers, and are available across all metropolitan centres in New Zealand:

- Supported Accommodation for Long-Servers: case management and up to 12 weeks transitional accommodation and support for long serving prisoners (both male and female prisoners, serving a sentence of two years or longer). This service is available in all metropolitan areas and some provincial centres. 356 places are available per year.
- Tiaki Tangata: this is a case management service for long-serving Māori prisoners. It provides transitional accommodation, employment support and assistance to re-engage with whānau and community. 160 places are available per year.
- Emergency Accommodation: provides short term (up to six nights) accommodation for high risk high need community offenders. There are a total of 250 places available at any one time, across the Northern Region, Hawkes Bay, Wellington, Christchurch and Invercargill.
- Out of Gate: navigational support for short serving prisoners and remandees who serve more than 60 continuous days on remand. The services start pre-release and continue once the offender has been released. A more intensive service is also available to offenders under the age of 25. There are 2,150 standard referrals each year, and 150 enhanced (the intensive services for young people). This programme does not provide accommodation and therefore people supported through this initiative would transition into their social housing place directly following completion of their sentence / period of remand.
- Reintegration Support for Short Servers: this is a wraparound case management service for short serving prisoners who are going to be released into West and South Auckland. This includes transitional and longer-term accommodation support and there are 100 places available each year.

Alignment with MSD strategic direction and programmes of work

A range of work continues to be progressed by MSD that is focused on providing people at risk of negative housing and broader outcomes with housing solutions. MSD provides housing support right across the housing spectrum – from short term emergency housing support, through to social housing and supported housing in the private market.

Funding an initiative to provide social housing places to ex-prisoners is well-aligned with MSD's focus on embedding a social investment approach for housing by learning specifically about what works to support different cohorts to achieve positive housing and broader outcomes such as sustained employment, reduced re-offending and a greater sense of community or social cohesion.

Supporting Offenders into Employment trial – MSD has implemented two trials, each taking a different approach, but both focused on supporting ex-prisoners into work by ensuring that they are work-ready and have the skill-sets to meet employer and labour market needs. The up-skilling and training provided to people supported through this initiative will be aligned to reflect labour market requirements, specific to the regions in which the trials are taking place. An externally contracted service is being implemented in Canterbury and an in-house intensive client support service will support up to 200 clients at any one time in Whangarei, Waitakere, Hastings, Palmerston North and Porirua. The two successful providers delivering the Canterbury trial are also social housing providers. However, provision of housing is not a specific outcome or milestone of the contract. If following the detailed design and RFP process, a successful provider is identified in the Canterbury region to deliver the Creating Positive Pathways for People with a Corrections History initiative, MSD will work with the provider to

ensure services are aligned and complementary and there is no duplication.

Alignment with other Budget Bids

[33]

MSD is also aware that there is a Track One Bid that has been submitted by the Justice Sector that seeks funding to support burglary prevention on both the victim (through target hardening) and the offenders (through provision of reintegration supports and cognitive behavioural therapy). MSD will work with agencies involved in this Bid to ensure alignment across the interventions proposed.

Feedback from the Social Investment Panel has been addressed as follows:

The panel queried MSD's ability to source the number of social housing places required to support this initiative. In response to panel feedback, MSD has scaled the initiative back to providing 250 new social housing places over four years, and would seek additional funding to scale up this initiative should it prove effective.

Demand

The Social Investment Panel indicated that it was supportive of this initiative as a Track One Bid as it provides an opportunity to enhance outcomes and reduce the Crown's liability through investment. MSD has worked closely with the Department of Corrections in the development of this initiative.

The panel queried whether the number of places sought will meet all of the currently unmet demand and asked for more specific information on what MSD knows about the housing needs of people exiting prison.

MSD does not ask specific questions about a person's criminal history in the housing needs assessment. This information could be provided in two ways:

- MSD asks about a person's current accommodation, and one of the options is 'prison/institution/hospital'
- MSD asks about whether someone is facing discrimination in accessing accommodation, and it may be recorded on an individual's case notes that they feel they are facing discrimination due to their criminal history.

This information does not provide an accurate picture of prisoner's demand for social housing upon exit from prison.

For the purposes of this initiative, to ensure that there will be sufficient demand for this support, information from a range of sources has been used:

- Text of Parole Board decisions (e.g. when release occurs despite unsatisfactory accommodation)
- Probation Officers' DRAOR assessments of offenders on parole or Release on Conditions orders (where current accommodation is rated as "unstable" or non-existent).

Aligned with estimates given in the Department of Corrections ITL Bid (outlined above), **it is estimated that there are 700 prisoners with an acute housing need released each year, based on these sources.**

Costing

MSD and Corrections has developed the costing for this initiative based on funding for places with a typology of one and two bedroom places (further detail outlined below) on the assumption that ex-prisoners who require a greater number of bedrooms are likely to be going back to be with families who already hold a social housing tenancy or have housing in the private market. This initiative is targeted at ex-prisoners who are single and do not have stable accommodation upon exit from prison.

The funding would enable MSD to purchase 250 places across New Zealand – half in Auckland, with the other half spread across the rest of New Zealand. MSD will continue to work with the Department of Corrections to develop a greater understanding of the regions that have the highest numbers of people exiting prison with an unmet housing need. This will include working with providers of reintegration programmes and providers of social housing, prior to the development of an RFP. MSD will also explore opportunities to undertake a data match through the IDI, if possible.

The breakdown of costs (total over four years) is \$11.347 for IRRS funding, and \$1.75m for services, totalling \$13.097m. MSD has sought on-going funding in out-years of \$5.146m to continue funding the additional IRRS places being purchased through this initiative.

An Intervention Logic Map is attached as Appendix One.

VOTE ANALYST OVERVIEW

Please provide a description of how well the initiative aligns with social investment principles (refer to section 1.2 of the guidance for a definition), whether the initiative has significantly changed from the November check-point and an overall view of how well the initiative has reflected feedback from the Social Investment Panel. Does the initiative have all the relevant supporting information?

[Vote Analyst to complete]

1. TYPE OF INTERVENTION

This is a cross-agency initiative that recognises the need for agencies to work together to meet the needs of highly vulnerable populations. Stable housing has a positive impact on the achievement of positive longer-term outcomes. For people with complex needs, support services are also required.

[33]

2. CASE FOR CHANGE

The target population is a high liability group, at risk of negative housing and other outcomes

The target population for this initiative is ex-prisoners who have served a long sentence or who have frequent interactions with Corrections (short-servers) who:

- are assessed as eligible for social housing and have a severe unmet housing need
- are participating in an eligible Department of Corrections reintegration programme.

Problem definition

Evidence shows that ex-prisoners can have difficulties reintegrating into the community. Particular challenges faced can include accessing sustainable housing in either the social or private market, obtaining employment, accessing education and developing pro-social connections. Each of these factors, and any combination of these factors, contributes to someone experiencing negative outcomes, including being in insecure housing or experiencing unemployment and being reliant on

benefit. In some cases, someone's release from prison is delayed because they do not have an address to go to.

It is estimated that there are approximately 700 people released from prison each year with an acute unmet housing need.

There is an opportunity to align this initiative with existing reintegration programmes funded by the Department of Corrections

The Department of Corrections has various reintegration programmes that support ex-prisoners to achieve positive outcomes. A number of these programmes provide short-term or transitional accommodation, as well as supporting ex-prisoners to access the services they need to successfully reintegrate into the community. The reintegration programmes seek to build on the support an ex-prisoner has received while still in prison.

Providers of reintegration programmes have said that for a range of reasons they face considerable challenges sourcing sustainable long-term housing for people following their completion of the programme. For example, affordability issues, a lack of supply, or discrimination faced by this cohort due to their criminal history.

The previous Minister for Social Housing asked MSD to develop an initiative that would better support people exiting prison into stable accommodation, given the challenges outlined above. In considering options, MSD considered whether this initiative could be progressed using existing IRRS places and the funding sought through this initiative fund services for the target cohort. However, given the significant supply shortage and that there are a range of different people with different needs on the register who have an unmet housing need, MSD consider that the funding of additional places is necessary so that there is not a directly adverse impact on other cohorts.

MSD is seeking funding to purchase new IRRS places, specifically for the target cohort

MSD is seeking to purchase additional IRRS places rather than ring-fence existing places. Using existing places to support this initiative would have a more direct impact on other people and households on the register who also have unmet needs. Purchasing additional places for this specific cohort means that there is a less of a direct impact on the register and other people in need.

How does this initiative align with the social investment approach and has this been used and applied with other previous interventions?

This initiative takes a social investment approach as it has a clear target population and is seeking to learn what works in supporting people leaving prison to experience positive long term outcomes, through the provision of stable housing and supports. Evidence is clear that there is a correlation between stable housing and positive outcomes for people who have served a Corrections sentence, but our understanding of causation is limited.

If MSD does not receive funding to support this initiative, people exiting prison who have completed a reintegration programme are more likely to progress backwards along the housing continuum and experience negative long term outcomes. For example, people may need to access emergency housing support through MSD, experience long-term stays in insecure or inadequate housing, and are more likely to be unemployed, be reliant on benefit, and to re-offend, resulting in a greater long-term cost to government.

[Agency to complete]

CASE FOR CHANGE ASSESSMENT

Please provide comments on how well the initiative and supporting information addresses the following:

- Definition of the problem or opportunity
- Outline of the existing services provided to the identified target population and what need/gap this initiative helps to address. Have other alternative options been considered?
- Description of the target population.
- Explanation of the outcomes expected as a result of the intervention (intervention logic) and robustness of evidence and assumptions underpinning this.

[Vote Analyst to complete]

3. EXPECTED RETURNS

The CBAX assessment demonstrates a 1.8 return on investment for government and a 1.8 Return on investment on social outcomes, as indicated in the CBAX analysis.

Impact Analysis

An explanation of who is impacted (winners and losers), what the impacts are (costs and benefits), and when the impacts will be realised and for how long. The impacts should be quantified and monetised if possible.

Costs Assumptions are based on:

- MSD being able to purchase 250 additional social housing (IRRS) places over four years
- Coming online over 48 months, from July 2017
- Assumed 50% of the places in Auckland and 50% across the rest of New Zealand
- Assumed costs for purchasing one bedroom, and some two bedroom places, across New Zealand
- Assumes \$7,000 per person of support services
- [38]
- Increases in rent over time are based on historical trends in Auckland and the rest of the country.
- Weekly rents are estimated as upper quartile of current social housing rents for the region and number of bedrooms.
- Income related rent (IRR) is estimated as average IRR for the region and number of bedrooms.
- The income related rent subsidy (IRRS) MSD pays is the difference between rent and IRR.
- [38]

Impacts and assumptions used in CBAX

These assumptions are based on the premise that without support through this initiative, these ex-prisoners would re-offend and/or be in in-secure housing / in a situation of over-crowding / experiencing some form of homelessness. The pre and post intervention levels are based on this counter-factual.

- It is assumed that 20% of released prisoners will enter employment in the six months following their release from prison, and sustain that employment for a period of at least 12 months with the supported provided through this initiative¹ – the associated tax impact is also included in the CBAX.
- It is assumed that 70 percent of ex-prisoners receive a main benefit – 42 percent of these are on JobSeeker Support.²

¹ A three year longitudinal study follow-up of 7,700 released prisoners found that around 80% have benefit spells for more than 12 months post release. For the purposes of this initiative, it is assumed that 80% of the remaining 20% are able to find and sustain employment.

- It is assumed that the remaining 28% of ex-prisoners on benefit are receiving the Supported Living Payment for the duration of this initiative.³
- It is assumed that for 50% of people supported through this initiative, their time spent in prison reduces from 16 nights in prison to 0.82 nights.⁴
- It is assumed that there is a reduced cost in police time for 50% of this population from 1.12 hours of time, to 0.41 hours of time.⁵
- It is assumed that there is a reduction in the need for emergency room treatment, from 2.06 to 1.83 visits per year for 80% of the target cohort, with an 80% success rate.⁶
- It is assumed that there is a reduction in inpatient hospital visits from 2.11 to 1.56 for 85% of this population, because without this intervention, it is assumed that their interactions with hospital would be at or very similar to the level for those who are experiencing homelessness, in the broad sense of the term.⁷
- It is assumed that there will be an increased need for GP care and that without support through this initiative, the target cohort would require 12.17 GP visits per year and through this initiative their need for this support will reduce to 8 visits per year.⁸
- It is assumed there will be a reduction in 'all other offences' (those not listed) for 50% of the target population, as a result of being housed, with a success rate of 80%, from 1 offences per person to zero.⁹

Non-monetised impacts that are not measured through the CBAX tool are as follows:

- More people exiting prison following a long sentence or who have frequent interactions with Corrections will have access to stable housing following completion of a reintegration programme
- People supported through this initiative sustain their social housing tenancy and experience greater stability and social connectedness
- Reduced reoffending by those supported through this initiative which results in a reduced cost to Corrections on this cohort¹⁰

² Based on findings from the 2015 Welfare Valuation, accessible here: <https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/newsroom/media-releases/2016/key-findings-2015.pdf>

³ As we do not have data on the benefit receipt type of the remaining ex-prisoners who are on benefit, for the purposes of completing the CBAX, it has been assumed that this group are receiving the Supported Living Payment, and that they receive this for the full four years of the initiative (as the average time on SLP across cohorts is 12.2 years).

⁴ Zaretzky et al. 2013 - At the base survey, prior to receiving 'Street to Home Support', single men had spent 16 nights in prison and at the 12 month follow up there was a reduction to 0.82 nights. This has been used to assess the reduced cost to Corrections if someone is provided with stable housing through this initiative. Without this support, current rates of re-offending are assumed i.e. that approximately 45% of offenders would re-offend within 48 months, and that this initiative is effective in preventing 75% of the target cohort from re-offending for half of the period of this initiative.

⁵ This is based on the assumption that provision of stable housing and supports means that 50% of the target population have a reduced interaction with the Police.

⁶ This is based on a counter-factual that if the target population did not receive housing and support through this initiative they would be in some form of an insecure housing situation and require emergency room treatment at a rate similar to people experiencing some form of homelessness.

⁷ Homelessness as defined here: <http://www.healthyhousing.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Severe-housing-deprivation-in-Aotearoa-2001-2013-1.pdf> and impacts as found by Zaretzky et al. 2013

⁸ The same assumption has been made with GP care as was with emergency department care (footnote 8)

⁹ Zaretzky et al. 2013 – 45% of offenders would re-offend within 48 months if not provided with stable housing. This is also supported by research in which ex-prisoners stated that they thought they would have re-offended if they had not been provided with stable housing.

- People supported through this initiative are engaged in education or training
- People supported through this initiative are accessing health services (including specialist services such as AOD and mental health services) funded through the support services aspect of this initiative
- People supported by reintegration services experience reduced re-offending and the Department of Corrections has estimated the return on investment for these programmes as \$3.91 per dollar spent
- The Budget for reintegration services for 2015/2016 is \$20.5m and it is anticipated that 4,300 people will be supported through this funding, over this period.

Impacts - Identify and list \$m present value, for monetised impacts	Option/scenario		Assumptions and evidence (quantify if possible, and use ranges where appropriate)	Evidence certainty ¹¹
	1	2		

Estimated impact on key outcomes				
This initiative will result in people who have been supported through a Department of Corrections reintegration programme sustaining a social housing tenancy and staying out of prison	70 percent age points		Being provided with a social house and support services means someone is able to sustain their tenancy and experience a range of other positive outcomes. General rates of re-offending are that approximately 48% of people re-offend within the first 12 months of exiting prison. With provision of stable housing and targeted supports people are able to build on the skills they have acquired in prison and build a positive life in their community.	High

Cost of the Initiative				
Total cost to purchase 250 IRRS places and support services	\$13.097			High

Government Benefits/(Costs)				
Reduced Justice sector (Justice, Corrections and Police) costs	\$25m		It is assumed that there will be a reduction in Police time and a reduced cost due to the reduced time someone spends in prison as a result of the support received through this initiative	Medium
Increased cost to Social Development	(6m)		It is assumed there will be increased costs to social development as people enter the benefit system following release from prison.	Medium
Decreased costs to Health	\$1m		It is assumed that there will be a reduction in health costs as people supported through this initiative are accessing appropriate healthcare.	Medium
Total Quantified Government Impact	\$20m			Medium

Wider Societal Benefits/(Costs)				
Accessing stable housing supports growth in			Reduced re-offending has a positive impact across communities as people feel safe and secure. People housed through this initiative	Medium

¹⁰ Usual rates of re-offending are that almost half of offenders will re-offend in a 48 month period (Department of Corrections study of almost 5,000 offenders between 2001 and 2003).

¹¹ Rate your level of confidence in the assumptions and evidence as high (green) if based on significant research and evaluations that is applicable, medium (amber) if based on reasonable evidence and data, or low (red) if there is little relevant evidence. Colour the rating box for each impact.

communities and safer communities through the reduced offending that occurs as a result of this initiative	High		are supported to build positive pro-social and community connections.	
People supported through this initiative are accessing education and training as a result of the support they receive	High Medium		The stability that comes with having a house supports people to have the confidence to enter employment or training which increases their income earning capacity and sense of independence.	Low
Increased sense of self-worth and well-being	Medium		People feel like they are valued members of society and want to give back to their community.	Low
Total Quantified Wider Societal Impact	Medium			Low
Net Present Value of Total Quantified Societal Impacts		-		Low

Impact Summary Table

Summary of monetised results [only fill this out if you have monetised costs and benefits]

Fill this table out with the NPV, benefit cost ratio and return on investment for your initiative. These can all be calculated with the information you included in the summary table above, and is available in the CBAx Output Summary (NB totals can vary due to rounding). We ask you to present all these measures, because they each provide a different perspective.

Use ranges for values where appropriate	Discount Rate	
	6% real (default)	3% real (sensitivity)
Net Present Value (NPV) ¹²	\$10m	\$11m
Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) ¹³	1.9	1.9
Return on Investment (ROI) – Societal Total ¹⁴	1.9	1.9
Return on Investment (ROI) – Government ¹⁵	1.8	1.8

Supporting Evidence

i.e., the bibliography

Andrews, G., Allnut, S., Basson, J., Butler, T., Sakashita, C., Smith, N. (2006). Mental disorders in Australian prisoners: a comparison with a community sample. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*. 40(1). pp272–276

Gonzalez, J., Nadine, C. (2014). Identifying barriers to mental health treatment and medication continuity. *The American Journal of Public Health*, 104(12). Pp 2328-2333

Clark, C. Dugdale, G. (2008) *Literacy Changes Lives – The role of literacy in offending behaviour*, London: National Literacy Trust.

Social Exclusion Unit. (2004). Retrieved from:

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/social_exclusion_task_force/assets/publications_1997_to_2006/seu_leaflet.pdf.

<https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/newsroom/media-releases/2016/key-findings-2015.pdf>

<http://www.healthyhousing.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Severe-housing-deprivation-in-Aotearoa-2001-2013-1.pdf>

Zaretzky, K., & Flatau, P. (2013). *The cost of homelessness and the net benefit of homelessness programs: A national study. AHURI Final Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-84894206826&partnerID=tZ0tx3y1>

¹² **Net Present Value (NPV)** - The NPV is the sum of the discounted benefits, less the sum of the discounted costs (relative to the counterfactual). This gives a dollar value representing the marginal impact on the collective living standards of all New Zealanders of the initiative, in today's dollar terms.

¹³ **Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)** - The BCR is the ratio of total discounted benefits to the total discounted costs. A proposal with a BCR greater than 1.0 has a positive impact, because the benefits exceed the costs. The BCR is the same as the Return on Investment Societal Total, unless there are negative impacts in addition to the fiscal cost of the initiative. All negative impacts are included in the denominator for the BCR measure.

¹⁴ **Return on Investment (ROI) - Societal Total** - Calculate the ROI by dividing the discounted net change in wider societal impact, including benefits to government, by the discounted cost of the initiative. This can be interpreted as the impact for New Zealanders per dollar the government spends on the initiative, eg, for every \$1 the government spends on this programme, New Zealanders receive benefits of \$3.

¹⁵ **Return on Investment (ROI) – Government** – Calculate the ROI by dividing the discounted net change in impact for the government by the discounted cost of the initiative. This measures the discounted net marginal (fiscal) benefits to the government.

4. CONFIDENCE IN EVIDENCE

Sensitivity analysis and confidence intervals

As the evidence is of a medium quality, MSD considers that there is a firm basis for the assumptions presented. This reflects the information presented above. The Department of Corrections has provided valuable data to support the development of this initiative, both information on prison exits, types of sentences and provider milestone reporting in relation to meeting accommodation related milestones, as well as anecdotal evidence from providers about the challenges faced securing stable accommodation for ex-prisoners once they have completed a reintegration programme.

MSD has a sound knowledge of current social housing tenants and the supports and services they are likely to require, and has based its assumptions for this initiative on that data, including rates and duration of benefit receipt and information about current market rents and contracting to inform development of indicative costings for this initiative.

Rent and IRRS payments are subject to change. However, projected rent increases have been factored into the costings.

Evidence to support the services aspect of this initiative

[33]

This evidence highlights the importance of the support services aspect of this initiative as targeted and tailored services, that build on the support that someone has already received while in prison, will help to ensure that once someone exiting prison is provided with a ring-fenced social housing place, they are able to sustain that tenancy and achieve other positive outcomes.

Corrections clients are a high-liability group and there is a strong rationale for supporting them into stable living and social circumstances that will support the achievement of a range of other outcomes, such as sustained employment, improved social connectedness and reduced re-offending. 2014 Welfare Valuation data shows:

- The high levels of unemployment among ex-prisoners are shown by the high numbers that flow into the benefit system. Nearly two-thirds of ex-prisoners take out a main benefit within one month of exiting prison (66 percent) and a large proportion, up to 80%, have been found to stay on a main benefit for more than a year. People with a corrections history have a \$30,000 higher average liability compared to those without a corrections history.
- Research supports the problem that there are high levels of re-offending among ex-prisoners. A 48 month follow-up of 5,000 ex-offenders showed that 49% were convicted of a new offence and were returned to prison at least once. Approximately 17,000 have spent between two and four spells in prison.

This initiative will address an identified gap in service provision. For example, for the month end November 2016, less than half (49.4%) of the number of ex-prisoners for whom a reintegration plan was developed, were able to be settled into long term accommodation, and in December 2016 the same report shows that just slightly more than half (55.6%) were in long-

term accommodation. This initiative seeks to ensure that ex-prisoners are supported to progress positively along the housing continuum, and to achieve positive long-term outcomes.

Other evidence

- Between 1 July 2015 and 23 August 2016, 8,088 literacy and numeracy assessments were undertaken. Data from that testing shows that up to 63% of prisoners have literacy and numeracy skills below Level One on the NZQA Framework.
- 458,000 (19.9%) were under the influence of alcohol or other drugs at the time of committing their offences.
- Ex-prisoners are at high-risk of long-term benefit receipt and supporting them into housing and providing support services will increase their likelihood of entering employment and their long-term welfare dependency
- A 2015 study found that New Zealand prisoners have greater issues with substance abuse than the general population with 87% of the prisoners surveyed diagnosed with a substance use disorder and 46% with a mental health disorder. Over a 12 month period, almost two thirds of prisoners surveyed had been diagnosed with either of these disorders – three times as many as the general population.¹⁶
- \$30,000 higher average benefit system liability than the general population. People under 25 years old on benefit with a corrections history¹⁷ were more likely to have a parent dependent on benefit compared to those without a corrections history.
- Research shows that housing instability and overcrowding has negative impacts on educational outcomes and that people with a Corrections history have much lower levels of educational achievement than the general population. For example, a study in the United Kingdom found that 60 percent of prisoners in the UK had difficulties with basic literacy skills, and had highly disruptive education experiences. Compared to the general population, 52% of male and 71% of female prisoners had no qualifications, compared to 15% of the general population.
- 52-71% of prisoners had no qualifications compared to 15% of the general population
- 49% of male and 33% of female school-aged prisoners were excluded from school compared to 2% of the general population¹⁸
- up to 60% have difficulties with basic literacy skills¹⁹.
- Mental health conditions, if not identified and managed properly, can be severely disabling and may prevent many people from participating in the labour market. Research has shown that large proportions of prisoners, 40-50%, do not continue treatment of their mental health conditions when they enter prison²⁰, and have much higher rates of mental illness compared to the general population (80% vs. 31%)²¹.
- Sneed, Estes, Koch & Quinn (2006) state that the prevalence rates of mental illness among individuals involved

¹⁶ Bowman, J. (2015) *Co-morbidity research – Part one*. Practice, The New Zealand Corrections Journal, Vol 3, Issue 2, 33 – 34. Department of Corrections

¹⁷ Corrections history refers to people who were imprisoned and had standard, medium and high severity community sanction

¹⁸ Social Exclusion Unit. (2004). Retrieved from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/social_exclusion_task_force/assets/publications_1997_to_2006/seu_leaflet.pdf.

¹⁹ Clark, C. Dugdale, G. (2008) *Literacy Changes Lives – The role of literacy in offending behaviour*, London: National Literacy Trust.

²⁰ Gonzalez, J., Nadine, C. (2014). Identifying barriers to mental health treatment and medication continuity. *The American Journal of Public Health*, 104(12). Pp 2328-2333

²¹ Andrews, G., Allnut, S., Basson, J., Butler, T., Sakashita, C., Smith, N. (2006). Mental disorders in Australian prisoners: a comparison with a community sample. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*. 40(1). pp272–276

with the criminal justice system are 2-5 times higher than rates among the general population.

- There is a positive return on investment when people who have had multiple interactions with Corrections are socially housed with the impact greater on those who had two or more sentencing and remand events.
- AHURI research respondents – 25 percent of people that received support through Street to Home thought that they would have committed crime or be in prison if assistance had not been received (p 110)
- Average number of stops in the street for single men – at baseline was 1.12 and at follow up was 0.41
- An evaluation of the Out of Gate Service found that it reduces re-conviction by 5.2% points. For example, if offenders had a 12 month reconviction rate of 50%, of those offenders who received Out of Gate, 44.8% would be reconvicted.
- Reduced benefit receipt over time – about a quarter of people receiving benefits in 2014/2015 have a criminal conviction, and for males it is four in ten
- A study in the US found that housing support reduced re-offending for high risk offenders.

VALUE-FOR-MONEY ASSESSMENT

Please provide a comment on how well the initiative and supporting information addresses the following:

- What is the RoI and NPV score and are the assumptions and judgements around expected outcomes reasonable/clearly explained in the impact summary tables
- The Societal RoI is a combination of monetised impacts, un-monetised impacts and the assumptions underlying the impacts. Initiatives will need to demonstrate a societal ROI of at least 2.
- The Government RoI calculates how much one dollar of government spending reduces fiscal cost i.e. the fiscal return on investment. . Initiatives will need to demonstrate a Government ROI of at least 1.

[Vote Analyst to complete]

5. IMPLEMENTATION AND SCALABILITY

Implementation

[33]

MSD has a high level of confidence that it will be able to successfully deliver this initiative. MSD has long-standing relationships contracting for services and good knowledge of the capacity and capability of the CHP market.

Using feedback loops to inform the initiative

MSD has identified a number of opportunities for using feedback loops to respond to early information obtained through the initiative. MSD has designed the evaluation approach so that the early evaluation findings inform delivery of the initiative. For example, MSD will be undertaking a process evaluation at six months. This will include collecting a range of qualitative information from providers and tenants about their experience of this initiative. These findings will enable MSD and Corrections to make changes in response to this new information. MSD will also be undertaking case studies of participants which will inform decisions on whether service tweaks are required.

In contracting, MSD will include relevant clauses to ensure that providers share and disseminate best practice learning with each other and the sector. This will help grow an understanding of best practice approaches to working with this cohort. In addition, contracts will include clear monitoring and reporting requirements. For example, quarterly reporting and additional ad hoc reporting as required.

Payments under contracts may be made in instalments, based on providers' meeting reporting requirements.

Exit strategy

If assessed as a feasible evaluation approach, MSD intends to undertake an RCT analysis at two years of the initiative. This will support MSD to make decisions about whether to continue with the combined housing + supports model proposed through this initiative, whether the initiative is connecting with the right reintegration programmes, and whether MSD should scale this initiative down to only funding the IRRS component, grand-parenting the services aspect.

To ensure that those receiving an IRRS place through this initiative are not displaced should the initiative not prove successful, MSD has sought out-years funding to continue funding the IRRS places sought through this initiative.

An indicative Implementation Plan is attached as Appendix Two.

6. UNDERSTANDING AND DEMONSTRATING EFFECTIVENESS

Data collection and impact evaluation method

1. To what extent has the initiative resulted in better outcomes for people exiting prison, who have an identified housing need?
2. To what extent has the initiative been implemented to sufficiently support the achievement of outcomes?
3. To what extent does the initiative provide lessons for what works in supporting ex-prisoners that can be generalised?

A range of outcomes will be measured across the evaluation:

- Improved tenure stability
- Reduced re-offending
- Reduced benefit support (including reduced Corrections spend)
- Improved sustainable employment and income
- Increased engagement in education and training
- Improved health outcomes
- Improved social connectedness
- Improved confidence, resilience and life skills

An indicative Evaluation Plan is attached as Appendix Three.

IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT

Please provide a comment on how well the initiative and supporting information addresses the following:

- Fit-for-purpose impact evaluation plan with consideration of how the initiative will be evaluated as it is implemented rather than just ex-post.
- Capability and capacity of the agency to deliver the initiative (implementation, project management and

procurement). This should also take into consideration the agency's Four Year Plan and previous track record.

- Does the implementation and evaluation plan allow enough flexibility for scalability?

[Vote Analyst to complete]

Intervention logic template: Corrections Initiative

Problem statement:

People who have served a Corrections sentence can face challenges when exiting prison and transitioning back into the community. One of the issues faced by this group is accessing stable accommodation – either social housing or housing in the private market.

The Department of Corrections funds a number of reintegration programmes that provide transitional support to people leaving prison, to help them to independence in the community. Reintegration programmes seek to build on the learning and support that someone has already received while in prison, so that they are able to transition back into the community. Reintegration programmes encompass a range of different supports. This can include the development of a reintegration plan, support to navigate services, direct provision of services and provision of short term temporary accommodation.

Provider evidence (both provider reporting and anecdotal evidence) shows that providers face challenges supporting ex-prisoners into stable accommodation once they have completed a reintegration programme. There are a range of factors contributing to this issue including affordability, accessibility (including that many ex-prisoners can face challenges securing a rental in the private market because of their criminal history) and the current supply shortage.

To address this issue, MSD, with the support of the Department of Corrections, is seeking funding to purchase additional IRRS (social housing) places for people who have served a long sentence (more than two years) or who have frequent interactions with Corrections, who are eligible for social housing, are completing one of the applicable Department of Corrections reintegration programmes²² and have an unmet housing need. MSD is also seeking funding to provide services to this group, to ensure that they are able to continue on a positive pathway and build skills that will support them to be contributing members of their communities. This funding could be used in a range of ways. For example, to address mental health needs or addiction issues or provide counseling or Budgeting support that they may otherwise not be eligible for, that will in turn support them to sustain their social housing tenancies and enter an education or training programme or employment.

For short servers (someone who has served a sentence of less than two years) or people who have frequent interactions with Corrections, MSD and Corrections will align the provision of housing and supports with the Out of Gate service and the Reintegration Support for Short Servers programme. For long servers (who have served a sentence of two years or more), MSD will align this support with the following programmes: Tiaki Tangata, Supported Accommodation for Long Servers and Specialised Accommodation for Female Prisoners. Eligibility for social housing will be assessed while someone is still in prison, where possible, to leverage on existing processes and relationships.

This initiative seeks to provide stability to people exiting prison and to prevent them from requiring emergency housing support, becoming homeless or living in insecure housing by providing them with an IRRS (social housing) place, and broader support services. Clients to be supported through this initiative are those who will be completing a reintegration programme who are also eligible for social housing and do not have access to stable housing following completion of the programme. People to receive this support will be identified while still in prison as part of the development of their reintegration plan. This means there will be relative certainty of the date that they will complete their reintegration programme and require a social housing place. The assessment of need for social housing will utilise MSD’s business as usual process and it will be recorded on a client’s file that they are receiving this support.

This approach seeks to ensure that there is not a gap in housing support for this group after their exit from prison. Currently, the number of prisoners eligible for reintegration programmes is double the number of places available on these programmes. The Department of Corrections has submitted a Track One Bid to expand successful programmes, including Out of Gate and supported accommodation services. The number of people eligible for support through this initiative is likely to far exceed the number of IRRS places available specifically for the identified cohort. As this is a trial, people who are eligible for this support and who elect to take it up, will be allocated places, until each region in which this is progressed (to be determined through the procurement process) is at capacity.

Goal: To support a reduction in re-offending and the achievement of positive long term outcomes by people who have served a long prison sentence or who have frequent interactions with Corrections, through the provision of social housing and support services.

<p>Underpinning theory based on evidence:</p> <p>Why do we think this investment will lead to these actions?</p>	<p>Resources/input</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for the required number of additional IRRS places, in properties of the bedroom configuration sought (one and two bedroom properties) 	<p>Activities – what will be done?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSD will work with the 	<p>Outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> X number of social housing places are secured and ring-fenced for people who meet the criteria to receive support through this initiative 	<p>Longer term impacts (conditions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> people supported through this initiative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -have not re-offended at 12 months and 24 months
---	---	--	---	--

<p>In 2015/2016 there were approximately 7,673 sentenced prisoners released from prison in New Zealand.</p> <p>[33]</p> <p>[33]</p> <p>In November 2016, reporting from the RSL Service for long servers showed that of the 166 prisoners for whom a reintegration plan was developed, less than half were able to be supported into long term accommodation.</p> <p>Providers of reintegration services have communicated to Corrections that they continue to face difficulties housing people following completion of a reintegration programme.</p> <p>[37]</p> <p>Across 2015/2016, 2,191 offenders accessed the Out of Gate service. The average RQ effect size for re-integrative services is 5.1 percentage points.²³</p> <p>Being in stable accommodation reduces the risk of re-offending by one fifth and being in employment reduces the risk by between a third and a half.²⁴</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a process developed to record on a client's file that they have received a social housing place that was ring-fenced for ex-Corrections clients • social services providers able to provide the necessary services to support ex-prisoners to reintegrate into the community • procurement process developed through which providers are identified to deliver this initiative • process to identify clients who are receiving this support so that the impact that the provision of stable accommodation has on other outcomes can be measured • MSD Service Delivery process developed so that clients who are housed through this initiative are identifiable on MSD system • provider reporting gives MSD and Corrections the information required to report and measure outcomes so that robust evaluation of the initiative can be undertaken to inform future investment decisions • The required information sharing agreements are in place between MSD and Corrections to support this initiative • Technology – recording on MSD file that client receiving this support <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for IRRS plus an operating supplement of between 20 and 35 percent will be sufficient to support providers to source additional properties to be used as social housing to house this cohort 	<p>Department of Corrections to identify how existing processes can be utilised to identify clients to receive this support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSD will develop a service delivery / system process so that it is on a person's record that they are receiving support through this initiative • MSD will undertake a procurement process to identify providers to provide social housing places who have relationships with service providers across their communities • MSD and Corrections will evaluate proposals received through the procurement process to select providers in regions across New Zealand, to deliver this initiative • Design of contracts that support reporting on the outcomes sought through this initiative • Data is collected through reporting that supports future investment decisions that are based on the effectiveness of the approach • Data supports evaluation of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • X number of people who have completed a Corrections reintegration programme following completion of a long sentence or who have had frequent interactions with Corrections are provided with stable accommodation and supports so that they can be participating members of society and achieve positive outcomes. • X enter employment, training or further education within 12 months of being housed • X do not re-offend within 12 months of being housed • X sustain their social housing tenancies at six months • X sustain their social housing tenancies at 12 months <p>Target group</p> <p>People who have served a long sentence (more than 2 years) or who have frequent interactions with Corrections, who are eligible for social housing and who have a severe unmet housing need (if not for this support would be considered 'homeless' as defined by the SAS criteria (not living in any accommodation or living in emergency housing for the time being).</p> <p>Measures of outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no. of ex-prisoners who are supported into stable accommodation through this initiative sustain their tenancies for six months • no. of prisoners who are supported into accommodation 	<p>following being housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -accessing health services -engaged with their communities and whānau -in sustainable employment or completing an education or training programme that will support them to enter employment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a plan is in place to support those supported through this initiative to transition to independent housing, where appropriate. <p>Medium term impacts (action)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a shared understanding between MSD, Corrections and providers of this initiative of what best practice in supporting this cohort looks like • a growth in the evidence base about what in addition to housing effectively supports this cohort not to re-offend and to re-engage in the community and with whānau • there is a positive impact on the emergency housing system as we can see a drop in the numbers of people who are exiting prison and requiring emergency housing • a greater number of providers who deliver reintegration services, and who receive a milestone payment following sustainably housing people who have completed a reintegration programme, receive that payment • This initiative supports the achievement of a number of BPS targets, including reducing long term welfare dependence and reducing reoffending. It also supports the Social Housing Reform Programme objectives. <p>Short-term impacts¹ (learning)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is less pressure on emergency housing as people who would have required this support have access to social housing • MSD understands more about what funding is required to secure supply of social housing for the target cohort • Providers have security of funding and are able to provide
--	--	--	--	---

²³ RQ gauges the extend of re-offending reductions by comparing rates of reconviction and re-imprisonment amongst offenders who receive a rehabilitative intervention, with the rates recorded amongst offenders who have an equivalent risk of re-offending but who had no exposure to the particular intervention. The effect size is the percentage point reduction in the rate of re-conviction / reimprisonment within 12 months.

²⁴ Evidence Brief completed by the Social Investment Unit, 2016

<p>The Department of Corrections predict the ROI for reintegration services to be \$3.91. It is expected that savings start in year three, and about half of savings are achieved by year four.</p> <p>Provision of housing alone is not sufficient to address the often multiple and complex needs faced by this cohort and an integrated approach is required.</p> <p>A December 2016 evidence brief published by whatworkswellbeing.org identified that there is an evidence gap on the impact of housing on subjective wellbeing and understanding the relationship between housing costs and benefits. This initiative will support a growth in the knowledge base.</p> <p>An Australian study interviewed 339 prisoners pre-release and found that 16 percent expected to be homeless or did not know where they were going post release and that 38 percent of female prisoners and 21 percent of male prisoners were in public housing prior to imprisonment.</p> <p>In the post-release interviews, of those who had not moved or moved once, 22 percent had been re-incarcerated at 9 months and of those who had moved twice or more, 59 percent were back in prison.²⁵</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providers are able to source the required number of one and two bedroom properties to support this initiative • Providers have the capacity, capability and willingness to work with this cohort • A cost of \$7,000 per person is sufficient to support this cohort to sustain their tenancies and work towards the achievement of other positive outcomes • Phasing supports the required number of places to be sought over time • There is sufficient demand for this support • Providing stable accommodation and support services to this cohort will support a reduction in re-offending and result in the achievement of positive outcomes 	<p>initiative, including achievement of the specific outcomes sought (housing retention and a reduction in reoffending)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information that supports a growth in understanding of the impacts of stable housing on subjective wellbeing and community engagement 	<p>sustain their tenancies for 12 months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number who enter employment within 12 months of receiving support • x number who enter training or further education within 12 months of receiving support • x number who enter benefit within 12 months of receiving support • number that do not re-offend within 12 months of receiving social housing 	<p>stable housing to the cohort being supported through this initiative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSD and Corrections work with providers to develop a clear set of measures and reporting requirements to ensure accountability and enable to success of this approach to be measure over time – embedding a social investment approach to social housing • MSD understands the impact that provision of this support has had on the social housing register and whether this support has resulted in it taking longer for other people or families to be housed • MSD learns about the types of support that this cohort require to sustain their tenancies and enter employment, education or training • The target cohort for this initiative have access to stable accommodation and the other support that they need to be on a path to achieving positive outcomes <p>External factors that may affect impacts²</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provider ability to source affordable housing to provide accommodation to this cohort • provider ability to source housing of the required configuration, and in appropriate locations, to house this cohort (i.e. close to amenities, but sufficiently spread out so that a large number of people receiving support through this initiative are not housed together) • capability and capacity of social services providers to deliver the range of services required to support this cohort to achieve positive outcomes • target cohort willingness to engage with this support • target cohort willingness to engage in education, training or employment • provider willingness to source social housing to house this cohort
---	---	---	---	--

²⁵ Ex-Prisoners, Homelessness and the State in Australia – the Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology

Appendix Two Implementation Plan

An estimated 6 week timeframe for high level design prior to RFP. Due to the level of interagency engagement required to deliver this the expected timeframe would be 9 months to complete detailed service design, operational guidelines, reporting requirements. This does not include any IT timeframes which depending on the level of system changes and priority of request it can take up to 18 months to be delivered. There are no departmental costs for this initiative, this will be managed through existing resource.

Appendix Three: CREATING POSITIVE PATHWAYS FOR PEOPLE WITH A CORRECTIONS HISTORY – EVALUATION PLAN

How will you evaluate (after the programme has been rolled out) what the effect of the programme was, particularly on the impacts listed in Section B?

Context and summary: We consider that the funding for this initiative (\$13.097m) as well as numbers targeted (250) provide good potential for conducting a RCT on the initiative. Identifying a treated and non-treated group to compare from the social housing register or Corrections data may be feasible.

Data collection and impact evaluation method

The aim of the evaluation is to ascertain whether a package of allocation of social housing and receipt of social service support leads to better outcomes for people exiting prison than a business as usual (BAU) service.

Key evaluation questions are:

4. To what extent has the initiative resulted in better outcomes for people exiting prison, who have an identified housing need?
5. To what extent has the initiative been implemented to sufficiently support the achievement of outcomes?
6. To what extent does the initiative provide lessons for what works in supporting ex-prisoners that can be generalised?

A range of outcomes will be measured across the evaluation:

- Improved tenure stability
- Reduced re-offending
- Reduced benefit support (including reduced Corrections spend)
- Improved sustainable employment and income
- Increased engagement in education and training
- Improved health outcomes
- Improved social connectedness
- Improved confidence, resilience and life skills

The evaluation will consist of five components:

1. Evaluation support for design and pre-testing

Best practice is to design new initiatives systematically, using the best available evidence and theory, person-centred design methods that involve people who will be clients in co-design, and with a focus on cultural acceptability and local “fit”. Part of best practice is to pre-test the intervention logic, programme innovation and theory of change before proceeding to a RCT. The pre-testing keeps in mind whether the intervention will be acceptable, successfully delivered, and experienced as helpful. This work will mostly use qualitative evaluation methods.

2. Randomised Control Trial (RCT)

If pre-testing is successful, and a RCT is feasible and ethically justified, a RCT design will be used and will be the primary method for determining impact. Identification of treatment and comparison groups will depend on the final design of the intervention and the RCT. It may involve, for example, randomly selecting people from a

target population identified from the Social Housing Register or Corrections data and assigning them either to a 'treatment' group (those who will be invited to take up the programme) or to a 'comparison' group (those who will receive a business as usual service (BAU)). If pre-testing involves the first 30-50 participants, the RCT could potentially involve the remaining participants, providing good statistical power to detect impacts. Analysis of service costs and participant outcomes (eg, benefit receipt, income, employment, justice and health costs and outcomes) will be carried out using the IDI at 18 months and three years and compared to the outcomes of the comparison group. The feasibility of analysing the impacts for participants' family members will be explored. This analysis will examine the trajectory of costs and benefits over time and provide information on the likely break-even point for ROI. Analysis will be repeated at six years to provide an update on participant outcomes

Limitations: An important limitation of the RCT is that it will only establish the impact of the intervention on those who are offered it. It will not be able to examine possible spillover effects (eg, positive or negative impacts on neighbours and neighbourhoods, or longer wait times for other social housing clients). Opportunities for combining the RCT with quasi-experimental methods that examine these possible wider impacts will be explored once service design is complete and its geographic coverage is known.

Sample numbers for this analysis will be determined once the initiative and planning proceeds in more depth.

3. Monitoring

Monitoring will examine provider reporting data on tenure-stability of tenants and evidence to assess progress towards outcomes.

4. Process evaluation

A process evaluation of the services being delivered will be carried out six months after the launch of the main trial and will examine whether the initiative is being implemented to best support achievement of outcomes, how the initiative is working and opportunities for improvement. The process evaluation will include qualitative interviews with case managers, landlords and providers of support services and some descriptive statistics will be compiled.

5. Case studies

Case studies will examine the experiences of tenants over three years to understand how outcomes can be successfully achieved along with any insights into the tenants' experiences of this pathway into housing. An ethnographic approach will provide insights into progress towards increased social connectedness and other social outcomes not able to be measured using linked data in the IDI.

Rationale for evaluation approach: Incorporating a randomised control trial into the evaluation adds complexity and has resource implications, and may not be feasible on further investigation or ethical review, or if the initiative is modified. However, robust evidence of the effect of stable housing and social-service support on ex-prisoners' outcomes is critical to understanding what works in achieving better outcomes for a high-risk target population.

Funding of evaluation

The evaluation will require funding of [33] for the evaluative components; namely support for design, process evaluation and case studies. Quantitative aspects of the evaluation will be resourced in-house.

Method	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Evaluation support	[33]			

for design and pre-testing				
Randomised Control Trial	Resourced in-house			
Monitoring	Resourced in-house			
Process evaluation		[33]		
Case studies	[33]		[33]	
Final reporting	Resourced in-house			

Completion dates, publication, and dissemination of findings to key stakeholders

Different streams of work for the evaluation will provide findings at various stages, as shown in the table below.

Method	Completion of substantive work	Publication	Dissemination to key stakeholders
Randomised Control Trial	After two years, followed by updated analysis after 3 ½ years.	Interim publication after 2 years, final report after 4 years	Internal dissemination throughout. Publicly disseminated via 2 and 4 year reports (with an update at 6 years).
Monitoring	On-going	Interim publication after 2 years, final report after 4 years	
Process evaluation	After 9 months	Interim publication after 2 years	
Case studies of participants	At 1 year, followed by after 3 ½ years	Interim publication after 2 years, final report at 4 years	
Final reporting	After 3 ½ years	At 4 years (updated at 6 years)	