

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Inquiry into sustainable employment for disadvantaged jobseekers

Melbourne—Tuesday, 3 September 2019

MEMBERS

Mr John Eren—Chair

Mr Gary Blackwood—Deputy Chair

Ms Juliana Addison

Ms Sarah Connolly

Mr Brad Rowswell

Ms Steph Ryan

Ms Kat Theophanous

WITNESSES

Ms Emma King, Chief Executive Officer, and

Ms Deborah Fewster, Manager, Advocacy and Engagement, Victorian Council of Social Service.

The CHAIR: Welcome to the public hearings for the Legislative Assembly Economy and Infrastructure Committee's Inquiry into sustainable employment for disadvantaged jobseekers. All evidence taken by this Committee is protected by parliamentary privilege. Therefore you are protected against any action for what you say here today, but if you go outside and repeat the same things, including on social media, those comments will not be protected by this privilege. All evidence given today is being recorded by Hansard and is also being broadcast live on the Parliament's website. Rebroadcast of the hearings is only permitted in accordance with the Legislative Assembly standing order 234. You will be provided with a proof version of the transcript for you to check and verify. Also verified transcripts, PowerPoint presentations and handouts will be placed on the Committee's website as soon as possible. I think you have got a 5-minute presentation, then we will ask questions.

Ms KING: My name is Emma King. I am the CEO of the Victorian Council of Social Service, and I appear today with Deborah Fewster, who is our Manager of Advocacy and Engagement. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you this afternoon. VCOSS, as I think you know, is the peak body for the social and community service sector in Victoria and also one of our key interests is in terms of eliminating poverty and disadvantage throughout Victoria, so we have a very keen interest in this Inquiry.

I guess in terms of theme setting, the Committee would be very aware of the narrative that exists nationally in terms of 'If you have a go, you'll get a go'. The implication of that is that if you do not have a job basically it is because you have not tried or you have not tried hard enough and that if you are working but you cannot afford to pay your rent or you cannot afford to pay for the doctor or you cannot afford to pay for your children's school books it is a reflection in some way of your personal failings. The view we hear is 'Therefore you're not having enough of a go'. I guess we are here to categorically reject that narrative because it is simply not true.

The reality is there is only one job available for every five people who are looking for paid work throughout Australia. There are increasing numbers of people who are in paid work who are now working in extremely insecure jobs. Roughly 40% of all jobs in Australia are now non-standard jobs in comparison to what they were. For some of the most disadvantaged jobseekers, having an insecure job perpetuates or compounds their disadvantage. So about 38% of all people living in poverty in Australia are living in wage-earning households, so what we are seeing is a growth of in-work poverty. We know having a job in and of itself is no longer the ticket out of poverty that it would have once been considered to be.

You will have seen also in our submission that we have cited homelessness data from the last census. I did want to correct a typo that is in there. The point we were making was clouded by a typographical error, which we are keen to correct, especially about the conversation of in-work poverty. That is that the most recent census identified that there are almost 30,000 people in Australia who are 'employed and homeless'—that is almost one-third of the entire homeless population who do have some form of work.

The CHAIR: Employed and homeless?

Ms KING: Yes. So while there are some jobseekers with personal barriers to finding a job and holding onto a job, we are seeing an issue where the main issue here is a structural issue: there simply are not enough jobs to go around. For those fortunate enough to be in work, increasingly those jobs are not secure.

Our submission identifies a range of ways that the Victorian Government can improve opportunities and outcomes for disadvantaged jobseekers, in particular through pursuing economic development strategies that prioritise employment-intensive growth and yield jobs that can be filled by disadvantaged jobseekers; building the skills and capabilities of working-age Victorians who face barriers to suitable employment; strengthening employment protections in the gig economy—we know that is growing; and leveraging early childhood education and schools to address early risk factors for employment disadvantage as well.

We are really keen to note that in this area we are not starting with a blank piece of paper. The Victorian Government has very strong foundations in place which are already reaping dividends. We have got Victoria's Big Build, which is underway, and that is coupled with a really very progressive social procurement framework, and we know that that is creating new pathways into work for disadvantaged jobseekers. It is really significant.

Central to this is Jobs Victoria, which has assisted almost 9,700 highly disadvantaged jobseekers into work in its first three years. Jobs Victoria does play a key role in bringing together and aligning the interests of government, industry groups, employers and jobseekers. That is a very important message in the context of this Inquiry into suitable employment, and that is that the work of Jobs Victoria is strongly aligned to industry. There is a focus on priorities that will provide jobs for the future. So in mentioning that and talking about the Big Build, it is not the only industry that has been prioritised by Jobs Victoria. From our perspective it is not the only industry that needs to be prioritised overall, because looking ahead we are very keen to see the community services industry in the mix. It is the jobs of the future. They are not going to be replaced by automation as a general rule. There are some welcome early steps that have been taken, but we would be really keen to talk about those opportunities further with you because we know that there is substantial growth impact. It is the biggest growing area of the workforce.

Another key piece of policy and funding architecture is the Education State, so this is a vital platform from which we can futureproof children and young people from becoming the disadvantaged jobseekers of the future. Again, this is a significant focus of our submission, which we would be pleased to speak with you about this afternoon amongst other things as well. Thank you for the opportunity, and thank you for the opportunity to appear today as well. We really appreciate it.

The CHAIR: Jobs Victoria; you mentioned it, and it sounded like you were in favour of it.

Ms KING: Yes.

The CHAIR: So in relation to the funding and obviously beyond 2019–20, what would you like to see in this space from mid-2020 onwards in relation to Jobs Victoria?

Ms KING: I am mindful of the current context in which we operate, and we are very keen to see a continued emphasis for Jobs Victoria because we think they have been able to demonstrate the shift of moving people who are out of work into a job and into a form of employment. We are keen to see that continue. We are fortunate at VCOSS in that we have been funded to provide a program for 200 disadvantaged jobseekers—they are young people aged up to 24 years of age—to link them into community sector work. So we are seeing Jobs Victoria turn its attention to say, ‘Well, how can we move people into some work other than those that are involved in construction and manufacturing?’. It is not taking away from that but actually saying, ‘How do we broaden that out?’. We are really keen to see an ongoing investment into Jobs Victoria but also the broadening out of the work that Jobs Victoria do. We know in the work that we undertake on a daily basis with Jobs Victoria that there is a real commitment there from the bureaucrats that we work with. As we have worked with a number of ministers across this area as well, we can see that as well.

Ms FEWSTER: Yes, and I guess what we would say is it is not just like another office or a team or a kind of a brand name. It is a central kind of organising platform, so it enables that high-level strategic work and then the boots on the ground work as well with industry, with training providers and importantly with communities and jobseekers. I think without that kind of organising platform and that kind of commitment to the infrastructure—the actual staff in there to do the policy work, to develop with the community sector and other industries these innovative programs—you can kind of fall into this ad hoc, piecemeal approach. I think it has been a game changer in this last three years having that Jobs Victoria infrastructure in place. It is desperately needed because we know that the Commonwealth employment services programs are not fit for purpose. They are not hitting the mark. There is of course a role for accountability on the Commonwealth and that kind of advocacy piece and maintaining that pressure, but there is an absolutely clear role for the state as well, and we really want to see that investment in the kind of infrastructure that enables the success and the outcomes.

Ms ADDISON: Just going on from that, what do you see as some of the impacts of mutual obligation?

Ms KING: From the Commonwealth’s point of view? Do you mean in terms of the—

Ms ADDISON: Well, the Commonwealth’s approach to mutual obligation—the impact that that does have on long-term unemployed or vulnerable people in our community. What impact does it have?

Ms KING: I guess we see the devastating impact that it often has. In terms of the characterisations I mentioned earlier about ‘If you have a go, you’ll get a go’, in terms of looking at the impact of mutual

obligation what we often find, I guess, is that it is on a number of different levels. I am thinking around the characterisation of people in terms of if they are not meeting their so-called mutual obligations what the impact of that is. We hear from many people who are struggling to find employment or who are looking for jobs that if they are working with job service providers, for example, they will have times made to meet with their job service provider at a time when they might have childcare responsibilities or have other obligations as well. So it is fundamentally a system that is not working. If we are going to have mutual obligation, I would be looking at actually what is the obligation of the State, what is the obligation of the Commonwealth, to actually look at people who are having a hard time. How do we actually give them a fair go? Because often we have people who are characterised by being in poverty for significant periods of time. They are expected to fit into a system that is not fit for purpose.

I guess I would look at one of the points that I think you asked the panel prior to us, and that was around looking at internet connection and the issues that people have when they are poor. What does it mean if you do not have an internet connection? Many of the issues around mutual obligation and other things also often rely on technology and a whole host of other things that many people do not have. They are the kind of constructs, as you mentioned earlier, that would work for all of us sitting around this table, but they actually do not work for a lot of people who are poor and disadvantaged as well. So they are often working within the construct of a system that is not set up for success.

The notion of mutual obligation in its pure sense sounds fine, but when you look at how it actually works in practicality, it is not. It is often a system that is for people who are well resourced, who might be out of work for a small period of time to actually look at how they come back in. We are looking here at disadvantaged jobseekers, often people who have been in significant poverty, who are facing significant disadvantage. As we know—and I think there has been lots of commentary through papers, et cetera—the so-called mutual obligation system that is in place now really does not work.

Ms FEWSTER: Yes, and I guess it is really kind of a tick-and-flick approach. So people are busy with this obligation around job search, but does it actually then tangibly lead to employment outcomes? If it does, what is the nature of that employment? Often people are cycling then, churning through periods of employment and unemployment or underemployment. So people are kept in this poverty trap.

And then the other thing is that it does not speak to that advantaged thinking and people's aspirations and what their goals are. People might be doing jobs, for example, that are in industries, careers or fields that they do not enjoy. They might be in jobs that kind of trigger aspects of their trauma history and things like that. So it is really keeping people squashed down, not allowing them to dream, have aspirations, think about career planning and that kind of thing.

I guess the other risk as well with this—and I cannot speak to any figures around it—is that if you think about the most marginalised people in our community, who are on income support and engaged in the mutual obligation job search and things like that, there is a risk that if you actually push people too hard, thinking about the intergenerational impacts of trauma and disadvantage, they could completely withdraw from income support, completely withdraw from job search and actually live in destitution. Again I do not know what the figures around that are, but there is a risk that people disengage completely.

The CHAIR: And then become rough sleepers eventually.

Ms KING: Potentially. For example, I am the President of a neighbourhood house, and we have a number of people, probably a broad spectrum of the community, that comes and engages with the neighbourhood house. We see people from quite disadvantaged backgrounds, who do not have email addresses, et cetera, who will come in, and they will connect with a neighbourhood house. They might connect because there is a kitchen garden, or they might connect because there is a cooking class in the first instance. It is about a welcoming place. They will often enrol in a course because they want to improve their literacy, they want to improve their numeracy, but often then they are dislocated from continuing with that course because they have got to meet their mutual obligation requirements and they do not fit with what has been provided at the local neighbourhood house. So it is really easy to see people suddenly drop away from the very place that provides them with that point of connection at a time that is particularly vulnerable for them and a community that is welcoming. It is one of the things that often stands out to me as being this very perverse outcome of a so-called

mutual obligation when you are watching people who are saying, ‘Well, we want to be part of the community, and we want to look at actually how we improve ourselves, but this system is not set up to support us in doing that’.

Mr BLACKWOOD: We have heard today on a number of occasions that short-term, more insecure employment opportunities are basically becoming a barrier for those people trying to find full-time work.

Ms KING: Yes.

Mr BLACKWOOD: What are some of the other negative impacts around these short-term, insecure work opportunities?

Ms KING: Yes, there is so much probably we could say around that. I think there are a couple of different aspects to that. Perhaps if I draw first and foremost on trends that we have seen through the National Disability Insurance Scheme coming in, where as a consequence of that—and there are a number of reports out that show this—since the NDIS has come into play we have seen significant casualisation of the workforce. It is broken down by size of employer. So in big employers we see more full and part-time employment in place, but when you go to mid-size and smaller there is a huge shift from what was full-time, often ongoing employment or part-time ongoing employment to casualised work.

So we are looking at that shift from block funding to individualised choice and control, and we do advocate for individualised choice and control but when we are watching that happen across a range of different sectors to start with we are seeing the real impact of a growing sector—these are the growing areas of work in many places. What were full-time, ongoing jobs that perhaps were in the manufacturing industry traditionally have been replaced by the service industry and the service economy. They are the growing areas of work; NDIS is an illustration of that. We have seen the same thing, though, play out in the retail sector. We are seeing it play out in the aged-care sector. So all of the areas that are the biggest growth areas in our economy are becoming characterised by a workforce that is often highly gendered, a workforce that is precarious and a workforce that is one where you simply do not know whether you can get enough hours to make ends meet from week to week, let alone looking at the rates of pay in and of themselves.

The other component of that, which we pick up in our submission, is around the gig economy. So you have got that broader structural piece happening as well, but we are seeing a growth in jobs in the gig economy. Again, I acknowledge that for some people they may choose to work through the gig economy, through platforms such as Airtasker, but in many places they only do it because it is the only option that they have actually got, the only option that is left. There are components around that in terms of looking at how do you ensure that your workplace is safe to begin with? How do you make sure that someone is actually getting paid a fair amount of money? How do you know that they are not being abused in terms of whilst they are in a particular job? And there is no career trajectory in a gig economy as a general rule. It is characterised by precarious work, and that is where we are seeing our growth.

If you look at the growth in sort of the service and the retail industries, they are our jobs of the future. We need to look very carefully at those in terms of the architecture of work to make sure that we are actually setting up what we want as a profession. Let us face it, as we all get old we want good people who are going to be looking after us. We do not want people who are coming in, without wanting to unfairly characterise, on 457 visas and the notion of the backpacker economy. We have heard all those terms being quoted in terms of they are our answer when it comes to disability and aged care; I just do not believe that is the case. I think that we should be able to create really good jobs in what are the jobs of the future. So it is a huge opportunity for us, but at the moment it is really risky and it is extremely precarious. If you are a jobseeker in that area, you can get a job, but in terms of looking at how many hours can you be guaranteed, the regularity of those each week and the rates of pay, it is highly precarious work and I cannot emphasise enough as well about the gendered nature of that work. It is quite significant.

Ms FEWSTER: I just had another point as well in terms of the impacts of people cycling through short-term and insecure employment, an employer or a labour hire company is not going to invest in your kind of continuous professional learning and development. Then if you do not have a lot of resources behind you because your work history is characterised by insecure employment, how do you kind of access that continuous

learning yourself and also how do you match that to your employment and where you are going with that? I guess there are flow-on effects in terms of people's skills becoming outdated, their ability to secure their next gig event, to use that kind of language, impacts people's I guess mobility within a profession, their ability to climb up the career ladder and to move into positions of leadership or better pay or better job security but also those flow-on effects looking back to what Emma was saying in terms of safety and quality when we were looking at disability and other aspects of the community services industry but also all aspects of the economy really, so thinking about the skills that people have on those big infrastructure projects as well.

Ms CONNOLLY: I just wanted to raise that your submission supports free TAFE and notes the community services sector is struggling to host industry placements for the free TAFE students. What strategies do you think can be implemented to increase the capacity of community services organisations for student placements?

Ms KING: Just to touch on that a little bit further, I will pass it to Deb who headed up one of our programs around this area. Just to illustrate that we had one of our member organisations in regional Victoria contact us because they have had a number of students from a local tertiary institution who wanted them to host our students which they actually desperately need to employ. They have got 35 vacancies at the moment in their family violence area but they do not have the capacity to take on students because they do not have enough workers. We have worked in the family violence sector around looking at how we can create communities of practice and support our sector in terms of doing that, but I will let Deb speak to that because she headed it up.

Ms FEWSTER: Sure. I would put in the qualification when I describe this initiative to say it is not perfect, but I think it is a really good starting point and there are lots of lessons to be learned. VCOSS was managing a project last year that went for a year. It is continuing into its second year this year, but it is actually being managed within Government because it has become part of business as usual within Family Safety Victoria. The program or project is called Enhanced Pathways to Family Violence Work. So it is great in that it links to a 10-year industry plan, it links back to the Royal Commission into Family Violence recommendations, and what that piece of work is around is saying that we need to grow the workforce both in specialist family violence organisations but recognising that family violence is everybody's business. We have acknowledged that now, and so we want all aspects of the community sector workforce in particular but other workforces to actually have appropriate knowledge—that appropriate family violence lens—recognising that in order to build the workforce one really tangible way we can do that is to create that pipeline of students and new workers coming through.

And some of the innovative components of the model were that Family Safety Victoria funded 10 capability-building coordinators around the state to support 34 organisations who were involved in this project. Each of these 34 organisations said, 'We're going to commit to increasing our student placements in this coming academic year', and it was a mix of small, medium and larger community sector organisations. So what Family Safety Victoria was interested in was getting growth and uplift across the sector. For some organisations that might have been increasing from one student usually that they take to three student placements; others might agree to take on 35 or 40 new students in the new academic year. So each of those organisations had a dedicated capability-building coordinator who could be that broker in terms of brokering the relationship with education providers, because that is a lot of work—building those relationships, sustaining those relationships, having someone at the end of the phone to answer questions about booking student placements.

What was also done through this project was they had a look at some existing systems, tools and resources in the health industry, so particularly hospitals, public hospitals. Public hospitals every year take on thousands and thousands of students and they have placement tools. So they have got software that allows student bookings to be made, amended, updated in real time, and there are a number of other tools that they use. There is something called the BPCLE—I am just trying to think of the acronym—best practice clinical learning environment. What that is about, without trying to get into the nitty-gritty of it, is actually around what is the cultural change that needs to happen within this workforce to provide really good, safe, high quality student placement experiences for students, so that they have such a great experience, feel so well supported, skilled and resourced that they are going to want to stay in this sector and perhaps will want to, post-graduation, actually take on a role within this organisation. So there are a number of tools like that.

There was also flexible funding. Some organisations might want to use that funding to bring in some extra admin support in their HR department; others wanted to use it to develop. For example, at VACCA—the

Victorian Aboriginal Community-Controlled Childcare Association—decided that they wanted to use some of their flexible funding to create additional resources with a cultural lens for students. So a range of these things came together to really support that uplift in organisations' ability to take on increased student numbers, and as I said, there was a piece of developmental research that was attached to that project so we can continually refine in that first year how the project was being rolled out, but as I said, not perfect. Some of the health language and some of the tools did not necessarily align, but a really great starting point.

Ms KING: It was a great pilot because we were able to also learn from what went well but also what did not, and then after say, 'Well, what would we do differently next time?'. Just to add to your question, which is a slight shift from it as well, we are a partner in what is called the Future Social Service Institute, so we host that along with RMIT and also the State Government. It is again focused on bringing more students in, and it does work alongside free TAFE in many respects but existed prior to it, and it was focused again on providing scholarships, prior to free TAFE, to people who were looking to work in the community services sector, because we are really keen to say, 'How do we provide the best quality training opportunities for those who perhaps have not been able to access them prior because of costs and a whole host of other things?'.

What we found is that when we provided the scholarship we were able to fill all the scholarship places, we were able to get placements et cetera, but quite early on a number of students were not arriving, and we asked the lecturers to contact students and instead of saying, 'Why aren't you here?', to make that call and say, 'How can I help you? Is there something happening that we can actually assist you with?'.

The CHAIR: Yes, great.

Ms KING: What we found very quickly was that students were having significant issues with the cost of transport. They did not have enough money for their myki card. A number of them were having issues with their housing. A number of them were having issues with mental health. Keep in mind that for many of the people who were engaged they had not been involved in a tertiary setting before. Some of them had finished school quite early.

We found through that first cohort of students, and some of them had quite significant issues after that 'How can I help you?' call was made. Often quite a small amount of money was provided that did things like cover the myki card, that did things like link people up with food, which was picked up in placements. For example, the placements were contacting RMIT and saying, 'We know students are turning up that have not eaten this morning. We're giving them lunch. We're not saying that we do this for all of our staff—we don't—but you need to make sure that they've got food'. As a consequence of that first cohort as an example, every single one of those students got through the course, they passed their course, they got jobs out of their placements, all bar one. The one who did not have significant mental health and housing issues, she came to everyone else's graduation and she graduated the following year.

The CHAIR: That is fantastic. What a great story.

Ms KING: So we know we can make it happen. The following year we had issues where students did not have IT, so they did not have computers. There was a group of them who were bunching around using the one computer. Where they needed help was to be given laptops and IT access. That was a game changer for them. It is not one size fits all. Often it is about asking that individual, 'How can I help you?', and someone having enough trust to say, 'Well, actually I cannot travel because I don't have the money for a myki. So, yes, you've waived my course costs, but there are a whole lot of other costs of living that are attached to that that are not matched on that front'.

The CHAIR: Yes.

Ms KING: So I think there is a lot of learning from that that can be more broadly applied. Looking at the environments, when we look at disadvantaged jobseekers, they are not often coming from a background where they have got money for all of those other components of life, which do include things like food and transport, basic things that we would all take for granted, and they are huge barriers to being able to attend courses. I just thought it was a nice illustration of where sometimes for quite a small amount of money a significant difference can be made for people.

Ms FEWSTER: I guess I would just add to that as well is that for VCOSS it is the nature of the work that we and our member organisations do, like we know this stuff inside out but—we have picked this up through a range of projects, including the ones that Emma has just mentioned—employers, for example, do not necessarily really understand the nitty-gritty of that kind of manifestation of disadvantage, so there is an important piece there around supporting and building the capacity of employers to be able to actually support disadvantaged jobseekers.

Giving jobseekers a job in the first place is key, but then it is actually how do you make that stick when people do not have that experience of having been in the workforce or are coming with no experience. Is it family violence or homelessness or other common forms of disadvantage? I guess that is an important component where we are keen to see some capacity building as well.

Ms CONNOLLY: Are you having many companies in all the ivory towers around Melbourne come to you seeking that type of education about the family violence and significant social disadvantage and their ability to employ those people but things they need to be aware of—for example, things like the Myki card—or is it just closed doors?

Ms KING: I think it would probably be a bit unfair to say ‘closed doors’. Where we have tended to do that work has been through the Future Social Service Institute, and the work we are doing in the community service sector with the traineeships is probably more with community service industries. We are involved in a number of task forces and ministerial task forces, including, for example, the Crime Prevention Taskforce, where we are sitting at a table where there are companies sitting around the table who are showing, I think, a real desire to look at what sort of work can they do in this space and how might that look different. VCOSS has not been engaged, if you like, with the big end of town in and of ourselves within that space. I think that would be a fair way to characterise it.

Ms FEWSTER: Yes. And I think it just probably has not necessarily occurred to those industries to come to us. But I do not think there would be any significant barriers to doing that. I guess, through some of the committees that Emma has mentioned that she is part of, we do see this strong commitment to corporate social responsibility. We know a lot of our member organisations do have great relationships with corporates, and this is probably just the next bit of the conversation, the next bit of partnering.

Ms KING: Yes, turning the puzzle up a bit further.

Mr ROWSWELL: Just in relation to Jobs Victoria, which we addressed at the start, the Department of Jobs, Precincts and Regions presented earlier today. They mentioned to us that almost 9,700 jobseekers have been supported into employment since the program started, which at face value is sensational. With a bit of further digging we heard evidence that that success is measured by 26 weeks of continuous work at a minimum of 15 hours per week. Do you have a particular view on that measure of success? Is it adequate? Should we be aspiring for more, or less? And do you have any particular concerns around follow-through after that program is implemented in an individual’s employment journey?

Ms KING: I am aware that they are the measures that Jobs Victoria use. I think one of the things that would be great would be to look at how we can build longitudinal data over time. I do not think there would be any pushback from anyone around that. I think it is kind of what funding allows at the moment in terms of looking at how do you measure success. We would be very keen. One of the things that we constantly advocate for is how we can improve our data and improve our data more broadly in the community services sector. I think for all of us we are very keen to be very accountable in this space. We want to make sure we are actually delivering really good outcomes for people.

Ideally if there was more work to be done around looking at how we can build longitudinal data, because I think, going back to the point we made about the enhanced pathways program we use, we spoke about the fact that often when there are pilot programs there are things to learn from not only what works but also from what does not work. There has got to be space to be honest around what does not work because sometimes that enables you to make those changes to programs so that, with a little bit of assistance, it can work.

I think in terms of the follow-through, I imagine there is always a desire to look at what can that follow-through look like and how do you help someone in their career trajectory. I know there are a number of things that come into play for Jobs Victoria in terms of the data that they look at. So my key takeaway would be to let us look at how we actually create longitudinal data in the long run, let us look at how we learn, but, gee, I would hate things to be knocked—

While we want outcomes, we want evidence base, and in order to do that we need really good data, but we also need to learn from not only what does work but from what does not work because that enables us to actually look at how do we improve things in the long run. We are very keen around that at VCOSS.

In the pilot project we are doing we are really keen to draw attention to, ‘If you like some of the things that we thought might work in the beginning but maybe for a whole lot of reasons did not work in the way we envisaged’—and we have learnt a lot from place-based models such as Go Goldfields, where they have talked about naming up what did not work and having the space and the maturity to be able to name that up quickly to look at what you can shift.

Longitudinal data is always a great thing, looking at longer term accountability. I do not think you will get pushback.

Mr ROWSWELL: Are you happy with that benchmark, though?

Ms KING: I understand the benchmark is there because of available funding and a whole host of other things that sit around it. We would always love to see more, as I suspect they would too.

The CHAIR: Very good. Thank you very much for coming in.

Ms KING: Thank you.

Committee adjourned.