



Central Ranges Local Learning & Employment Network
Incorporating Macedon Ranges, Mitchell & Murrindindi Shires

Evaluation of Kyneton Community Learning Centre Flexible Learning Options Program

Certificate I Vocational Preparation

REPORT

February 2013

Prepared by: Lisa Linton – Partnership Broker Central Ranges Local Learning and
Employment Network



Central Ranges Local Learning & Employment Network
Incorporating Macedon Ranges, Mitchell & Murrindindi Shires

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Background	5
Methodology	8
Summary of Findings	9
Conclusions.....	22
Recommendations	23
Appendices.....	23



Executive Summary

During a meeting of the Macedon Ranges Employment and Training (MRE&T) Network in 2011, the high numbers of disengaged young people in the area was tabled as a collective issue. The Central Ranges Local Learning and Employment Network (CRLLEN) brokered a meeting and subsequent workshop with key stakeholders to examine the viability and possible elements of a Flexible Learning Option program, through local training providers, that would target this cohort of young people, re-engaging them into an educational or career pathway.

The program was to be delivered through Kyneton Community Learning Centre (KCLC) beginning in Term 3, 2012 and targeting enrolled and non-enrolled students aged 14-15 (up to 17 years) in a Certificate I in Vocational Preparation course. The program was intended to use two funding streams (Fee for Service through School Resource package funding arrangements and Skills Victoria) to ensure referrals from a wide source. It was intended that an MOU be developed outlining referral mechanisms, points of contact between schools and funding arrangements. The program was supported by a Flexible Learning Options Advisory Committee of key stakeholders who met on a monthly basis. Wrap around support was provided to the program ranging from case management of participants through Youth Connections, to course delivery support.

Nine enrolments were received with a total of seven going on to either partially or fully complete the course and establish their own education and career pathway. Four participants fully completed the course and three achieved a partial completion. The program ran four days a week for a total of nine weeks.

The advisory committee decided it was important to evaluate the program against the objectives outlined in the original stakeholder workshop. Outcomes could then be reported back to the network to inform future program development and evidence resource requirements. An evaluation plan was developed using a Flexible Learning Options evaluation framework tool and endorsed by the committee and the Macedon ranges Partnership Broker conducted the research with participants, program deliverers and partners.

The evaluation report investigated the ability of the program to increase the re-engagement into educational/career pathways for dis-engaged young people. The degree to which this was achieved was measured by the ability of the program to achieve sustained participant engagement, increased opportunities for education and career pathways for participants, increased partner effectiveness in supporting participants during and after the program and learning's to inform future re-engagement programs. Tools were developed to measure outcomes.

Evaluation findings concluded that the pilot was successful in re-engaging the majority of young people enrolled for a period beyond the life of the program. Sustained engagement did occur over time but was very difficult in the first three weeks while students settled in and



received assistance with social and emotional issues. Key barriers to program engagement included external lifestyle issues, instability of the home environment, depression and family break-down. These factors are largely out of control of the program organisers. Key enablers for sustained engagement was one on one attention, certificate recognition, supportive relationships with personnel from other agencies, flexibility of the program, not too restrictive learning environment and the absence of bullying. Participants demonstrated significant changes in their behaviours, attitudes and self-awareness which had a positive impact on their ability to learn. The majority of participants followed the course with further education, or TAFE. Using the wrap around approach to participants these pathways have been maintained three months after the program. The flexibility of the course, the environment in which it was delivered, and the approach taken by the coordinator and trainer ensured maximum retention and engagement of students. Coupled with partnership support for participants, and support to the staff from the advisory committee greater success for students was achieved. The key difficulty for the pilot was sustainability of funding and referral processes.

Participants reported learning a wide variety of new skills including financial management, preparation for work, controlling their behaviour, relaxation, and learning how to give and receive respect. They also reported increases in self-awareness, communication skills, confidence, and motivation.

At the completion of the program seven participants had clear understanding of and solid plans around their career pathway. A flexible approach to participants working towards their goals allowed student's to progress at their own pace and be comfortable to come back and complete units at a later date. Pathway development was supported through connections with other agencies. Following up students after course completion was seen as important but not within the scope of the training provider.

Partnerships were demonstrated to be vital in the successful delivery of the program. Key successes for partnership in the program included opportunities for projects, flexibility of partners to meet needs of participants, and a collaborative approach to identifying and developing solutions to issues. Challenges were the establishment of roles of partners, coordination of support for participants, and clear referral processes.

Themes that emerged from the evaluation included:

- Flexibility – flexibility of the environment, curriculum, support for participants all contributed to the success of the program
- The environment – out of school, community focussed, home like, mentoring, adult focussed environment aspects decreased students anxiety levels, increased trust and removed barriers to learning
- One on one learning – at student's own pace, pursuit of individual interests, and use of volunteer support contributed to success outcomes around individual learning needs
- Incentive – need for achievement, real outcome that could be built upon enabled students to refocus on their goals



- Partnerships – wrap around support for high needs students, problem solving, new opportunities for community involvement all contributed to successful outcomes for students
- Role of Coordinator and Trainer – flexibility, taking on additional resource commitments, coordination of program ensured ongoing engagement of students and greater ability of program to remain sustainable

Key challenges and successes included:

- Success also involves challenges
- Partnerships
- Sustainability and funding
- Program content

The key challenge of the program was in the difficulty of sustainability with funding constraints and the lack of formal and agreed referral and coordination arrangements in place between partners.

The program demonstrated that for particularly disengaged young people the course was a successful model for re-engagement into educational and career pathways. This model is vital to continue as part of a suite of options available for young people who require a different pathway than traditional schooling to complete their education.

Sustaining programs that are resource intensive and specialised for individual needs of students is challenging but essential in ensuring that no young person falls through the gaps because there is no option to meet their requirements. There are gaps that exist to support young people as they transition through such programs that also need to be addressed.

A strategic approach is required to develop the necessary processes and coordination between different programs to ensure their sustainability. Linking in findings of the report to the Macedon Ranges Youth Partnerships project will assist in the development of systems and processes for a coordinated approach to referral and tracking student pathways in such programs.

It will also ensure a sustainable model of funding is developed to support this course as one of a number of options available to young disengaged people in Macedon Ranges.

With the recognition that there are increased numbers of young people disengaging from school at earlier ages, there is an emergence of increasing numbers of Flexible Learning Option programs. The use of an evaluation framework to inform outcomes of Flexible Learning options is vital in the quality improvement of programs, ensuring duplication does not occur, and in supporting schools and organisations to understand what works and what needs ongoing support in ensuring success.

Background



During a 2011 meeting of the MR E&T Network the issue of the high numbers of young people disengaged from school was raised. The Central Ranges Local Learning and Employment Network (CRLLEN) facilitated a meetings in late 2011 and early 2012 with Berry Street (RTO) [first meeting], Woodend Neighbourhood House, Kyneton Community Learning Centre, Cobaw Community Health (Youth Partnerships), Macedon Ranges Shire (Youth Unit), Kyneton and Gisborne Secondary Colleges to assess the viability of delivering a flexible learning option with local Macedon Ranges training providers focussing on disengaged young people.

In order to develop a clear path forward the CRLLEN facilitated a workshop in March 2012 with key stakeholders including Kyneton Secondary College (KSC), Gisborne Secondary College (GSC), Cobaw Community Health (CCH), ICP Training and Kyneton Community Learning Centre (KCLC) to agree on key elements of a program.

The program would target enrolled and non-school enrolled students allowing two funding streams to be utilised (fee for service and Skills Victoria) and a wider catchment for referrals. It would be jointly owned and supported by an advisory committee. The program would deliver Certificate I in Vocational Education with the lead agency being KCLC. Both GSC and KSC, along with Youth Connections representatives indicated they had current potential referrals. It would also aspire to foster engagement and re-engagement of young people into education, be relevant to youth and complimentary to existing programs in the area. It was intended that an MOU be developed describing the referral mechanisms, and point of contact within each organisation.

CRLLEN provided funding to support a trainer to develop the program and consult with local stakeholders on referral pathways, partnership support and delivery options. A draft course overview was also developed and presented to the committee in May 2012.

Program Outline

Purpose: Engage participants in an educational/career pathway

Elements: The program will be centred on participants needs, using a strength based approach which aims to develop increased self-awareness in a supportive environment. Based on a community themed delivery, it will focus on self-value, educational needs and pathway plans through relevant and purposeful activities. Participants would also be case managed throughout their pathway. It will focus on student's literacy and numeracy needs and allow them to develop the rules and regulations in a learning environment very different to a classroom. Target ages would range from 14-15 up to 17 years. Pathway options include return to school, VCAL, Certificate of General



Education for Adults, Vocational Education Training (VET), employment or volunteer engagement.¹

Course topics included:

- Participate in OH&S processes (BSBOHS201A)
- Increase personal effectiveness (VU20006)
- Prepare for employment (VU20007)
- Develop an action plan for career planning (VU20008)
- Follow basic food safety practices (HLTFS207C)
- Develop and use a personal budget (FNSFLIT201B)
- Provide responsible service of alcohol (SITHFAB009A)

Participants also participated in an arts based project run through the MRSC where they worked with street art experts to design and paint the Kyneton Outdoor Pool. Excursions were also conducted and included Barker Trailers and Harcourt Vineyards to assist students in experiencing local workplaces.

Total cost of the course for students currently enrolled in school and who are therefore not able to access Higher Education and Skills funding was set at \$967.00 (Based on a minimum class size of 9). Funding would be provided by the schools (fee for service) Students not enrolled at school will be assisted with funding for the course and will be charged \$160.00 or \$120.00 concession. Participant selection would be a mix of school enrolled and un-enrolled to ensure financial viability and numbers to be sustainable.

To ensure that the FLO program would be well supported by key stakeholders an advisory committee was then established. The CRLLEN facilitates the committee and has representatives from KCLC, CCH, MRSC, KSC and GSC who meet on a regular basis. In total the CRLLEN has facilitated 11 meetings in 12 months to support the process.

The pilot program began in Term 3, 2012 with nine enrolments and was run from the KCLC in Kyneton. The program ran four days a week for a total of nine weeks. As a pilot it was decided by the committee to evaluate the program to:

- Find out whether the program met its objectives;
- Report the achievements made during the program ;
- Record evidence about what was successful;
- Inform planning for follow on programs to improve delivery;
- Analyse funding and resource requirements for future programs, and;
- Analyse program partnerships

¹ Stakeholder Report Summary and Course Overview – Macedon Ranges Flexible Learning Options Lyn McShannag, May 2012



An evaluation plan was developed and endorsed by the FLO Advisory Committee and the Macedon Ranges Partnership Broker conducted the research between September and November 2012. ²

Methodology

The goal of the program was to *“Increase the re-engagement into educational/career pathways of disengaged young people in the Macedon Ranges area.”*

The numbers of disengaged young people was recorded prior to and following the completion of the program to obtain data.

The objectives included to:

“Achieve sustained participant engagement during the program”

Using enrolment details, attendance records, interviews and observations of key stakeholders, questions around the consistency and quality of participation demonstrated by participants over the program was measured.

“Increase the opportunities for education and career pathways for participants”

Using student records and interviews with both participants, and staff education and career pathways were recorded and analysed to establish whether an increase had occurred.

“Increase partner effectiveness in supporting participants during and after the program”

Interviews with advisory committee members and key personnel from participating organisations informed the findings. Questions including what worked well and what were the challenges were explored.

“Identify issues and learning’s to inform future re-engagement programs”

Questions including what worked well, what were the challenges and issues and what could be changed in the next program were asked at an interview with participants, partners and staff.

To answer the questions the following tools were used:

1. Program Trainer Interview Tool³
2. Program Participant – Interview Response Sheet⁴
3. Program Coordinator Interview Tool⁵

² FLO Advisory Committee – Evaluation Plan for Certificate I in Vocational Preparation Lisa Linton, September 2012

³ Program Trainer Interview Tool – CRLLEN Macedon Ranges Partnership Broker - Lisa Linton September 2012

⁴ Program Participant Interview Response Sheet – CRLLEN Macedon Ranges Partnership Broker – Lisa Linton September 2012

Summary of Findings

Goal: Increase the re-engagement into educational and/or career pathways for disengaged young people in the MR area.

Of the original nine enrolments, one left in the first week, and one older participant left soon after. Seven out of the original nine enrolments (77%) of the Certificate I Vocational Preparation have re-engaged to some degree with education or a career pathway where they were previously disengaged from any education or were very disengaged if attending school at all. Four participants fully completed the course and three achieved a partial completion. See Table 1 for summary of engagement prior to and after completion of the course. Please note data has been de-identified.

Table 1: Summary of engagement levels at enrolment in Certificate I Vocational Preparation

Participant (age)	Engagement with education (Prior)	Plan	Degree of disengagement	Partial/full completion Certificate	Engagement after
1 (17)	At home – not enrolled in school since Year 7	Animal Studies Wants to learn more first	High	Full	Enrolled in CGEA Term 4, 2012
2 (15)	Working part time not enrolled in school	Wants to continue education and work part time maybe a SBA	High	Partial	Enrolled in SatVCAL
3 (16)	Pathway from school - fluctuating attendance in 2012 and behavioural problems	Wants to go back to school and complete Yr 10	Medium	Full	Enrolled back into Year 10
4 (15)	Pathway from school not attending in 2012	Wants to do Building	High	Full	Enrolled in CGEA Term 4. Wants to enrol in IT at TAFE in 2013

⁵ Program Coordinator Interview Tool – CRLLEN Macedon Ranges Partnership Broker Lisa Linton September 2012



5 (16)	Pathway from school not attending in 2012	Wants to be Carpenter	High	Full	Enrolled at Kangan Building and Construction
6 (16)	Left school due to bullying not attending in 2012	Wants to go into Army but needs to learn more first	High	Partial	Enrolled in Certificate General Education Adults (CGEA) Term 4, 2012
7 (16)	Not attending school for a while. Works part time	Wants to do aged care	Medium	Partial	Unknown

Participants had a very low level of engagement with either an education or career pathway prior to attending the program. Four participants had not attended school for longer than six months while three were sporadically attending school. The majority of participants had some idea of what they wanted to do in the future but didn't have any real direction in their lives to achieve what they wanted.

Seven participants had increased their level of engagement into educational or career pathways at the completion of the program demonstrated by both their Training Plan and also their perceived interest and commitment to their education or career pathways. In the interviews all participants described "hating school" prior to the commencement of the program. One participant stated that doing the program has helped her to see the options and has given her information and confidence in ways to achieve what she wants, whereas previously she hated school and didn't feel like she would be able to have a future working in her area of interest. She is now progressing her studies by undertaking a Certificate of General Education for Adults and planning to pathway into Satellite VCAL. One also described wanting to keep learning but not ready to make any commitments at the onset of the course and after completion of the course described himself as missing school and wanting to go back and complete the year.

Objectives:

Sustained participant engagement during program

At interview participants were required to sign a commitment to completing the course and to attend regularly to encourage ownership of their choice to be involved. While this was the case, according to student records four participants regularly attended the course while three were spasmodic. Three participants recorded 100% attendance, while one was slightly less regular. Of the four regular attendees the degree of actual engagement in the learning environment increased as the course progressed. Three students attended less regularly. According to the trainer, the ones who attended regularly "became better engaged in their learning."



Sustained engagement was also measured by the degree of engagement change over time as well as attendance. This demonstrated that students not only came to the course but became more active participants as time went on.

Both participants and program organisers reported that engagement in learning increased over time. The first three weeks were difficult for both trainer and students as they settled into the course content and routines were developed. One participant described being a bit “ifly” about the program for about the first three to four weeks. Participants were highly anxious and nervous. One stated “I thought it might be like school so I felt very nervous, once I got to know everyone it was much better.” The coordinator of the program described the group as having feelings of hostility and aggression, but participants had mellowed as they settled into the environment. Participants were initially very unsettled and some were described as “bouncing off the walls or as banging their heads on the table”. Other behaviours displayed included flicking things, unable to sit down, making high pitched noises, and squealing. Observations concluded that this was not happening by the completion of the program. One participant also described that after a while they were “back into doing work now.” Students like to be acknowledged by the trainer near the end that they were “getting their work done now.”

Table 2 describes the significant changes in key behaviours indicating engagement levels as the program progressed.

Table 2: Summary key changes in behaviours over program progression

Behaviour at beginning of program	Behaviour at end
Highly aggressive and hostile	Increased trust and less aggression
High degree of mistrust	Increase trust demonstrated
Unresponsive	Work achieved
High levels anxiety especially when a new person comes into the room	Less anxiety, coping better when a new person comes in
Feeling dumb	A sense of achievement

Maintaining engagement was according to the coordinator “hard work” and at times “all over the place”. Engagement ranged across the group quite significantly. The coordinator described that engagement was retained largely due to the rapport the participants had with the trainer and regular contact with parents or guardians keeping them informed and involved. It was often difficult for parents to get their young person to the course. As relationships developed with staff of the KCLC comfort levels of the participants increased, leading to better engagement. The trainer described “When we first started the course, I didn’t exist; it took at least a week to be acknowledged and two to three to gain rapport. It was then that I got to speak to the participant not the performer.”

According to the trainer, coordinator and participants themselves there were some common barriers and enablers that impacted on the engagement of students in the program.



Key barriers included:

- External lifestyle issues
- Instability of the home environment
- Depression
- Family break-up

Key enablers for students included:

- One on one individual attention for students
- Incentive of a Certificate and recognition they had to work to get it
- Supportive relationships with personnel from other agencies
- Flexibility of program structure and time
- Environment relaxed and not too restrictive for e.g. smoking in designated area allowed
- The absence of bullying

These factors significantly contributed to whether individual students became increasingly engaged over time. Barriers affecting individual students were largely out of control of the course delivery environment whereas the enablers could be controlled through coordination of the course structure and content. An interesting observation by staff was that, while excursions were popular with some participants, they also proved to be a barrier to some attending. It was thought that this was due to high anxiety levels experienced by some participants from being out of the “home environment” of the KCLC.

Four participants of the Certificate I Vocational preparation were formally interviewed by the researcher as part of the evaluation process to ascertain engagement in learning across the course of the program. The participants described their learning in a positive light and were proud of the achievements they had made. What students learnt can be summarised under the following headings:

Skills, behaviours and attitudes:

- Financially supporting myself
- Preparing for a job and being interviewed
- Spray paint techniques
- Acting in a workplace – health and safety
- How to control my behaviour
- Relaxation
- Food handling
- Rules in the classroom and workplace
- Learnt how to give and get respect

Self-Awareness:

- More about myself
- It's okay to ask for help
- The need to communicate and show respect



- How to feel good about finishing my work
- More self-awareness
- Becoming more confident
- More confident
- More stable and less disappointed in myself
- Less stressed and less angry
- More mature
- Getting up and taking responsibility
- More motivation

“I have learnt how to relax, read over things, double check it and understand what I am doing – I now feel good about finishing things.”

“When I started the course I was worried I wouldn’t finish it, that I wasn’t smart enough. After the course I am more confident about finishing things and that I need to do something for opportunities to open up for me.”

Although increased engagement did occur for participants it took time and patience from the trainer in the initial weeks. Engagement was patchy at times but overall an increase was achieved. Engagement required a high degree of resourcing by the trainer, the coordinator and personnel from other organisations to be maintained and successful.

Increased opportunities for education and career pathways for participants

All participants completed a Training Support Plan (TSP) prior to the program commencing. This was completed at interview stage with the young person, their guardian, and CCH. The plan identified what pathway participants were interested in following and identified support or special learning needs. (See Table 1) Language, literacy and numeracy levels were also tested. Table 3 summarises the identified pathways for students at the completion of the program.

Table 3: Pathways identified for students (immediately following the program)

School	TAFE/other training	Employment	KCLC - CGEA	Structured Workplace Learning, Apprenticeship
1	2	1	3	-

Following the completion of the course students had a clearer understanding and more solid plans around their career pathways. A number of participants moved quickly onto their next goal while some chipped away at a number of units. The Community Centre environment allowed students to progress at their own pace and ability. Some participants experiencing many social challenges were able to complete units as their circumstances allow, coming back into the next course and moving slowly into their pathways.



After tracking of students three months following the course Table 4 indicates the pathways that students have taken. Please note one participant not able to be tracked as they have left the area*.

Table 4: Pathways identified 3 months following completion of course*

School	TAFE/other training	Employment	KCLC - CGEA	Structured Workplace Learning, Apprenticeship	SatVCAL
1	1	-	3	-	1

During the program all participants were given a number of ongoing opportunities to link in with and develop relationships with social support in the form of councillors, mentors, or speakers. Students were connected with workers from Macedon Ranges Shire Council and Cobaw Community Health through the Youth Connections program. The worker from MRSC provided one of one support to some participants taking an active role in coming into the classroom and also getting to know all participants. She also took participants out of class at times to provide extra support to students when it was required.

The trainer herself played a significant role in the provision of social support to students. This was essential as she had been able to develop trust with students. She described many of the initial classes as “sorting through issues and providing education on matters such and drugs and alcohol”, in an environment that allowed these issues to be expressed and discussed confidentially. This, according to the trainer, needed to happen prior to any learning outcomes being achieved. The rapport that was developed and the support provided to students by the provider while advantageous to the program also proved a threat when at times a drop in attendance occurred when the trainer was unwell or unable to attend. This could also be problematic as the provision of social support is outside the role of the trainer under normal circumstances and also can impact on the outcomes of unit work being achieved.

Youth Connections clients were case managed by CCH during the program. The Youth Liaison Officer from Victoria Police provided a session with the young people. Students with particular health issues were also referred to the Youth Clinic run through CCH. The coordinator maintained regular contact with parents and guardians and agencies involved to ensure that the young people were constantly supported. While this was challenging in a number of cases and highly resource intensive it also proved a valuable resource in keeping students attending.

Difficulties were experienced in tracking participants once they left the course. This occurred with those that exited early and also once participants had completed. Time to follow up students could not be allocated to the trainer and the coordinator undertook this role in a voluntary capacity. Although this was also undertaken in partnership with other organisations



it was a common conclusion by all partners that the young people are difficult to find in the first place and then track.

The support services that were put in place for participants were a key determinant for the success of the students finding a pathway and for the majority to continue on the pathway after the completion of the program. After three months of the program, five participants remain connected into social support while maintaining their career and education pathway.

Participant feedback indicated that the young people felt that they had increased options available to them after they had completed the course.

“I could chill out for a term and now I’m ready to go back to school”

“I’m feeling confident about going back to school”

“This course helped me to have some goals for my future”

“The course has given me information and ways of working out my options for the future”

“I now know that doing this course will help me get a job”

“I have learnt how to get more confident in new environments”

The program has given me options where I felt I had none

“I am feeling confident to go back to school with new skills”

“The program has given me more self-discipline to follow my dreams”

Increased partner effectiveness in supporting participants during and after program

The FLO program was supported throughout its implementation by a committee comprising of KCLC, CCH, MRSC, KSC and GSC and CRLLEN who met on a regular basis to support the coordinator and trainer in identifying and develop solutions to issues coming for the program. Table 5 describes the provision of resources and support by these and other key partners during the delivery of the program.

Table 5: Key partner support

Organisation	Support provided
Cobaw Community Health	Committee member Youth Connections – referral and case management of participants



MRSC	Committee member Case management Classroom support for trainer Arts project Community Bus
Victoria Police	Committee member Visit to program
GSC	Referrals to program and enrolment process Visited students
CRLLEN	Chair committee Committee member Facilitator/Partnership Broker Funding for original program development Evaluation Classroom support for trainer
Industry – Barker Trailers Harcourt Valley Vineyards	Site visits
SatVCAL	Discussions with Trainer and Coordinator

Interviews with key partners outlined key successes and challenges of the partnerships and provided valuable insight into how enhancing relationships between partners can influence the success of future programs.

Successes

- Transparency of partnerships
- Opportunities for joint projects
- Flexibility of partners to modify program
- Support felt by KCLC when all partners identify issues and develop solutions together
- Program helped other agencies to work more closely together
- Coordinator role essential

Challenges:

- Clear boundaries for workers not established
- Linking in agencies and getting them to work together and everyone understanding what role they play in the overall
- Expectations of role not clearly understood
- Barriers to regular meetings with referring agencies for e.g. time
- No clear coordination role in participant case management
- Lack clarity of what happens after the course is finished – whose responsibility is the student
- Meetings have been held at a problematic time for partners
- More clarity needed around referral process and who is responsible
- Official time allocation and pay recognition if involved in program
- Program can have greater capacity to involve other partners in curriculum e.g. visit to TAFE



- More information required from other organisations about who they are working with and what they do
- More clarity around project – more planned approach at beginning to ensure everyone outcomes are being met and roles are clearly defined
- More could be done to involve parents as partners – especially in providing support to each other
- Can be frustrating when everyone not at table in meetings
- Lack understanding of the VET system – need evidence from schools that student exited

Solutions suggested:

- Clear boundaries and understanding of both role of worker and the organisation is established prior to beginning of program
- Expectations of roles outlined and agreed upon
- Regular meetings with referring agencies
- Clear coordination role for each participant established
- Rotate committee meeting times and venues
- Establish agreed referral process
- Workers have clear connection back to their PD as to their role in FLO
- Plan with SatVCAL some combined visits
- Plan projects at beginning with all parties involved
- Involve parents to assist in supporting each other

Challenges with solutions:

- Planning time not factored into trainers wage
- Planning time not factored into worker time allocations/case load pressure
- Increase coordination time and few resources to support

Identify issues and learning's to inform re-engagement programs for the future

Through interviews with both participants, trainer, coordinator and key partners the following themes emerged around what worked well in the program.

Flexibility

The flexibility of the Certificate I Vocational Preparation program was a key theme in the successful outcomes for participant's re-engagement with education and learning. The curriculum allowed time at the beginning for students to settle into the environment, to build trust with each other and the trainer and for rules to be established. During the program the flexibility of the curriculum also allowed time for individual students to work with the case manager and for the group to "go out and explore in the bus". These activities allowed participants to establish rapport with each other and for more relaxed discussion around what they wanted to achieve in their learning to occur. The trainer explained, "Spending the time to allow the real young person to come out was good and helped them settle into



learning better.” The flexibility of the curriculum also allowed others to come to some sessions which were of great benefit to participants.

The flexibility of the trainer and coordinator was also vital in the success of the course and outcomes for students. The trainer was able to assess the curriculum early and adapt both it and the assessment tools to suit the participants and their needs. The flexible role the trainers provided in supporting the young people socially was integral in their re-engagement. By being inventive the trainer was able to allow social support to be incorporated in the curriculum and through discussion between students building their communication skills.

The Environment

Located within the KCLC the course was conducted in a portable area out the back. The room’s location meant that participants had to walk past staff, other classes and the occasional childcare centre to reach the space. This was a definite key to success for the participants of the program who were uncomfortable in a classroom/school environment. The environment was more like a home, and not at all like school. Although anxiety levels were initially high, students described the home like atmosphere and the small classroom size as helping them to settle into learning. Participants were greeted by community members each day and were guided into respecting the other users of the centre including the children. Students were mentored in giving and receiving respect by each contact they had within the centre. Rules were established collectively amongst the group to begin with, however the restrictive environment they were used to at school was not present. Students were allowed to smoke in designated areas and negotiated what times breaks were initiated. Participants described being treated more like adults and this gradually lead them to begin to relax, to be less hostile and to trust others around them. This coincided with the point at which participants began to describe themselves as “wanting to learn.” A different environment was the key in removing the barrier to learning that had been created in the past, even for a short time.

One on One Learning in small group

Participants, coordinator and trainer described the key element to the successful outcomes for students in the Vocational Preparation program were the one on one learning focus for each student. Although this was difficult to manage at times especially in the beginning, students were able to complete work at different paces according to their abilities. It also meant the trainer could concentrate on particular learning needs established at the assessment stage. One on one learning allowed students to pursue interests that they determined in assessment tasks. Volunteer support also allowed this approach to be more effective.

The incentive



To achieve successful outcomes with the FLO program it was essential to have incentives for participants. This was especially important as many of the participant's had very little experience with achievement at school. The course delivering an actual Certificate meant that students even if they had not fully completed the course could gain certificates of attainment in different units studied. This provided many with a sense of pride and generated belief in their own ability to learn. As one committee member described "the Certificate I Vocational Preparation gives these students a real outcome, a real advantage – they can actually go to TAFE after they complete it." For these students it was also a good incentive to see their school supporting a different approach to their learning. The practical applications in the learning worked especially well for students as an incentive because they could see how this knowledge and skill could impact on them in the workforce.

"I enjoyed the food handling and OH&S units, I have never been taught practical things"

"I felt confident in class as the time went by because it was all common sense"

The Partnerships

The evaluation results showed that support from other agencies was vital to the success of a FLO program. According to each stakeholder interviewed the wrap around support for each participant is vital to their re-engagement and their ability to follow through with their career or learning pathways chosen. When the system between organisations and their involvement in the program was working well the benefits to participants was enormous, resulting in increased participation. Additionally when all parties met together issues arising were workshopped and solutions were developed. The trainer and coordinator felt this support was extremely important. Partnerships with parents of participants were also vital to ensuring students participation. While there were significant barriers happening in some cases, where parents were more involved participation increased. Partnerships around the art project conducted with MRSC had some positives for program participants. One student described "I like experiencing new things - like the Melbourne trip to see the graffiti – I hadn't seen any before."

The role of the KCLC, the Coordinator and Trainer

In the first instance the willingness of the KCLC to take on a difficult pilot enabled the project to be successful. When fee for service funding was not made available through the schools, KCLC took on the liability and the potential additional resource implication to allow the program to continue. When participant numbers were low the centre also took on the commitment to support these young people. It was clear through the evaluation process the degree of dedication and commitment that was required by both the coordinator and the trainer to the success of the program. Resources required to successfully ensure the wrap around approach and to ensure flexibility was well above what would be normally expected.



The role of the coordinator became pivotal to the successful running of the program. The coordinator was responsible for initial interviews, parental follow-up, agency referrals and liaison, and student follow-ups. It was estimated that the time taken each day undertaking the role was up to two hours. The role is integral in ensuring the wrap around approach to each participant is achieved. The role was assessed by the committee as being so vital that in the subsequent FLO program that was delivered following the pilot, the coordinator role was factored into the funding. Unfortunately due to low numbers this was not able to continue as a paid position and the role fell back to the original coordinator to add to his responsibilities.

Evaluation results demonstrated that the consistency of the staff was important in maintaining student participation. The young people in the course found trusting others an issue and the consistency of staff meant they were able to build reliable relationships with a fewer number of people in the course of their learning.

The distinct role of the trainer and her particular approach ensured successful outcomes for students in the program. It was important for the young people to distinguish her as a “trainer” and not as a teacher. The relationship was described by participants as one that treated them more like an adult and that was built on respect for each party. Evaluation participants spoke strongly about the dual respect that had been created between trainer and students. Learning was approached building on the knowledge and experience that participants brought with them. Participants described themselves as “not feeling like a dummy” whereas previously they had felt this way when they had attended school. The trainer approached the program from the perspective of building relationships with participants, and developing their self-esteem as a foundation to learning.

“Lyn [the Trainer] is a bit funny, she never tells me off, she instructs not teaches”

“I feel more mature in this class –it is different from school”

“When I showed my own vulnerabilities, the young people responded.”

What were challenges and issues?

Through interviews with both participants, trainer, coordinator and key partners the following themes emerged around what challenges and issues arose during the course of the program.

Successes can also involve challenges



A number of the aspects that made the program successful also presented themselves as challenges. While flexibility was essential to the course's success it was resource intensive. It relied on the centre, the coordinator and the trainer contributing additional hours to the program. The one on one learning approach was also resource intensive and required careful management by the trainer. The approach taken by the trainer while ensuring success also presented many challenges. The trainer described being flexible required a great deal of time and energy. "Having to change things quickly to adapt to the participants, sometime hour to hour, was difficult," she described. Due to the high level of social support she offered the young people, it meant that there were times this crossed over into her personal life.

Partnerships

The partnerships while being a key success factor were also challenging at times. Stakeholders spoke about not have an understanding about each other's roles within their organisation but also in relation to the program. The program's key challenge around partnerships was in the implementation of the arts based project. The project was a great opportunity for the young people to be involved and was coincidentally being run at the same time as the course. Unfortunately due to the timing of the implementation, and the fact that project parameters had already been set, it meant that no collaborative planning could be done involving the young people or the trainer prior to the project beginning. The project was not geared towards youth engagement although a number of participants were interested in the topic. "I didn't like the way that the project people picked everything we were going to do" and "I didn't like working with the graffiti guys, they were weird and annoying and not interested in us at all," were two examples of where participants felt little ownership over the project. The trainer found it difficult to manage the external project as well as course content and it was felt that the project needed more structure and organisation to build on its merit. For a project to be successful it was felt that good interpersonal relationships and the ability to be flexible were vital. In the absence of planning from the onset and a lack of clarity of roles between partners this made the project a challenge.

Sustainability and Funding

Stakeholders felt that there was a general lack of support by schools both financially and in referring young people to the course. In the original workshop between stakeholders, schools indicated their support for the program via funding provision through School Resource Package (SRP) funding arrangements. An MOU was intended to be created to ensure this partnership arrangement was to be put in place. This arrangement did not occur and as a result students could only attend the course if they exited from school. Financial sustainability of the program was dependant on receiving the two streams of funding (Schools SRP and HESG). When this did not occur and referrals from schools did not occur (with exception of GSC) the sustainability of the program became insecure. Obtaining referrals to the program became a big pressure for the committee. The KCLC had to carry the additional cost involved in supporting the participants to complete the course. The



funding formula and the realities of the cost of a resource intensive program remain a major barrier to the sustainability of the program.

Program content

The program content was adapted during the course of the program by the trainer to suit individual needs of students but also the group as a whole. It was discovered that students did not learn efficiently when using computers individually. The use of Facebook was the main barrier to learning. Group work was still a challenge for participants at end of the course. At the time of writing the report however, students who have gone onto the next FLO program offered at KCLC have settled well into group work. It was also discovered that participants had a very low level of confidence in a workplace environment and that group rather than individual placements would be worthwhile considering in the future. Shorter days and a shorter week were also recommended by a number of stakeholders.

Suggested Changes

Changes suggested by interviewees included:

Partnerships:

- Develop a sustainable funding model prior to program beginning
- Plan projects and other collaborative activities early and meet regularly over the course time
- Clearly define the roles of all organisations and partners
- Develop MOU's with partners
- Involve young people in the planning and development of projects around areas of their interest for e.g. Graduation
- Include in evaluation those who left the program

Course Content:

- Build on the learning's from the evaluation to hone the course
- Share learning with other FLO programs about what made it successful

Conclusions

The program was successful in its goal to increase the re-engagement of disengaged young people in Macedon Ranges into an educational and/or career pathway. Although numbers entering the course were not high, 77% of those who did enrol have re-engaged with education or a career pathway where they were previously disengaged from education, many for a long period of time. Seven young people have developed a solid career plan where they had previously little idea of the direction for their future and how to get there.

Sustained participant engagement over the course timeline was varied. Time and patience was required by the trainer and course coordinator to foster engagement especially in the first three weeks of the program. As the course progressed engagement levels increased as



trust was built and participants saw the benefits in what they were achieving. Most significant was the changes in behaviour, attitude and positive self-awareness in students over time which contributed to their ongoing pathways options.

As a result of the program there was an increase in opportunities for education and career pathways for students. Seven had identified pathways at the completion of the course. After three months six had retained a pathway. Social support and the wrap around approach played a vital role in keeping students engaged in their pathway and positive about their future.

Partner support was vital to the success of the program. Effectiveness of partnerships increased over time and key learning's such as the importance of pre-planning and the clarification of roles and responsibilities was realised. Key successes also include the ability of the curriculum, trainer and coordinator to maintain flexibility. The home like environment was instrumental in allowing students to re-engage in learning. The need for overall coordination of the program and the importance of the liaison role between students, parents, schools and agencies was demonstrated clearly in the course of the program.

One on one learning in small groups and the provision of incentives to participants was recognised as a key success. The provision of wrap around support provided by other agencies both to the participants themselves and through support provided to staff through the committee was essential.

The role of the KCLC, the trainer and the coordinator was pivotal in the success of the program despite the high resource requirement it demanded.

The key challenge of the pilot was in the difficulty of sustaining such a program with funding constraints and the lack of formal and agreed referral agreements in place between partners.

Recommendations

The pilot evaluation has demonstrated the success in of the delivery of Certificate I in Vocational Preparation to young people in a community setting as a means of re-engaging them into education or career pathway. The young people this has worked for in particularly has been those who have:

- been out of school for a long period of time
- high degrees of anxiety, hostility, aggression and lack of trust in adults
- had a particular negative experience of school and the classroom environment over a period of time
- unable to cope in school environment
- are unable to cope in groups of more than five
- need individual attention with their learning
- high social, emotional and/or health needs
- multiple barriers to engagement



- the need to re-engage for a short period of time as a break or to continue on another pathway

The importance of retaining this type of FLO program as a part of a suite of programs available for young people is vital. A strategic approach to the development of the suite linking options is recommended. The FLO committee has potential to take on a more strategic approach to the whole FLO environment.

The pilot was specifically tailored and adjusted to participants and many learning from the program itself can be transferred. It is recommended that the findings of the report be shared across key networks to enable other developing FLO programs to take on the learning's.

It is recommended that the findings from the evaluation be reported to the Macedon Ranges Youth Partnerships executive committee to progress some of the more strategic work highlighted in the report. This includes the need for a planned coordinated approach to sustained funding, referral pathways and tracking tools in the FLO environment.

Appendix 1

STAKEHOLDER REPORT SUMMARY



MACEDON RANGES FLEXIBLE LEARNING OPTIONS – May 2012

This is a summary of the interviews/discussions held with KC&LC trainer/coordinator and the various Stakeholders with the view to develop an understanding of stakeholder and participant needs. The recommendations have been embedded in the Training and Assessment Strategy (TAS) where possible within the framework of the Certificate I in Vocational Preparation course.

Stakeholders

Central Ranges Local Learning Employment Network (CRLLEN) – Boyd Maplestone
Kyneton Secondary College (KSC) - Chris Bromley
Gisborne Secondary College (GSC) – John Horley
Cobaw Community Health (CCHS) Youth Connections - Jan Rees, Damian Mason, Joy Black (Spiral Program)
Macedon Ranges Youth Development (MRYD) – Kathy Dent, Pauline Neil
Kyneton Police Youth Officer (KPYO) – Joe Grbac
Berry Street, Seymour, CAP program – Marcus Cook
Satellite VCAL Coordinator – Marcia McGrath
KC&LC – Lynn McShanag, John Thomas
ICP Training – Sharon Phayer
CVGT – Renata Andrews
Sureway – Melissa
BEST – Cheryl,
Volunteers Network – Eric Dearicott
Change it up team – Youth representatives/ambassadors (through MRSC)

Referral/selection

- Referral agencies – GSC, KSC, MRSC, CCH, Job Service Agencies
- Selection would be mixed school enrolled and unenrolled participants for the financial viability and numbers for sustainability.
- Age – schools are looking at yr9 level, welfare referrals 14/15-17yrs
- MOU with schools for enrolled school based participants, particular attention to selection into the program/ soft reentry back into school enrolled participants and would also have a case management approach for entry into the program/during and re-entry back into school.
- MOU/ Training support plan with referral agencies, participants, parents addressing selection /commitment/and special needs/support/privacy, duty of care.
- School selection would be developed through school careers and welfare officers
- CCH/GSC referrals would possibly engage in Spiral program as a preliminary to, and FLO would be seen as a logical follow on for those not engaged. To look at working together at linking both programs.

Educational /wellbeing support

- Partnerships with case manager (CCH, KSC, GSC) for back up (open communications) for participants that have special needs or needs that are identified in the learning environment.
- MRSC are willing to offer a support person for 2hrs a week for the duration of the program as a network support and referral contact to be made available.
- Introducing community ambassadors into the learning environment of the program for community behavioral programs, (KPYO) cyber bullying, alcohol in communities, legal advisory.



Central Ranges Local Learning & Employment Network

Incorporating Macedon Ranges, Mitchell & Murrindindi Shires

- Developing mentor/role model partnerships with industry/ youth services and 'change it up' youth reps.
- KPYO offered crises support, also networking volunteer connections.
- Willingness for MRSC, KPYO, CCH to show case what is available for youth within their organizations.
- KSC, GSC - Schools will offer professional involvement in the delivery of the program as well as career advisory visits, including what is available in their school for the student(KSC) in yr 10.
- JSA's (CVGT) database link up for up to date data on available placements /apprenticeships /traineeships. Talk on what is available in pathway options.
- Engaging externally with community volunteers to develop opportunities and relationships i.e. Fire brigade.
- Satellite VCAL external transition day/showcase.
- Curriculum resource sharing with Satellite VCAL, Berry Street in relevant programs, CAP. Debriefing delivery approach/management.

Methodology / Delivery approach

- Program acts as a taster in developing employability skills
- Links between education and the workplace.
- Language, literacy, numeracy is continued.
- Valued and inclusive approach to the course and to future education
- Life skills element to the program so as not to be industry/gender specific
- Accredited gives substance for future employment. Ability to provide multiple certificates within the program
- Involving community as the primary theme and health/food as a secondary element
- Resilience/confidence building and having an underlying Cognitive Behavioural Therapy approach
- Give participants ownership/responsibility of their environment and rules and regulations
- Create relationships with volunteer networks, industry and JSAs for involvement and pathway placement options.
- Establishing CGEA as a pathway option for those younger participants that wish not to return to school with a follow through option of VCAL.
- Make the delivery all about the participant with relevant purposeful activities and exercises. Using kinesthetic and visual learning and work/community related external excursions.
- Experience orientated with focus on participants interests in relation to career pathway.
- Flexibility and the ability to steer clear of conventional classroom environment.
- Integrating/complimenting and linking into other programs/services i.e. VCAL, Spiral, Mock interviews, Ignition, My future, Pole position, MR youth development team.
- Have professional involvement in classroom delivery from Schools.

Follow up

- What is the follow up for 4th term, for those identified as not returning to school?
- CGEA and then VCAL if not re-engaged into school, innovating new programs, work placement through business/industry partnerships for traineeships/apprenticeships.
- Special attention is given to the participant to support re-entry back into the school environment through case management and support given to face to face teachers.



Example Evaluation Outline

The end product

What is the purpose of our evaluation?	Who is our audience?	How can we communicate with this audience
Did the Cert Voc Prep achieve its objectives?		
To report achievements of Certificate I Voc Prep	Program participants Program team FLO Committee Members General public CRLEN Other re-engagement programs	Graduation presentation Newsletters/media release Websites Report – funding bodies/CRLEN/evidence for applications Presentations
To record evidence about what has worked in the program	Program participants Program team	Report Presentation
To inform planning for next program and for other like programs	Other re-engagement programs Program team CRLEN FLO Committee members	Report Presentation
To improve program delivery for following programs	Program team CRLEN FLO Committee members	Report Preparation meetings
To analyse funding and resource requirements for future programs	Program team CRLEN FLO Committee members Other re-engagement programs Funding bodies	Report
To analyse program partnerships	Program team FLO Committee Members CRLEN	Report CRLEN report

Example Evaluation Plan



Central Ranges Local Learning & Employment Network
 Incorporating Macedon Ranges, Mitchell & Murrindindi Shires

Goal (taken from Workshop and Lyn's report)	Questions	Information required	Data source
Increase the re-engagement into educational/career pathways of disengaged young people in the MR area	Has there been an increase in the re-engagement of young people in the MR area?	How many dis-engaged prior to and after the program	
Objectives (This will happen by):	Questions	Information required	Data source
Sustained participant engagement during program	Did participant levels remain consistent during the program?	No's enrolled Attendances Program team observations	Enrolments Attendance records Program evaluation/interview
	What levels and quality of participation were demonstrated by participants over the time?	Program team observations Program participant feedback	Program evaluation/interview Program evaluation/interviews
Increased opportunities for pathways for participants	How many participants have identified a pathway- Training support plan	No's with identified TSP	Student records
	How many students have engagement plan in place	No's with identified engagement support in place	Student records
	Participants completed course	No's completed	Student records
	How many participants enrolled in CGEA or other courses	No's enrolled in CGEA or other course	Student records
	How many participants have enrolled back in school?	No's enrolled	Student records
	How many participants have secured an apprenticeship, SWPL,	No's secured	Student records
	How many participants have secured employment?		



Central Ranges Local Learning & Employment Network
 Incorporating Macedon Ranges, Mitchell & Murrindindi Shires

	How many participants have no identified pathway?		
<p>Increased partner effectiveness in supporting participants during and after program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community services • Education • Industry/business 	<p>What support and resources were provided by partners</p> <p>What worked well between partners that increased the program effectiveness?</p> <p>What were the challenges?</p>	<p>Support and resources given</p> <p>Information about what worked well/challenges</p>	<p>Partner discussion</p> <p>Partner interview</p>
<p>Identify issues and learnings to inform re-engagement programs for the future</p>	<p>What worked well in the overall program</p> <p>What were the challenges and issues as a result of the pilot?</p> <p>What would we change for the next program?</p>	<p>What worked well</p> <p>What were overall challenges</p> <p>What would we change</p>	<p>Evaluation session after program completion</p>

- What skills have participants learnt?
- Have their confidence/resilience/self-awareness/self-esteem levels increased
- Have their attitudes to education/employment changed?
- Do they have an increased understanding about where they want to head in future
- What have you learnt that you will use in the future
- What parts of the program did you enjoy or not enjoy and why?
- What could we do to improve the program for the next participants?



Program Deliverer Interview

Date: _____

Interviewee: _____

Interviewer: _____

Section 1:

Did the program achieve its goal to increase the re-engagement into educational and/or career pathways of disengaged young people in the MR area?

Can you describe the degree of engagement with an educational or career pathway the young participants had prior to the program?

Can you describe the degree of engagement with an education and/or career pathway participants have after the program?

Section 2:

Did the program achieve its objectives?

A. Sustained participant engagement during program

Did participant levels remain consistent during the program?

What levels and quality of participation were demonstrated by participants over the program delivery time?

B. Increased opportunities for pathways for participants

Have participants developed a Training Support Plan during the program? How many?

Have participants developed any structures for social support and engagement during the program – either formal or informal? How many?

What extra support did you offer or link students into as part of the course (personal health and wellbeing needs, case management support)?

How many participants completed /partially completed the course? What were some of the barriers and enablers that impacted on participants completing the course?

Describe the pathways the participants have decided upon as a result of the course?

How would you rate the program in relation to the successful re-engagement of students in learning? Poor /Good/ Very Good/Excellent (Why?)

C. Increased partner effectiveness in supporting participants during and after program



What assistance and resources were provided by partners to support the program?

What worked well between partners that increased the program effectiveness?

What were the challenges?

How would you rate your engagement with parents? Poor /Good/ Very Good/Excellent (Why?)

D. Identify issues and learning's to inform re-engagement programs for the future

What worked well in the overall program?

What were the challenges and issues as a result of the pilot?

What would you change for the next program? If you could improve one thing about your program, what would you do?

Were there any courses/subjects that you don't currently offer, but you feel there is a need for?
Evidence of need?

Section 3: Other:

What skills do you think that participants have learnt as a result of the program?

What changes have you noticed in participant's levels of confidence, resilience, self-awareness and self-esteem as a result of the program?

What changes have you noticed in participant's attitudes to education, training and employment as a result of the program?

Is there anything else you would like to feedback about any aspect of the program?



FLO Evaluation Interview Questions - Program Participants

Interviews will be conducted with participants as a one on one structured discussion. This will also contribute to participants learning outcome of “doing an interview”. Interviews will be about 10 minutes duration and will be conducted at KCLC in the large meeting room.

CRLEN Partnership Broker (PB) will conduct the interviews as part of an overall evaluation process for the FLO Pilot project. Prompts won't be used as actual questions but will give some parameters around what types of responses the evaluation is wanting to illicit.

The PB will explain to participants the purpose of the interview and what will be done with the results:

1. Just relax – my name is Lisa and I have worked with Lyn on helping to support the Certificate program. I am going to spend about 10 minutes with you in mock interview. Think of this as just a normal conversation you might have with someone.
2. The Cert I is what is known as a pilot program which means we are giving it a go to see how well it goes.
3. We want to know what has worked well and what hasn't and where we can improve when we do it again
4. Questions will be asked around what you have learnt, what you liked/didn't like and how you might see things differently than before you started the program
5. The things you talk to me about will be used in my report but I won't be using your names or any information that lets anyone know who you are. Lyn would also like to know what you got from the course. We may be able to use some of your ideas to change the program next time
6. I will be using a checklist that Lyn has given me to let her know how well you have done in your interview. This will be around the things that Lyn has worked with you yesterday on doing an interview – eg's

What kind of things have you learnt in the program?

Prompts:

Skills– Workplaces, OH&S, Budgeting, RSA,

Behaviours - being in a classroom, working with others, working on a project

Attitudes – how to be positive,

**Tell me how you saw yourself at the start of the program and what you see yourself like now?
Have there been any changes?**



Prompts:

More – confidence, self-awareness, feel better about myself

Less – angry, hopeless

Tell me a bit about what you thought about going to work or school before you started the program and what you think now?

Prompts:

Interest? Motivation? Positive? Negative? Scared? Confident? Better prepared

What do you want to do when you have finished this program? How has the program helped you to decide?

What have you learnt in the program that you think you can use in the future?

What parts of the program did you enjoy or not enjoy and why?

What are your ideas for how we can make the program better for the next students?



Central Ranges Local Learning & Employment Network
 Incorporating Macedon Ranges, Mitchell & Murrindindi Shires

Date: _____

Interviewee: _____

Interviewer _____

Quantitative data:

Numbers initially enrolled:

Number of weeks in program:

Number of days:

Attendance and participation levels

Participant	Number of days attend	TSP compl	Engagement pathway established	Complete or partial completion (C) or (P)	OH&S	RSA	Food handlers	Excursion attendance out of 3
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								

Section1:



Did the program achieve its goal to increase the re-engagement into educational and/or career pathways of disengaged young people in the MR area?

Can you describe the degree of engagement with an educational or career pathway the young participants had prior to the program

Can you describe the degree of engagement with an education and/or career pathway participants have after the program?

Section 2:

Did the program achieve its objectives?

C. Sustained participant engagement during program

Did participant levels remain consistent during the program?

What levels and quality of participation were demonstrated by participants over the program delivery time?

D. Increased opportunities for pathways for participants

Have participants developed a Training Support Plan during the program? How many?

Have participants developed any structures for social support and engagement during the program – either formal or informal? How many?

What extra support did you offer or link students into as part of the course (personal health and wellbeing needs, case management support)?

How many participants completed /partially completed the course? What were some of the barriers and enablers that impacted on participants completing the course?

Describe the pathways the participants have decided upon as a result of the course?

C. Increased partner effectiveness in supporting participants during and after program

What assistance and resources were provided by partners to support the program?

What worked well between partners that increased the program effectiveness?

What were the challenges?

How would you rate your engagement with parents? Poor /Good/ Very Good/Excellent (Why?)

D. Identify issues and learning's to inform re-engagement programs for the future



Central Ranges Local Learning & Employment Network
Incorporating Macedon Ranges, Mitchell & Murrindindi Shires

What worked well in the overall program?

What were the challenges and issues as a result of the pilot?

What would you change for the next program? If you could improve one thing about your program, what would you do?

Section 3: Other:

What skills do you think that participants have learnt as a result of the program?

What changes have you noticed in participant's levels of confidence, resilience, self-awareness and self-esteem as a result of the program?

What changes have you noticed in participant's attitudes to education, training and employment as a result of the program? Other comments?