



LEGAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES

OUTCOMES FRAMEWORKS

A Rapid Scoping Review

JUNE 2022





Legal Assistance Services Outcomes Frameworks

A Rapid Scoping Review

Dr Kerryyn Butler

Law and Justice Foundation of New South Wales
July 2022

This report is published by the Law and Justice Foundation of New South Wales, an independent, not-for-profit organisation that seeks to advance the fairness and equity of the justice system, and to improve access to justice, especially for socially and economically disadvantaged people.

This report was prepared by the Law and Justice Foundation of NSW for the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department.

Authors: Dr Kerry Butler

Title: Legal Assistance Service Outcome Frameworks - A Rapid Scoping Review

ISBN: 978-0-6450832-1-7

The report should be cited as – Butler, K., (2022) *Legal Assistance Services Outcomes Framework – A Rapid Scoping Review*. Sydney. The Law and Justice Foundation of NSW.



A catalogue record for this book is available from the National Library of Australia

Publisher

Law and Justice Foundation of New South Wales
Level 11, 66 Clarence Street, Sydney NSW 2000
PO Box A109 Sydney South NSW 1235
Ph: +61 2 8227 3200
Email: publications@lawfoundation.net.au
Web: www.lawfoundation.net.au

© Law and Justice Foundation of New South Wales, July 2022

This publication is copyright. It may be reproduced in part or in whole for educational purposes as long as proper credit is given to the Foundation.

Any opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Foundation's Board of Governors.

Table of Contents

Legal Assistance Services	1
Outcomes Frameworks	1
Acknowledgments	4
Executive Summary	5
This Report	6
Methodology	6
Relevant literature included	7
Working definitions	7
Framework Development	9
Outcomes Framework Structure	9
Outcomes	10
Program Logic and Theory of Change	10
Choosing outcomes	10
Indicators	11
Quantitative and Qualitative Indicators	13
Required Resources	13
Data sources	13
Outcome and Indicator banks	14
Shared Outcomes Frameworks	15
Sector-wide outcomes frameworks	15
Shared outcomes	16
Benefits of Outcomes Frameworks	19
Limitations of Outcomes Frameworks	21
Legal Assistance Frameworks	22
Victorian CLC Sector Outcomes Measurement Framework	22
Community Legal Centres Queensland	23
The Citizens Advice Example	24
US Legal Services Corporation	27
Literature Reviewed	29
References	36

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Catriona Mirrlees-Black, Delphine Bellerose and Kimberly Jane, LJF Research staff, for their insight and expert input into this work. Special thanks also to Dr Hugh M McDonald, Victoria Law Foundation and Suzie Forrell, Health Justice Australia, for their helpful peer-review and comments on the draft. We are grateful to the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department for funding this research.

Executive Summary

The successful use of outcomes frameworks as part of an outcomes-based approach to service design and continuous improvement has many benefits. This approach puts people's needs at the centre of design and delivery. It leads to continuous improvement by building evidence about what works and why, and drives innovation to achieve even better outcomes.

Use of outcomes frameworks in the legal assistance sector is patchy and remains largely in its infancy nationally and internationally. However, there are relevant examples emerging. Five are highlighted in this report.

There is no agreed terminology or single prescribed approach to developing a framework, but there are certain features they tend to have in common. In particular, they are structured around a set of themes or goals under which high-level and intermediate-level outcomes, their indicators and data sources are categorised.

The outcomes included depend on the purpose for which the framework is being developed. Potential purposes include service improvement, planning, resource aligning, performance reporting and evaluation.

There is recognised good practice regarding the development of the indicators that measure the outcomes. Indicators are most often quantitative but can also be qualitative to capture soft outcomes.

There is good practice available on capturing the various aspects of an outcomes framework in outcome and indicator banks.

There is little reported information on the amount of resource required to develop, test, and refine outcomes frameworks, particularly sector-wide frameworks. However, what there is suggests it is a resource intensive exercise likely to take months if not years, dependent on the diversity of services the framework seeks to cover, and the level of organisational maturity and capacity.

Shared and sector-wide outcomes frameworks present their own challenges and need to be high-level and flexible to have utility and be adopted by the organisations they cover.

It is also important to be aware of the pitfalls of outcomes frameworks, including that not all outcomes can be measured, that frameworks may create unintended and perverse incentives, and an over-reliance on indicators that are imperfect measures.

However, these challenges are worth overcoming as an outcomes-based approach encourages services and governments to tailor policy and service delivery to the needs of clients. The wider literature indicates it also supports a more flexible, dynamic and responsive mechanism to changing circumstances.

This Report

This report describes the conceptual role of outcomes frameworks for legal assistance services. It includes a section that clarifies working definitions, and draws together evidence relevant to framework development, shared outcomes, and sector-wide frameworks. Five examples are highlighted along with a list of all reviewed literature.

The purpose of this report is to collate information on how outcomes frameworks are currently used within the legal assistance sector nationally and internationally and, where directly relevant, in other allied human services sectors. Where available, information is included on what works well, and less well, in the practical application of outcomes frameworks. This information may be of value in informing the development of sector-wide outcomes frameworks for legal assistance services in Australia.

Methodology

As the name suggests, the primary purpose of a **scoping** review is to determine the ‘scope’ or coverage of a body of literature on a given topic by indicating the volume and nature of available literature and gaps. Scoping reviews are commonly used when a body of literature has not yet been comprehensively reviewed, or exhibits a large, complex, or heterogeneous nature not amenable to a more precise systematic review.¹ A particular use of scoping reviews is in clarifying working definitions and conceptual boundaries of a topic or field. It is informative to categorise or group existing literature according to its nature, features and geographic characteristics. Scoping reviews typically do not include a risk of bias assessment, nor do they synthesise findings from individual studies or generate a ‘summary of findings’ like a traditional literature review or a systematic review.

The work reported here is that of a **rapid** scoping review. A **rapid** scoping review is a form of scoping review that provides more timely information than a full scoping review. It is a relatively flexible approach that allows for limiting some of the steps of a full review when resource and/or time limitations must be considered.²

For this rapid review the Foundation developed a research protocol to define review parameters and set out the inclusion criteria and search strategy. The inclusion criteria comprised academic and grey literature published between 2004 and 2021. The literature was sourced by:

- Searching academic databases
- Searching key websites, including international legal assistance service providers

¹ Peters et al. 2015

² The rapid review presents literature and material identified as relevant but has not necessarily undergone an extensive critical evaluation, nor is it an exhaustive review due to the review parameters, the search criteria and the restriction of literature to that published between 2004 and 2021. Similarly, the five examples highlighted at the end of the report are considered to be the most relevant (publicly available) legal assistance service frameworks at the time of review, however we offer no recommendation or endorsement.

- Google-searching
- Reviewing reference lists of articles included in the review were hand-searched using the snowballing method.

The initial search results were filtered by abstract or content skimming to produce a final literature list of 36 relevant documents/material.

Relevant literature included

- Peer-reviewed journal articles..... 6
- Grey literature..... 23
- Online database 5
- Conference proceedings..... 2

Working definitions

Outcomes frameworks are increasingly being adopted across many and diverse sectors. The development and application of this approach has been adapted and customised to such an extent, and so quickly, that the theory to guide development has not kept pace.

- Diversity of users mean development happens disconnected from any acknowledged authority.
- Terms are modified or improvised for each user, and some terms are used interchangeably.
- Lack of widely accepted definitions of the terms used to describe outcomes framework elements.

A review of the literature included in this report reveals a degree of ambiguity concerning some terms, while other terms seem to have widely accepted and understood definitions. For the purposes of this report, definitions are provided below.

Indicators are specific, observable, and measurable markers that represent achievement of or progress towards the outcomes. They indicate what is needed to change in order to achieve a desired outcome.

Inputs are the resources dedicated to a program for its establishment and implementation. This includes, but is not limited to, staff time and administrative overheads.

Outcomes are the changes that occur for individuals, groups, and/or communities during or after the delivery of programs/services. Outcomes can vary in how attributable they are to the programs/services and the extent to which they are observable and can be measured.

- **Short-term** or immediate outcomes can be primarily attributed to the program or intervention.
- **Medium-term or intermediate** outcomes are often partly attributable to the program or intervention.
- **Long-term** outcomes share attribution with other services, interventions, and client circumstances. The program or intervention is often considered a contributing factor in the achievement of the outcome.

- **Hard** outcomes can be independently and objectively measured. Often, they are easily quantified and attributed. For example, the number of people who were not evicted, or the number of people for whom debts were reduced.
- **Soft** outcomes are more intangible or subjective outcomes that often rely on more imprecise measures. Soft outcomes include improved health and wellbeing, improved capacity and ability to cope, increased financial stability and resilience. It is important to remember that legal assistance services can only contribute to these outcomes and causation should not be attributed to the service provided. Case studies for individuals are an example of how soft outcomes can be reported.

Outcomes Framework is a collection of selected outcomes, often grouped into themes, and the indicators to measure those outcomes together with the data sources required to quantify those indicators.

Outcome Measures are the tools and data sources that will be used to provide the more granular, specific detail about what will change. E.g., service data, surveys, instruments³.

Outputs are things that a program or organisation produce, the work a program does. E.g., number of people served; number of services performed.

Proxy measures are used as indirect measures that serve in place for outcomes that have not or cannot be measured directly. Proxy measures can be used when there is little or no data available about the outcome of interest. They may not be necessary, but when they are, identifying valid proxy measures requires technical know-how and subject expertise.

³ Research and standardised instruments can be tests, scales, questionnaires, or even checklists. They should be evaluated for reliability and validity.

Framework Development

Outcomes Framework Structure

Countless approaches to framework development exist with many interchangeable terms which can make understanding framework development difficult. Frameworks reviewed for this report generally have a consistent structure in that there are multiple 'levels', each referring to a particular element. Level 1 describes each identified broad goal, (or principle/theme/domain) of which there may be several. The high-level outcomes, intermediate outcomes, indicators, and data sources are organised under each of these.

Table 1: Example of framework structure

Level 1	<i>Principle</i> <i>Goal</i> <i>Theme</i> <i>Domain</i>	Organising outcomes under these broad categories encourages people designing and using outcomes frameworks to consider the broader drivers of outcomes. This level is not in itself measurable but reflect the organisation or sector's principles or goals.
Level 2	<i>High-level outcomes</i>	High-level outcomes reflect broad, positive changes that the organisation or sector are seeking to achieve. This level of outcome is achieved by realising the contributing intermediate outcomes and indicators
Level 3	<i>Intermediate Outcomes</i>	Intermediate outcomes are generally service delivery focused (within the control of the service). They are generally more easily, or at least potentially, measurable.
Level 4	<i>Indicators</i>	Indicators are chosen that reflect the changes required to achieve the outcome.
Level 5	<i>Data sources</i>	Identify data sources available, or that can potentially be developed, to demonstrate achievement of outcome.

Outcomes

Outcomes are the changes that occur for individuals, groups, and/or communities during or after the delivery of programs/services. Choosing which outcomes should populate an outcomes framework will depend on the purpose of the framework and the goals and priorities of the sector. Some considerations include:

- some outcomes cannot be readily measured, in some cases appropriate proxy indicators may be identified but some outcomes may be unknowable.
- long-term outcomes can be difficult to track without extraordinary research and follow-up.
- many outcomes can be linked to more than one goal or principle (level 1). Consider if double-counting outcomes will cause reporting issues.

Outcomes relevant to the legal assistance sector are sometimes categorised in a variety of ways. For example, The Citizens Advice Bureau⁴ categorises their outcomes as Advice Service outcomes, Advice outcomes, and Client outcomes. The Victorian Community Legal Sector⁵ categorises outcomes at individual level, organisational level, community level, and systems level, and Community Legal Centres Queensland⁶ categorises their impact according to the beneficiaries, clients, community, justice system services, and volunteers. This can be a helpful approach to guarantee outcomes are considered from the perspective of different stakeholders or different goals but may be simply an artifact of the framework development rather than a feature of the framework. From the literature reviewed in this report, there is no consensus on how, or if, outcomes should be categorised.

Program Logic and Theory of Change

Most often programs or services developing an outcomes framework will have undertaken a program logic or theory of change exercise as part of a broader evaluative approach⁷. This exercise maps out how a program or service achieves its intended outcomes. It explicitly links inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes in a clear causal pathway. Best practice requires the assumptions between the program inputs, activities and outcomes to be evidence-based. Efforts to retrofit program logic to existing programs can be particularly challenging where the program(s) are complex or have multiple unrelated components.

Choosing outcomes

Outcomes can be

- Short-term (the most immediate and direct result of an activity. Results-based outcomes are a sub-set of short-term outcomes)
- Medium or intermediate (a desired result or an outcome that links to long-term or high-level)

⁴ Citizens Advice Bureau 2020b

⁵ Planigale M. & Thwaites R. 2017

⁶ Monro, Farrell & Hanson 2018

⁷ This is not often the case with shared or sector-wide frameworks

- Long-term or high-level (these outcomes result from achieving short-term and intermediate outcomes they are often achieved beyond the timeframe of an activity or follow-up period).

Results-based outcomes

Results-based outcomes are short-term practical outcomes that relate to direct legal services provided and are specific to the legal problem. For instance, an example of a results-based outcome for a client with a consumer legal problem could be statutory rights enforced, refund agreed/refused, repair agreed/refused, replacement agreed/refused. Housing legal problem outcome examples include client keeps their home, house repossessed, client evicted, client rehoused, action taken against landlord.

These can be used to demonstrate client outcomes but should not be used on their own to measure the ‘success’ or ‘effectiveness’ of services because results-based outcomes may also depend on factors beyond the direct control of the legal assistance provider. Curran and Crockett⁸ provide the example of a lawyer securing housing for a client in a case. Beyond assisting to prevent unlawful eviction or foreclosure, security of housing tenure may depend on extra-legal factors such as available public housing stock and waiting lists over which a legal service has little or no control. This does not mean results-based outcomes are not useful to collect but that service performance should not necessarily be assessed only by these outcomes. A more appropriate outcome by which to assess performance may be that the client received a fair hearing, or that they were able to tell their side of the story.

Indicators

Indicators are measurable markers that show whether progress is being made towards achieving an outcome.

Indicators should be assessed for validity (does the indicator measure what it intends to measure), reliability (does the indicator produce consistent results over time), and useability (is it practical to collect the respective data). They should also be subject to ongoing assessment. A formal mechanism for reviewing indicators is recommended and should include consultation with stakeholders, technical experts, data providers, funders, and service providers.

In sectors where there is sufficient research into what works, and what does not work, an evidence check can be used to help select indicators to measure outcomes. The evidence check will identify and assess evidence-based indicators that could measure the achievement of specific outcomes. That is, if it is known that a certain intervention increases the likelihood of achieving a specific outcome, then an indicator demonstrating that intervention can be taken as evidence the outcome is being achieved.

The evidence base for ‘what works’ in legal assistance services in Australia requires significant investment and development. Without robust and rigorous evaluations and efficacy studies, and wide dissemination of results, it is expected there will be significant evidence gaps to take into account.

⁸ Curran & Crockett 2013

Evidence can include published research and reviews of available literature. Case studies, when shared across the sector, are an important source of supporting information.

See the below link for a detailed example of how an Evidence check contributes to identifying robust indicators.

Wellbeing indicators across the life cycle: an Evidence Check rapid review⁹

Good practice for developing and reporting indicators have been reviewed by Statistics NZ who have developed the following set of criteria for indicator selection: ¹⁰

- **Valid and meaningful** – an indicator should adequately reflect the phenomenon it is intended to measure and should be appropriate to the needs of the user.
- **Sensitive and specific** to the underlying phenomenon – sensitivity relates to how significantly an indicator varies according to changes in the underlying phenomenon.
- **Grounded in research** – awareness of the key influences and factors affecting outcomes.
- **Statistically sound** – indicator measurement needs to be methodologically sound and fit for the purpose to which it is being applied.
- **Intelligible and easily interpreted** – indicators should be sufficiently simple to be interpreted in practice and intuitive in the sense that it is obvious what the indicator is measuring.
- **Relate where appropriate to other indicators** – a single indicator often tends to show part of a phenomenon and is best interpreted alongside other similar indicators.
- **Allow international comparison** – indicators need to reflect [country]-specific goals, but where possible should also be consistent with those used in international indicator programmes so that comparisons can be made.
- **Ability to be disaggregated over time** – indicators should be able to be broken down into population sub-groups or areas of particular interest, such as ethnic groups or regional areas.
- **Consistency over time** – the usefulness of the indicators is directly related to the ability to track trends over time, so as far as possible indicators should be consistent.
- **Timeliness** – there should be minimal time lag between the collection and reporting of data to ensure that indicators are reporting current information.
- **Linked to policy or emerging issues** – indicators should be selected to reflect important issues as closely as possible. Where there is an emerging issue, indicators should be developed to monitor it.
- **Compel interest and excite** - the indicator should resonate with the intended audience.

⁹ Miranti R et al. 2017

¹⁰ Brown 2009

Quantitative and Qualitative Indicators

Quantitative indicators are most often used to describe hard outcomes. Hard outcomes are those that can be independently and objectively measured. They are easily quantified and attributed. For example, how many people, what proportion, and how often.

Qualitative indicators are most often used to describe soft outcomes (changes in feelings or attitudes etc). How we measure qualitative outcomes or responses can be problematic because of the subjectivity of the outcome. Unlike quantitative indicators it is difficult to assess validity, reliability, replicability or standardisation.

Methods for validating qualitative measures include participant/member checks, peer evaluation, field tests, and multiple methods (triangulation). Standardised instrument scales that have undergone this type of testing can be useful to capture more subjective types of information. Examples are standardised instrument scales like Rosenbury self-esteem scale (measure of self-esteem), or mental health scales like SF36.

Required Resources

There is very little information in the reviewed literature on the resources required to develop and implement an outcomes framework. Literature regarding the methodology or development of such endeavours is scarce. Hendricks, Plantz et al,¹¹ highlight the following observations “expect a relatively long-time horizon for developing, testing, and refining outcome measurement systems. In fact, [the authors] assert that agencies will require two to four years from the time the idea of outcome measurement is first introduced to the point of having meaningful outcomes data”. The authors also comment on technical resources required in the way of highly experienced evaluators/researchers to guide the development of the framework, training of in-house staff of agencies, and ongoing, task-specific, and content-specific technical assistance in implementation (even after initial in-house training has been provided). Similar observations are shared in a review of shared measurement systems by US consultancy FSG¹², they state “shared measurement systems may take several years and millions of dollars to develop, yet the cumulative annual savings among participating organizations can dwarf the initial time and money invested”. They also remind us that “these systems cannot replace the roles of academic researchers and third-party evaluators, whose rigorous studies remain necessary to understanding why the reported results are being achieved and to what they may be attributable”.

Data sources

Collecting both quantitative and qualitative data will generally be required to populate the indicators. Quantitative data sources include surveys, administrative, or service data, or secondary data (data collected by external programs, i.e., census data). Qualitative data commonly includes interviews, focus groups, and case studies. When choosing indicators for a new outcomes framework it is typical for there to be considerable data gaps. A gap analysis will identify which indicators currently have data available and/or collected and which have no existing data source identified and new data are required. It is common for

¹¹ Hendricks, Plantz & Pritchard 2008

¹² Kramer, Parkhurst & Vaidyanathan 2009

outcome and indicator banks to list data as ‘under development’ where indicators have been identified for which no data source was readily available.

Outcome and Indicator banks

Outcome and indicator banks are a means of documenting relevant information that may be used for an outcomes framework. An example template of the information captured in an outcome and indicator bank is presented below.

Figure 1 Example template

Core Outcome	Outcome Indicators
Core client outcome area	Identified outcome indicator
Data Source	Department/ Organisation who owns/manages the data
Indicator measure	Existing measure identified as relevant in measuring the indicator
Measure source	Where the indicator comes from
Data report	The data report the measure comes from
Data elements	Elements that make up the indicator
Counting rules	An understanding of how the indicator is counted
Subgroups/Client populations	Relevant DCJ populations for which the data is available

Source: NSW Government Communities and Justice Core Client Outcome and Indicator Bank

Examples of specific outcome and/or indicators are available by following the links below.

Citizens Advice Bureau, Indicators for Measuring Citizens Advice ¹³
NSW Government Communities and Justice Core Client Outcome and Indicator Bank ¹⁴
NSW Government Communities and Justice Indicator Bank ¹⁵
Victorian Community Legal Sector Outcomes Measurement Framework ¹⁶
Legal Services Corporation (LSCV Outcome-Measures-Major-Benefits) ¹⁷
Legal Services Corporation (Outcomes Catalog) ¹⁸
Measuring Outcome from Citizens Advice (MOCA) ¹⁹

¹³ Citizens Advice Bureau 2020a

¹⁴ Department of Communities and Justice 2020a

¹⁵ Department of Communities and Justice 2020b

¹⁶ Planigale M. & Thwaites R. 2017

¹⁷ Legal Services Corporation (LSC)

¹⁸ Legal Services Corporation (LSC)

¹⁹ Citizens Advice Bureau 2020b

Shared Outcomes Frameworks

Outcomes frameworks can be designed for services, organisations, or for whole-of-sector. As outlined in the Program Logic and Theory of Change section, services and organisations who adopt an outcomes approach to decision making will often develop a program logic or theory of change model as part of the outcomes framework.

The approach to developing a shared sector-wide outcomes framework is necessarily different as it takes a higher-level view and does not include inputs and activities. To accommodate the diverse ways in which services are provided to clients across the sector a high-level of abstraction must be used. The level of abstraction refers to the amount of complexity by which a system is viewed or programmed. The higher the level, the less detail. The lower the level, the more detail. This is a delicate balance to achieve when developing sector-wide frameworks. If the level of abstraction is too low (too specific and detailed) the outcomes and measures may not have wide application across the whole sector. However, if it is too high (too general) it is then difficult to operationalise and will lack meaning.

Sector-wide outcomes frameworks

Where previously governments and funders have required reporting of primarily what has been done (e.g., inputs, activities and outputs), there has been a shift towards wanting to measure what is achieved (outcomes and impacts). Traditional reporting processes account for how much funding is allocated to a service (input), the type of work that is undertaken with clients of the service (activities), and how many people received services (outputs). These data are important but will often fail to tell other important parts of the whole, such as, whether the service made a difference to clients, and whether their lives were improved as a result. What outcomes services achieve with the funding they receive can be more informative and meaningful for service design and accountability than output counts.

Governments, both here and internationally, are using cross-agency (or shared) outcome frameworks to focus the efforts of government agencies and non-government organisations (NGOs) on what is most important in their sector. These shared sector-wide frameworks aid agencies and NGOs to adopt an outcomes-focused approach in the design, delivery and evaluation of their services and ensures that the sector understands which outcomes are considered priorities.

For further detailed information on how other sectors have approached a sector-wide framework, please access the below material by following the links.

Disability Housing Outcomes Framework ²⁰
Family Violence Outcomes Framework ²¹

Shared outcomes

In an environment of restrained funding and service demand outstripping supply there is an increased interest in evidence from all types of funders and a move away from outputs and activity reporting toward measuring impact and outcomes.

Much of the work done on shared outcomes involves charities and non-profits who seek to collectively demonstrate impact. Given the diversity of the legal assistance service sector in Australia, valuable lessons can be learned that parallel those in the human services sector.

Shared measurement is any tool that can be used by more than one organisation to measure outcomes. The process of shared measurement requires an understanding of a sectors' shared outcomes and a commitment to engagement and collaboration.

Several reviews have been published including one by US-based social impact consultancy FSG ²² who examined shared measurement approaches in the US to understand key steps in their development. FSG identified eight common elements that they consider are central to successfully developing shared measurement systems. They are:

- **Strong leadership and substantial funding** throughout a multi-year development period
- **Broad engagement** in the design process by many organizations in the field, with clear expectations about confidentiality or transparency
- **Voluntary participation** open to all relevant organizations
- **Effective use** of web-technology
- **Independence from funders** in devising indicators and managing the system
- **Ongoing staffing** to provide training, facilitation, and to review the accuracy of all data
- **Testing and continually improving** the system through user feedback
- In more advanced systems, **a facilitated process** for participants to gather periodically to share results, learn from each other, and coordinate their efforts

²⁰ Social Ventures Australia 2020a

²¹ Victorian Department of Premier and Cabinet 2020

²² Kramer, Parkhurst & Vaidyanathan 2009

UK Think Tank & Consultancy organisation, New Philanthropy Capital (NPC),²³ whose work also focuses on sector-wide impact, identifies a number of features necessary for shared measurement. They include.

- **Shared outcomes:** organisations using shared measurement should have consensus on the shared outcomes that their sector achieves and measure these shared outcomes using the same tools.
- **Consistent methodologies:** organisations using a shared tool should use the same tools and consistent methods when measuring. This means having consistent research designs, similar sample sizes, similar analysis, and consistent reporting of results.
- **Focus on measuring outcomes and impact:** shared measurement should focus on measuring the difference a particular activity or organisation makes to an issue or group of people.
- **Agreement around what is measured:** there should be agreement on the key outcomes in a shared measurement framework while also allowing the flexibility for organisations to pick and choose which outcomes are most relevant to their work.
- **Clarity around a sector's impact:** shared measurement should involve understanding how a sector works together to solve a particular problem. This can mean mapping out a sector's theory of change or impact network.
- **Ability to compare** shared measurement should allow organisations to meaningfully compare their results to those of similar organisations. This helps organisation put their impact data in context and learn about what approaches are most effective.

NPC reviewed and analysed 20 different shared measurement approaches and examined how shared measurement is developed. Key findings concerned the following themes.

1. **The conditions necessary for a shared measurement approach,**
 - a. an evidence gap is a crucial incentive to develop shared measurements
 - b. initial support and committed funding from funders
 - c. a committed group of individuals or organisations to drive the process
2. **Success factors in developing a shared measurement approach,**
 - a. a bottom-up approach which allows practitioners and front-line organisations to specify the outcomes important to them, rather than imposing pre-selected outcomes on the sector.
 - b. a diverse range of stakeholders involved in the development.
 - c. led by an organisation perceived as independent by the sector who is better able to balance the demands of services and funders. (i.e. sector body, academic institution, think tank, or consultancy).
3. **Success factors in designing a successful measurement approach,**
 - a. tools used in shared measurement must use robust methods.
 - b. meaningful outcomes as agreed among diverse stakeholders.
 - c. any tools must be easy to use and accessible.
 - d. a degree of flexibility in outcomes is essential. For instance, allowing organisations flexibility in choosing outcomes from a list of suggested outcomes.

²³ Ógáin, Svistak & de Las Casas 2013

4. **Important factors in ensuring the scale and sustainability of shared measurement**
 - a. use of technology to minimise the burden of data collection
 - b. ongoing tool refinement to respond to changing environments
 - c. committed funding for a number of years to support the scaling up of and ongoing refinement of an approach

The review also found a number of challenges that must be mitigated and successfully overcome when developing successful outcomes frameworks and measurement. These are sceptical attitudes, a lack of shared values, data protection issues, aligning approaches with existing issues, a lack of availability of software, a struggle to gain support from funders and commissioners, challenges in striking a balance between organisation's individual needs and remaining relevant to whole-of-sector.

While all legal assistance providers deliver legal services to clients, the nature of the work they do, and the way they do it, is incredibly diverse. Developing shared outcomes for sector-wide use must take this into account.

As an example, Clear Impact Australia recently published an article outlining their work with NSW Family Services to develop shared outcomes with multiple agencies that they fund²⁴. Relevant key findings include.

- limit the number of mandatory shared measures, giving the service providers room and autonomy to develop additional measures meaningful to their own quality improvement.
- capture from service providers the story behind the data, what works, and planned actions.
- recognise that for each program, region and organisation what works will vary.
- avoid enforcing a one-size fits all approach to outcome measurement.
- collaborate and agree to a set of performance measures that will best represent the outcomes you are trying to achieve.
- recognise the limitations of averaging data across multiple organisations using different data collection tools.

²⁴ Stockton n.d

Benefits of Outcomes Frameworks

Outcomes-based approaches to decision making have been gaining popularity and use among non-profits, governments, and social services in recent times. This approach places the needs of people at the centre and allows services and governments to tailor its policy and service delivery to those needs while being flexible and responsive to changing needs and circumstances. In a shift away from reporting activities and outputs, many agencies and non-profit organisations have turned their attention to using outcomes and social impacts to demonstrate the value of their service.

An outcomes framework is a collection of selected outcomes, and indicators to measure those outcomes, and the data sources required to quantify those indicators. A variety of different models have been developed, each with strengths according to the intended purpose and use ²⁵. Specific purposes and uses include planning, resource aligning (including performance monitoring), reporting and evaluation.

None of the frameworks reviewed for this report had been designed specifically for resource aligning or performance monitoring. Performance monitoring frameworks differ from outcomes frameworks by purpose and design and have the addition of key performance targets.

There are many benefits to adopting an outcomes-based approach to service design and funding. Social Ventures Australia highlight a few in their *Guide to Developing an Outcomes Focus* that we consider are highly relevant to the legal assistance services sector in Australia.²⁶

- **It leads to greater impact** – an outcomes-focused approach encourages agencies and NGOs to be clear about the impact they want to have, and then test, learn and iterate to make sure services are effective. This test, learn and iterate process can improve service design and delivery, foster collaboration to achieve shared goals, and drive innovation, that ultimately leads to better outcomes.
- **It is good for the people that are served** – an outcomes-focused approach puts people's needs at the centre of design and delivery. When the focus is on the individual, service providers can work with individuals to empower them to be agents of change for themselves, their families and their communities.
- **It supports innovation** – by building evidence about what works and why, agencies and NGOs can find new ways of addressing challenging problems. Designing programs that can be tailored to the individual that also leverage the other services that the individual is accessing, to address their unique range of needs and aspirations, based on evidence of what works, can lead to new approaches.

²⁵ Penna, RM & Phillips 2004 Penna, R & Phillips 2005
Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth 2009

²⁶ Social Ventures Australia 2018

- **It engages and refocuses the agency or NGO** - it can be energising to see that the work you are doing is creating meaningful impact for people in need. Having greater clarity of the change that your work leads to can inspire everyone in an agency or NGO, and even the beneficiaries themselves, to engage in the work and try, test and iterate to find the best ways to create that meaningful impact.
- **It provides greater transparency for funders** - government commissioning agencies and other philanthropic funders prefer to fund programs that can demonstrate what they are doing works and are creating meaningful and lasting impact. An outcomes-focused approach provides better information to all parties, so funders can also work with NGOs to make programs more effective. NGOs that are better able to demonstrate their value can unlock new funding opportunities.
- **It supports collaboration** - individual needs often span many social issues. Agencies and NGOs can achieve better outcomes if they are aware of all of the outcomes an individual wants to achieve and then designing services to address all the needs of an individual, or by partnering with agencies and/or organisations to deliver holistic solutions.

Limitations of Outcomes Frameworks

Outcomes frameworks can be an invaluable tool to focus providers on client-centred practice, and to demonstrate some of the changes that services achieve. However, outcomes must not be overly relied upon to measure performance or when considering resource allocation. Outcomes are just one of the data types used to assess performance and operations. Important limitations to consider are briefly discussed below.

Not all outcomes can be measured.

“Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted²⁷.” Many important and critical aspects of a program cannot be meaningfully quantified or reliably measured. For instance, soft outcomes are difficult to reliably measure, long-term outcomes may be lost to follow-up, and other outcomes defy measurement entirely. Aspects of program delivery like the quality of representation or advice can be difficult to ascertain and therefore even well considered outcomes tell only part of the story.

“Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted”

Unintended consequences.

“When a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure²⁸.” The use of outcomes and other performance measures can have adverse unintended consequences. For instance, when outputs or outcomes are used to report performance to funders, those measures may end up driving a program’s work. This is true across a variety of measures as the choice of specific indicators can, implicitly, define what is and what is not important. Where an organisation’s performance is measured by these, this can inadvertently influence decisions. For instance, a service that is assessed on the number of a specific type of service it provides may inadvertently favour providing those services over other equally appropriate services.

“When a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure”

Indicators are imperfect measures.

Indicators provide an *indication* that something has happened. The ability to ‘prove’ the program has achieved an outcome is limited by the assumptions made when the indicator is chosen. It should be noted that tracking outcomes is not the same as evaluating effectiveness²⁹. For this reason, indicators cannot support assertions of causality on their own and should not be intended as such without sufficiently robust evidence.

²⁷ Bruce Cameron 1963

²⁸ Strathern 1997

²⁹ Hendricks, Plantz & Pritchard 2008

Legal Assistance Frameworks

Five examples of outcomes frameworks have been identified within the reviewed literature as particularly relevant and a summary of each is outlined below.

Victorian CLCs – Australian example of legal assistance service framework. This framework was developed to support all Victorian CLCs to better demonstrate and report outcomes.

Community Legal Centres Queensland – have developed a toolkit for CLC workers to measure service outcomes and impacts.

Citizens Advice – UK example of outcomes framework for advice services (comparable to some Australian legal assistance services). This framework has been adopted across hundreds of sites within the UK and sites use a shared outcome and indicator bank.

Legal Services Corporation: Virginia IOLTA and Cleveland models – two US examples of legal assistance service outcomes frameworks used to report on funding for legal aid in two US states.

Victorian CLC Sector Outcomes Measurement Framework

Development of an Outcomes Measurement Framework was funded by Victoria Legal Aid's Innovation and Transformation Grants Program. Over 18 months, work between 35 community legal centres, and the Federation of Community Legal Centres Victoria, facilitated by Lirata Consulting, developed a sector-driven tool which assists community legal centres to measure the outcomes of their work to better demonstrate individual and collective impact, to improve outcomes for clients, and to build evidence to further advocate to funders.

The Framework acknowledges that CLCs undertake many different types of activities and will inevitably be associated with some outcomes and indicators more than others. It is designed in a way that allows individual CLCs to pick and choose which outcomes align with their CLCs strategic purposes, and priority areas of focus. The framework recognises that in time, and with the support of Victorian CLCs, the Framework could also enable shared measurement of outcomes across multiple CLCs. The Framework could be continuously updated and improved based on the experience and feedback from CLCs.

The Framework identifies five themes; Access to Justice for All, Empowered Communities, Holistic Responses to Needs, Fair Laws and Systems, and Effective CLCs. Each theme is linked to one high-level outcome each with numerous intermediate outcomes and multiple indicators. Below is an extract from the Framework.

Table 2. One of the five themes from the Victorian example.

THEME	Access to Justice for All
HIGH-LEVEL OUTCOME	People experiencing disadvantage have increased access to justice
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME	People experiencing disadvantage access legal assistance in a timely way
INDICATORS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disadvantage Profile: Number and % of people accessing legal assistance by type and level of disadvantage [data source: intake and closure forms] • Mode of Initial access: Number and % of people accessing legal assistance by mode of initial access. [Data source: incoming enquiry log] • Wait time: Average wait time for assistance by service type and type of legal issue. [Data source: Spreadsheet recording wait time data]

Source: Victorian Community Legal Sector Outcomes Measurement Framework

A suite of **supporting documents** and tools is available and includes the **framework**, case studies, client outcomes surveys, stakeholder and partner surveys, and templates for advocacy registers and incoming enquiry logs.³⁰

Community Legal Centres Queensland

This project was undertaken with the aim of providing Queensland CLCs with a practical self-evaluation toolkit with which to undertake outcomes reporting, and to contribute to building a sector culture of measuring and reporting on outcomes and impacts. The main purpose of the project was to develop a toolkit which could:

- Capture, measure and report outcomes for clients and other stakeholders more systematically
- Build the measurement and evaluation capacity of CLCs and the sector
- Effectively capture and communicate what works to funders and the sector

³⁰ Planigale M. & Thwaites R. 2017

- Use the information and insights to highlight possible improvements to a CLC

The project was funded by the Queensland Government, Department of the Attorney-General and was undertaken by The Incas Group in partnership with CLC Queensland (CLCQ). The project was supported by a Steering Group comprising CLC managers, and members of the CLCQ team. The project delivered a theory of change model that identifies outcomes for clients, community, justice system services, and volunteers. Indicators and data sources were identified and piloted with three different CLCs that reflect the shared goals and diversity of the membership. Additionally, CLCQ built a website to host the toolkit which aims to provide a consistent method for measuring outcomes while remaining flexible for member organisations.

While the toolkit supports broad mapping of indicators to outcomes it is not in the traditional format of outcome framework documents.

Activities	Stakeholders	Sub-Groups	Intermediate Outcomes	Long term Outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of legal advice, casework, and information services for and including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ children and young people (up to 24 years); ○ people experiencing financial disadvantage; ○ Indigenous Australians; ○ older people (aged over 65 years); ○ people experiencing, or at risk of, family violence; ○ people residing in rural or remote areas; ○ people who are culturally and linguistically diverse; and ○ people with a disability or mental illness; • Community legal education activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Talks to schools & universities ○ Advice to agencies regarding client's legal situation and how best to assist them ○ Legal information seminars to community groups • Advocacy on public and legal policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Responding to legislative changes ○ Undertaking law reform projects ○ Police multicultural programs ○ DV Response taskforce 	Clients	Information provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client has more knowledge of their rights and responsibilities • Client has their matter properly heard and adjudicated • Client has confidence in their legal representation • Client has specific issue resolved (e.g. relationship issues addressed, debt managed, employment complaint dealt with/income, housing need, consumer entitlement, immigration status resolved, abuse/discrimination tackled, social security entitlements enabled) • Client knows what they can do to get help/knows what to do next time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decreased stress and anxiety • Improved financial wellbeing • Improved personal relationships • Increased personal safety • Decreased social exclusion/isolation
		Advice seeking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased targeted & appropriate referrals into and out of non-legal support services (e.g. Health, Employment, Education, Housing) • Increased number of clients accessing referral services • Increased knowledge /competence in advising on legal situations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased collaboration between services • Improved ability to effectively service priority clients
		Representation and case work		
	Community	Community Service Organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased community knowledge and self-confidence around legal issues • Improved ability to have legal issues addressed • Improved access to advice and support on legal matters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased individual and community wellbeing
		Civil Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Self-represented applicants) understand the process, are prepared and have realistic expectations of possible outcomes • (Represented clients) benefit from appropriate and higher quality representation • Improved speed and efficiency in processing cases • Increased exposure to advocacy on public and legal policy • Improved productive contact, engagement and collaboration with CLCs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease in resources expended by court staff • Fairer legal outcomes for applicants/clients • Increased knowledge to inform policy and process changes
	Justice System & services	Courts/Tribunals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses government's need to provide an effective service for vulnerable individuals and the broader community • Department has access to informed advice and representation on legislative issues/changes • Improved legal services across a broader client base 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better informed and improved development of legal policy and practice • Better able to meet objective of effective justice services for all
AGD and Department of Justice		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referrals enable clients who are not eligible for Legal Aid (e.g. tenancy and employment law) to be more appropriately serviced • Reduced pressure on LAQ resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Aid functions more effectively 	
Volunteers	Legal Aid Queensland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals gain experience in new and different areas of law • Individuals increase their understanding of clients' circumstances and broader community issues • Greater awareness and empathy within law firms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved ability to make a difference in the community • Improved professional practice development 	
	Volunteer legal staff			

Figure 2: CLCQ Theory of change

The Citizens Advice Example

Significant work in this area has been undertaken in the UK. Projects between Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB)³¹, Scotland Legal Aid, and Evaluation Support Scotland has produced a number of informative documents that detail the process undertaken, and the resulting outcomes, indicators and measures. Measuring outcomes from citizens advice

³¹ The Citizen's Advice network provides both advice and representation of a wide range of administrative justice and consumer redress issues. Citizens Advice Bureau advisers act as authorised lay representatives and as tribunal representatives alongside professional legal advisors as well as boasting a large volunteer force that includes retired and non-practicing solicitors and advocates (barristers).

(MOCA) was a partnership programme between various CABs and Evaluation support Scotland (ESS). Together they developed a suite of materials including;

- an overall model of outcomes linked to national outcomes and a number of advice specific models
- indicators and methods for evaluating outcomes from advice and social policy
- a discussion of the challenges facing CABs who have multiple reporting demands
- a section addressing reporting on outcomes, with a focus on writing client case studies
- a summary of some of the evidence available

Building on this work; the **Harmonizing Indicators Project** was undertaken. This project brought together Citizens Advice with their statutory funders to make monitoring and evaluation of advice more rational and more useful³². The collaborative approach involved representatives from citizens advice national organisation, Scottish Legal Aid board, the government and The Improvement Service. Each member of the group consulted with and provided feedback from their stakeholders. The findings were tested through a reference group which allowed for consultation with other people, including health, money advice, and CAB managers not directly involved in the project group.

Recognising that a variety of outcomes can be achieved from legal assistance, a simplified approach identified three types of outcomes to measure routinely.

1. **Advice service outcomes** – e.g., individuals in need have access to good quality advice services, and individuals experience a fair process and/or the end result was fair.

Outcome	Outcome Indicator	Possible methods
Individuals in need have access to good quality advice services	<p><i>It is easy to access advice</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can easily get to the advice centre • I can physically access the building • I feel comfortable going to the CAB • I can get advice when I need it • My communication needs are met • I feel listened to 	Survey of sample of clients Focus group Capture unsolicited comments (e.g. cards in a box)
	<p><i>Advice is good</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The advice I was given was accurate, relevant and timely • I am clear about my options and next steps • I have confidence in the adviser • The best possible outcome was achieved 	Audit of cases End of interview question/survey
	<p><i>I got access to representation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was advised to seek advice from a solicitor/other agency for higher level of advice • I got help to appeal/represent myself • Adviser appealed decision • I was represented at <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits tribunal • Employment tribunal • Court hearing 	Record of referrals and action taken
Individuals experience a fair process/ the end result was fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I got what I wanted • I was satisfied with the outcome • I was satisfied with the way things were handled 	Survey of sample of clients

Figure 3: CAB Advice service outcomes

³² Citizens Advice Bureau 2020a

- Advice outcomes** – practical outcomes that relate to the specific area of assistance. E.g., outcomes related to benefits, consumer, debt, housing, immigration, other legal proceedings, etc.

Measuring advice outcomes

These are practical outcomes that relate to a specific area of advice. We took each level one advice code and identified a few key practical outcomes.

We identified that outcomes might be noted as part of ongoing work and captured on a case management system, with a review on case closure or a sample survey.

Please note that for specific projects or for social policy reasons more detailed outcome codes might be collected. **We are focussed here on core reporting.** We suggest that funders could choose which of the indicators below are of most interest to them. We do not suggest that CABx report to every funder on every indicator.

Level 1 advice code	Indicators	Methods
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Benefit awarded ● Benefit not awarded ● Client income maximised ● Correct tax code identified and applied ● Overpayment of tax identified and recovered 	Note outcome if and when client or other agency gives feedback
Consumer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Statutory rights enforced ● Refund agreed ● Refund refused ● Repair agreed ● Repair refused ● Replacement agreed ● Replacement refused ● Apology 	Follow up or review at case closure Survey sample of cases
Debt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Debt successfully challenged ● Debt strategy agreed/completed ● Verified financial gain ● Income maximised ● Improved financial capability 	
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Grants accessed ● Grants not secured 	
Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Employment rights improved ● Employment rights maintained ● Employment rights enforced ● Claim to employment tribunal won ● Claim to employment tribunal lost ● Claim settled outwith tribunal 	
Finance and charitable support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Receives charitable grant ● Access financial product 	
Health and community care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Requested outcome achieved ● Apology/redress secured ● Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) successful ● ADR not successful 	

Figure 4: Advice outcomes (CAB)

- Client outcomes** – the impact on the client and their family. Two key outcomes have been chosen to focus on. They are; improved health and wellbeing, and does the client feel able to address this and other issues/seek support. These outcomes are measured by a set of 8 indicators using an instrument developed specifically for the project.

For each outcome, indicators have been identified and potential methods (measures) are agreed. For more examples see **Measuring Outcome from Citizens Advice (MOCA)**³³.

³³ Citizens Advice Bureau 2020b

US Legal Services Corporation

In the United States, the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) is the single largest funder of civil legal aid for low-income Americans. LSC provides funding to 132 independent non-profit legal aid programs across the country. An **Outcomes Toolkit** has been developed and is available on LSC's website ³⁴. Organisations collect and report outcomes for the non-financial and financial benefits ³⁵ they provide to clients (through their extended services cases).

Examples of two specific models funded by LSC are the Virginia IOLTA model and the Cleveland model.

The Virginia IOLTA Model

The Virginia legal aid programs collect and report outcomes for cases closed in 12 legal problem categories. **See the full list** ³⁶. These outcomes are **results-based outcomes** (practical outcomes that relate to the specific assistance given). Some legal problem categories have more outcome options than others. Some examples include:

Consumer/Finance category – 20 possible outcomes such as;

- Obtained federal bankruptcy protection
- Stopped or reduced debt collect activity

Family category – 32 different possible outcomes, such as:

- Obtained or maintained custody of children
- Obtained protection from domestic violence
- Obtained, preserved, or increased child support.

The Cleveland Model

The Cleveland Legal Aid Society collects fewer categories of outcomes data than those used in the IOLTA model, but combines data for different case types to develop higher-level outcomes that correspond to the program's strategic goals of:

- 1) Improving safety and health
- 2) Promoting education and economic stability
- 3) Securing decent, affordable housing.

Like the Virginia model, Cleveland Legal Aid also report non-financial benefits and financial outcomes. **See the full list of the non-financial outcomes data that Cleveland collects.** Additionally, some programs collect data regarding the success rates of their case work and are based on the extent to which the client's goals were or were not achieved.

³⁴ <https://live-lsc-d9.pantheonsite.io/i-am-grantee/outcomes-toolkit>

³⁵ Financial benefits are outcomes reported in dollar value. The two categories of financial benefits include 'direct dollar benefits' (lump sum awards/settlements and monthly benefits), and 'dollar savings' (savings achieved through judgements or payments avoided such as bankruptcy, garnishment).

³⁶ Legal Services Corporation (LSC)

Cleveland Legal Aid report significant lessons learned since it began using its outcomes system. The most significant are listed below.

Many important aspects of the program's work cannot be quantified.

- Every measure is imperfect
- Consistency is important
- Outcomes measures are necessary, but not the only tool to assess effectiveness
- Ongoing evaluation and improvement of the system is essential.

Literature Reviewed

The table below lists all the literature that has been reviewed and referenced within this report. Whereas this rapid scoping review aims to identify the scope of literature available it does not examine in detail or provide a synthesis of the findings like a full literature review would do. Therefore, the below table provides a good starting point for interested readers wanting to know more about how outcome frameworks are developed and used in Australia and internationally.

Title	Author	Journal/Publisher	Jurisdiction	Description
Outcomes Reform in Victoria	Victoria State Government 2021		Australia	Victoria is using an outcomes approach to focus on what matters to reform the public sector and create better outcomes for Victoria.
Roadmap to Social Impact. Yours step-by-step guide to planning, measuring and communicating social impact	Ramia, I, Powell, A, Stratton, K, Stokes, C, Meltzer, A & Muir, K 2021		Australia	A guide to implementing outcomes measurement and evaluation in the social services. Describes the process for developing an outcomes framework for organisations or services. Has a particular focus on outcomes frameworks for evaluation. Includes guidance on developing a theory of change and logic model.
An overview of how Communities and Justice is applying the NSW Human Services Outcomes Framework	NSW Department of Communities and Justice 2021		Australia	An overview of the NSW Human Services Outcomes Framework and how it is being applied by the NSW Department of Communities and Justice. NSW Government is applying the Outcomes Framework and using outcomes and indicators in their strategic planning to build consistency across government, improve data collection and analysis and share information.
Tracking Outcomes: A Guide for Civil Legal Aid Providers & Funders	National Center for Access to Justice 2021		USA	Describes the value of outcomes data in understanding of civil legal aid in the US. A series of interviews with leaders in the provider and funder communities offer a snapshot of current perspectives on working with outcomes data. A panel of expert advisors contributed insights and a review of the literature is included.

Title	Author	Journal/Publisher	Jurisdiction	Description
Family Violence Outcomes Framework	Victorian Department of Premier and Cabinet 2020		Australia	Describes the staged approach to outcomes reform that will help build the validity and reliability of outcomes data in parallel to delivery of the reform. The Family Violence Outcomes Framework aligns with the Victorian Governments overarching whole of government outcomes architecture which sets out a clear and consistent logic for designing and measuring outcomes.
Disability Housing - building a common outcomes framework for people with disability	Social Ventures Australia 2020		Australia	The Disability Housing Outcomes Framework was developed by SVA Consulting under the guidance of a Steering Committee, and in partnership with key individuals and organisations from across the sector. This guide introduces the Framework and outlines key considerations and first steps to support organisations to embed the Framework in practice.
Communities and Justice Indicator Bank	Department of Communities and Justice 2020		Australia	The complete details of all indicators contained in the Client Outcome and Indicator bank including information on where data is available. Detailed scores based on selection methodology. – Excel version.
Communities and Justice Core Client Outcome and Indicator Bank	Department of Communities and Justice 2020		Australia	The full Indicator Bank including Core Client Outcomes and Indicators, how and why they were developed and additional information about data availability- PDF version.
Indicators for Measuring Citizens Advice	Citizens Advice Bureau 2020		UK	This document gives a core/simplified list of indicators for measuring Citizens Advice Bureaux advice activity and outcomes. The guide describes the principles used to develop the set of indicators, measuring activity, measuring who uses services, measuring outcomes from advice, using the indicators in practice, and links to other work.
Measuring Outcomes from Citizens Advice	Citizens Advice Bureau 2020		UK	This guide was developed for the Citizens Advice Bureaux. Divided into six sections this pack includes the Citizens Advice Bureaux logic model, outcomes for advice work, and a range of methods for evaluating that work. There is a section with lots of examples of ways to report on the difference advice work makes.

Title	Author	Journal/Publisher	Jurisdiction	Description
Outcomes Measurement in the Australian Community Sector: A National Report Card	Callis, Z, Seivwright, A & Flatau, P 2019		Australia	This report examines the understanding and extent of outcomes measurement amongst community sector organisations, the financial, technological and human resources available to facilitate outcomes measurement practice, the degree to which common tools and resources for measurement are utilised, and the barriers faced by organisations in undertaking measurement.
Measuring the impacts of community legal centres: A toolkit for CLC workers to measure your services' outcomes and impacts	Monro, R, Farrell, J., & Hanson, C. 2018		Australia	CLCQ have developed a practical self-evaluation toolkit which aims to capture, measure and report outcomes, builds the measurement and evaluation capacity of the sector, effectively capture and communicate what works to funders and the sector, and supports use of information and insights to highlight possible improvements to services.
Measuring Softer Outcomes in Advice Services	The Improvement Service 2018		UK	This briefing paper focuses on the process of measuring softer outcomes in advice services, paying particular attention to practical examples of services that are currently measuring softer outcomes. It also offers recommendations for organisations delivering advice services with the aim of encouraging more local authorities to submit data measuring softer outcomes in the future.
Managing to Outcomes A Guide to Developing An Outcomes Focus	Social Ventures Australia & NSW Social Innovation Council 2018	NSW Human Services Outcomes Framework Guidance Material	Australia	This guide is designed to support organisations to adopt an outcomes-focused approach. The guide has four main sections that will help you to build your capacity regardless of what stage your organisation is at. Sections include understand what an outcomes-focused approach is, define the outcomes your organisation is seeking to achieve, measure whether or not you are achieving outcomes, use the information you collect to prove and improve what you do.
Using evidence to improve outcomes	Chilvers, M, Adams, S & Osborn, M 2018	Developing Practice: The Child, Youth and Family Work Journal, no. 50, pp. 6-23	Australia	This article discusses the development of the NSW FACS Outcomes Framework and how the Framework will embed and generate evidence that will improve outcomes for clients.

Title	Author	Journal/Publisher	Jurisdiction	Description
Burra Lotjpa Dunguludja Outcomes Framework	Aboriginal Justice Caucus 2018	Victorian Aboriginal Justice Agreement Phase 4	Australia	Burra Lotjpa Dunguludja is the fourth phase of the Victorian Aboriginal Justice Agreement (AJA). It is a partnership between the Aboriginal community and the Victorian Government to improve justice outcomes and family and community safety. Guided by the principles of self-determination, the Aboriginal Justice Caucus has developed an outcomes framework to meet the challenge of Aboriginal over-representation in the justice system.
Victorian Community Legal Sector Outcomes Measurement Framework	Planigale M. & Thwaites R. 2017		Australia	The Victorian CLC Outcomes Measurement Framework is the product of 18 months of consultation and work with many CLCs and experts. The draft framework provides outcomes, indicators, data collection tips, tools and case studies.
Wellbeing indicators across the life cycle: and Evidence Check rapid review	Miranti R, Tanton R, Vidyattama Y, Schirma J & Rowe P.	brokered by the Sax Institute for NSW Family and Community Services and FACSIAR 2017	Australia	This Evidence Check identifies key indicators of wellbeing relevant across the life cycle. A number of key terms are used throughout. A brief overview of these key concepts is provided below, focusing on (i) concepts related to developing a wellbeing framework, (ii) concepts related to indicators and measurement, and (iii) concepts related to assessing the quality of evidence.
The challenges of defining and measuring outcomes in nonprofit human service organizations	Mensing, JF 2017	Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 207-12	USA	This editorial focuses on the challenges faced by human service executives and managers in developing a transparent and readily understood method for identifying and aligning outcomes with overall client-centered goals and organizational resources.
Evaluation of legal service delivery: Challenges, opportunities and work towards a framework	Forell, S & McDonald, H 2017	in ILAG Conference, Johannesburg, pp. 14-6	Australia	This paper reports ideas and progress towards establishing a framework that engages with the evaluative and service environment challenges to identify clear, modest but rigorous opportunities for evaluation.

Title	Author	Journal/Publisher	Jurisdiction	Description
Shared measurement: Greater than the sum of its parts	Handley, S, Sabri, F & Kazimirski, A 2016	Inspiring Impact	UK	This paper builds on a previous paper (blueprint for shared measurement) and draws together national and international examples of good practice and focused on where data has been used to influence services, stakeholders, and strategy.
Shared measurement: easier than you think	Social Ventures Australia 2014		Australia	The process and the conditions for success of a shared outcomes-based measurement system is discussed in this article that details the experience of the homelessness sector in South Australia.
The Compass: Your Guide to Social Impact Measurement.	Muir, K & Bennett, S 2014		Australia	A beginners' guide to navigating social outcomes and impact measurement, to understand what it is and why it is important.
Blueprint for shared measurement	Ógáin, E, Svistak, M & de Las Casas, L 2013	NPC for Inspiring Impact	UK	This review focuses on shared measurement approaches that allow organisation to define and measure their shared outcomes. It examines these different approaches to understand the key steps and success factors in developing, designing and implementing shared measurement.
Measuring legal services: a practical methodology for measuring the quality and outcomes of legal assistance services	Curran, L & Crockett, A 2013	University of Tasmania Law Review, vol. 32, p. 70	Australia	This article discusses research into measuring the quality and outcomes of legal services. It focuses on the quality of the services process as an appropriate way of measuring and ensuring positive service outcomes. The authors conclude that any attempts to review or evaluate legal assistance services must recognise a need for an understanding of the need for care, the complexity and diversity of service delivery.
A Literature Review: Examining the Literature on How to Measure the 'Successful Outcomes': Quality, Effectiveness and Efficiency of Legal Assistance Services	Curran, L 2012	Effectiveness and Efficiency of Legal Assistance Services'(February 2012)	Australia	This literature review examines research, studies, reports, reviews and evaluation and other material both nationally and internationally around legal assistance services evaluations on successful outcome, quality, efficiency, effectiveness. This Literature Review highlights that legal assistance work is not only complex but that it is also complicated.

Title	Author	Journal/Publisher	Jurisdiction	Description
Outcomes in Advice	The New Economics Foundation & Advice UK 2010		UK	The aim of this report is to assess how advice services can be resourced to deliver better value for money. A key theme of the report is that outcomes (the longer-term changes that advice agencies make in the world) matter.
Good practice guidelines for indicator development and reporting	Brown, D 2009	Third World Forum on statistics, knowledge and policy, Busan, Korea, pp. 27-30	Australia/ New Zealand	This paper summarises the characteristics of good practice associated with the development and reporting of indicators and illustrates them with case studies of indicator initiatives in New Zealand and Australia.
Measuring Outcomes of Community Organisations	Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth 2009		Australia	This paper presents a summary of research into the use and effectiveness of outcomes' measurement frameworks for Community Organisations. The intended audience is Community Organisation representatives and others concerned with the issue of whether and how best to measure outcomes of Community Organisations in Australia.
Breakthroughs in Shared Measurement and Social Impact	Kramer, M Parkhurst, M Vaidyanathan, L 2009	FSG Social Impact Advisors	USA	This paper is based on six months of interviews and research and examines twenty 20 efforts to develop shared approaches to performance, outcomes, or impact measurement across multiple organisations.
Measuring outcomes of United Way-funded programs: Expectations and reality	Hendricks, M, Plantz, MC & Pritchard, KJ 2008	New Directions for Evaluation, vol. 2008, no. 119, pp. 13-35	USA	The most widely used approach to program outcome measurement in the non-profit sector in the US is described. Strengths and limitations of the distinguishing features of this approach, efforts to disseminate the approach, implementation, and actual outcome measurement as assessed.
Eight Outcome Models	Penna, R & Phillips, W 2005	Evaluation Exchange, vol. XI, pp. 4-5	USA	This paper offers insights into which outcomes model might be appropriate to the particular needs of a program at a given point in time. It describes eight outcome models that fall into three main categories; program planning and management, program and resources alignment, and program reporting.

Title	Author	Journal/Publisher	Jurisdiction	Description
Measuring Shared Outcomes Across Funding Streams	Stockton, B Accessed March 2022	Clear Impact Australia	Australia	This article offers a case study in how the Results-Based Accountability framework can help result in more useful data and better outcomes for clients. It demonstrates how the framework can give organisations the data they need to assess, analyse, inform and continuously improve their individual programs.
CLAS Detailed Firm Wide Outcomes	Legal Services Corporation (LSC) Accessed March 2022		USA	Example of an annual report complete with lists of outcomes collected for each of the substantive law areas for Cleveland Legal Aid.
LSCV Outcome Measures Major Benefits	Legal Services Corporation (LSC) Accessed March 2022		USA	This list describes the major benefits from direct legal representation of individuals that are reported under twelve categories.
Outcomes Catalog	Legal Services Corporation (LSC) Accessed March 2022		USA	This list is the result of a survey of states, grantees, and other organizations currently collecting outcomes for legal services (in the US) and is a starting point for outcomes that might be right for a legal aid program to collect.

References

Aboriginal Justice Caucus 2018, *Victorian Aboriginal Justice Agreement Phase 4. Burra Lotjpa Dunguludja Outcomes Framework*, Victoria.

Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth 2009, *Measuring Outcomes of Community Organisations*, <<https://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/not-for-profit/submissions/subdr199-attachment.pdf>>.

Brown, D 2009, 'Good practice guidelines for indicator development and reporting', in *Third World Forum on statistics, knowledge and policy, Busan, Korea*, pp. 27-30.

Bruce Cameron, W 1963, *Informal sociology, a casual introduction to sociological thinking*, New York, NY: Random House.

Callis, Z, Seivwright, A & Flatau, P 2019, *Outcomes Measurement in the Australian Community Sector: A National Report Card*.

Citizens Advice Bureau 2020a, *Indicators for Measuring Citizens Advice*, <<https://evaluationsupportscotland.org.uk/resources/indicators-for-measuring-citizens-advice/>>.

Citizens Advice Bureau 2020b, *Measuring Outcomes from Citizens Advice*, <https://www.cas.org.uk/system/files/publications/measuring_outcomes_from_citizens_advice.pdf>.

Curran, L 2012, *A literature review: examining the literature on how to measure the 'successful outcomes': quality, effectiveness and efficiency of legal assistance services*.

Curran, L & Crockett, A 2013, 'Measuring Legal Services: A Practical Methodology for Measuring the Quality and Outcomes of Legal Assistance Services', *U. Tas. L. Rev.*, vol. 32, p. 70.

Department of Communities and Justice 2020a, 'Communities and Justice Core Client Outcome and Indicator Bank', <<https://www.facs.nsw.gov.au/download?file=798452>>.

Department of Communities and Justice 2020b, 'Communities and Justice Indicator Bank', <<https://www.facs.nsw.gov.au/download?file=798947>>.

Handley, S, Sabri, F & Kazimirski, A 2016, *Shared measurement: Greater than the sum of its parts*, Inspiring Impact.

Hendricks, M, Plantz, MC & Pritchard, KJ 2008, 'Measuring outcomes of United Way–funded programs: Expectations and reality', *New Directions for Evaluation*, vol. 2008, no. 119, pp. 13-35.

Kramer, M, Parkhurst, M & Vaidyanathan, L 2009, *Breakthroughs in Shared Measurement and Social Impact*, FSG Social Impact Advisors, USA, <www.fsg.org/resource/breakthroughs-shared-measurement/>.

Legal Services Corporation (LSC) 'CLAS Detailed Firm Wide Outcomes', vol. 2022, <<https://lsc-live.app.box.com/s/kwsntm75kockru8twyomfj09jj7q1kf>>.

Legal Services Corporation (LSC) 'LSCV Outcome Measures Major Benefits', <<https://lsc-live.app.box.com/s/xereiau8bwhaqrhwpm672ro1ynf41zg8>>.

Legal Services Corporation (LSC) 'Outcomes Catalog', <<https://www.lsc.gov/our-impact/civil-legal-outcomes/outcomes-catalog>>.

Mensing, JF 2017, 'The challenges of defining and measuring outcomes in nonprofit human service organizations', *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 207-12.

Miranti R, Tanton R, Vidyattama Y, Schirma J & Rowe P 2017, *Wellbeing indicators across the life cycle: and Evidence Check rapid review*.

Monro, R, Farrell, J & Hanson, C 2018, *Measuring the impacts of community legal centres: A toolkit for CLC workers to measure your services' outcomes and impacts*, Community Legal Centres Queensland, Australia, <http://www.communitylegalimpact.org/uploads/1/3/1/0/13108841/self-evaluation_toolkit_2.03.18.pdf>.

Muir, K & Bennett, S 2014, *The Compass: Your Guide to Social Impact Measurement.*, Sydney, Australia.

National Center for Access to Justice 2021, *Tracking Outcomes: A Guide for Civil Legal Aid Providers & Funders*, Fordham Law School, New York.

New Economic Foundation & Advice UK 2010, *Outcomes in advice*, London.

NSW Department of Communities and Justice 2021, *An overview of how Communities and Justice is applying the NSW Human Services Outcomes Framework*, Department of Communities and Justice, Sydney.

Ógáin, E, Svistak, M & de Las Casas, L 2013, *Blueprint for shared measurement*, NPC for Inspiring Impact, London.

Penna, R & Phillips, W 2005, 'Eight Outcome Models', *Evaluation Exchange*, vol. XI, pp. 4-5.

Penna, RM & Phillips, WJ 2004, *Outcome frameworks : an overview for practitioners*, Center for Outcomes, Rensselaerville Institute, Rensselaerville, N.Y.

Peters, MD, Godfrey, CM, Khalil, H, McInerney, P, Parker, D & Soares, CB 2015, 'Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for conducting systematic scoping reviews', *JBI Evidence Implementation*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 141-6.

Planigale M. & Thwaites R. 2017, *Victorian Community Legal Sector Outcomes Measurement Framework*.

Ramia, I, Powell, A, Stratton, K, Stokes, C, Meltzer, A & Muir, K 2021, *Roadmap to Social Impact. Your step-by-step guide to planning, measuring and communicating social impact*.

Social Ventures Australia 2014, *Shared measurement: easier than you think*, 2/12/2021.

Social Ventures Australia 2018, *Managing to Outcomes | A Guide to Developing An Outcomes Focus*.

Social Ventures Australia 2020a, *Disability Housing - building a common outcomes framework for people with disability*.

Stockton, B n.d, *Measuring Shared Outcomes Across Funding Streams*, viewed 17/02/2022 2022, <<https://clearimpact.com/measuring-shared-outcomes-across-funding-streams/>>.

Strathern, M 1997, 'Improving ratings': audit in the British University system', *European review*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 305-21.

The Improvement Service 2018, *Measuring Softer Outcomes in Advice Services*, <https://www.improvementservice.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/9315/measuring-softier-outcomes.pdf>.

Victoria State Government 2021, *Outcomes Reform in Victoria*, viewed March 2022, <<https://www.vic.gov.au/outcomes-reform-victoria>>.

Victorian Department of Premier and Cabinet 2020, *Family Violence Outcomes Framework*, State Government, Melbourne: Victoria.

