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1. Executive Summary

1.1 Financial Management Resource Support Unit (FMRSU) at Matrix on Board

Matrix on Board (‘Matrix’) operates a Registered Training Organisation (‘RTO’) delivering nationally accredited training, including a program of capacity building, professional development and support for the Money Management sector (‘MMS’) in Australia. The aim of this program is to develop a qualified Money Management workforce and sustainable service providers, in order to adequately support clients and their families to achieve financial independence. Facilitated through the Financial Management Resource Support Unit (‘FMRSU’) since 2009, on average 151 Money Management workers from 29 service providers in Western Australia, Northern Territory and Queensland have participated each year, in this program.

A substantial proportion of these workers are Indigenous, and this workforce has delivered Money Management support to more than 33,000 Indigenous clients. The FMRSU training follows a ‘Workforce Development’ model which is committed to helping people achieve their learning goals in a fun and supportive learning environment. This model incorporates a multi-pronged approach described in Table 1 below:

Table 1: FMRSU’s multi-level Workforce Development approach for the Money Management Sector in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. A Systems Perspective | - Design and Implementation of Workforce Development Policies  
- Managing Organisational Change  
- Resources and Partnerships  
- Workforce Mapping & Planning |
| 2. Organisational Capacity Building | - Workforce Sustainability (Recruitment, Motivation, Stress and Burnout, Job satisfaction, Career paths, Turnover, Job Redesign)  
- Management & Supervision (Coaching and Mentoring supervisors) |
| 3. Development of a Skilled Workforce | - Information Management (Evidence based practice, Accessing information effectively)  
- Development of Knowledge, Skills and Abilities  
- Transfer of Training to Work Practice |

In November 2014, Matrix engaged Financial Resilience Australia (‘FRA’) to conduct an evaluation of this workforce development program, with a particular focus on informing the ongoing and future capability needs of Money Management workers (‘MMWs’) and Money Management service providers (‘MMSPs’) in the sector.

1.2 Terms of Reference for the FMRSU Evaluation

This evaluation aims to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the FMRSU program in building the Money Management sector’s capacity to service client needs, in particular for remote Indigenous communities, over the period 2009-2015. Encompassing all components of the multi-tiered FMRSU approach (described in Table 2 below), this evaluation also seeks to map the sector’s current and future workforce development needs; identify and measure changes in capability (for participating MMWs and MMSPs) and highlight the types of interventions that were most effective.

Remote Indigenous employment, education and support is an inherently difficult process, hence this evaluation also documents the evolution and significant changes in this sector, in order to contribute to building sector-wide knowledge and share lessons learned. The

---

1 ‘Indigenous’ refers to all Australians of Aboriginal and Torres Straits Islander origin Australian Bureau of Statistics
evaluation also comments on the effectiveness of an online training delivery platform adopted by Matrix in late 2014.

Table 2: FMRSU program components and content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Component</th>
<th>Content covered in Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Education &amp; training</td>
<td>(A) Base level training:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Money Management Workers Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. MoneyBusiness Kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Family Payments Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Certificate I in Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge, skills &amp; experience</td>
<td>(B) Advanced training and professional development:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Certificate III in Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Financial Literacy Education Skillset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. New Leaders Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Presentation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational structure, systems &amp; culture</td>
<td>(C) Service provider engagement and service planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Training (specified by funders) in response to policy changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Approved Money Management Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. ATM Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. ASIC Licensing course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work conditions &amp; opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Agreed areas of focus for FMRSU Evaluation

This evaluation focuses on the effectiveness of three key areas of the FMRSU program – program design, delivery and outcomes. The key issues considered relating to each agreed area of focus are outlined in Table 3 below:

Table 3: FMRSU Evaluation – agreed areas of focus and issues considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Area</th>
<th>Main issues considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program Design  | 1. What were the needs of the sector, participating organisations and workers?  
|                 | 2. Did the program design meet the needs of all the above stakeholders?  
|                 | 3. What changes were made to program design/content, and why were these changes necessary?  
|                 | 4. How can the program design be modified to better identify, address and measure changes to workforce needs and organisational capacity?  
|                 | 5. Was the program accessible to workers who are Indigenous?  
|                 | 6. Was the program relevant to the needs of Indigenous clients & communities?  
| Program Delivery| 1. Which workforce development strategies were utilised?  
|                 | 2. Did the key activities undertaken effectively support these strategies?  
|                 | 3. What were the service delivery objectives of the MMSPs and MMWs prior to participating in the program?  
|                 | 4. How far were these objectives met?  
|                 | 5. What are key lessons learned for program implementation and delivery?  
|                 | 6. What barriers have affected the effectiveness of the program?  
|                 | 7. What factors enabled the implementation of the program?  
| Program Outcomes| 1. How did key stakeholders (MMSPs and MMWs) rate the FMRSU program?  
|                 | 2. What was the change in workplace capability for participating MMWs?  
|                 | 3. What was the change in organisational capacity for participating MMSPs?  
|                 | 4. What was the change in MMWs capacity to service their clients’ needs?  

1.3 Key Findings and Recommendations

This evaluation assesses both the extent to which the FMRSU program has achieved its workforce development objectives, and the quality of the program delivered by FMRSU. We find that there has been significant improvement in the awareness, knowledge, skills and behaviour of MMWs who have participated in this program. The reach and scope of the FMRSU program has also grown significantly since it was established in 2009, including the number of clients serviced by the participating MMWs, and the organisational capacity of participating service providers.

The program has achieved better outcomes than national vocational education and training (‘VET’) averages, in relation to completion rates, student satisfaction and relevance of the training to the workplace. In particular the program has a significantly higher rate of Indigenous participation, particularly those who live in remote/very remote areas. Changes made to the program design and delivery since it began, have delivered positive outcomes.

Based on these findings, we conclude that the FMRSU program has outperformed national average training outcomes, and been successful in achieving its workforce development objectives. In particular, it has had significant success in training Indigenous workers, including those from remote communities, where other national programs have struggled. We also highlight five key recommendations, which can enable the sector to continue to assist those who need help in managing their money wisely:

1. **Deliver professional qualifications for new Money Management workers**: Continue to deliver professional qualifications for Money Management workers, using FMRSU’s successful workforce development approach. In particular, workers who are new to the Money Management sector, and those who are working for the first time in a remote context, need this dedicated training in order to succeed in their roles.

2. **Offer ongoing mentoring and coaching support for Money Management workers**: Mentoring and coaching support for Money Management workers, both during and following the completion of accredited qualifications, has been a particularly successful feature of this program, which should be continued. In future, peer to peer mentoring amongst Money Management workers can supplement the support currently offered via dedicated mentors.

3. **Increase networking opportunities for Money Management workers and managers**: Networking opportunities, including industry-wide forums, offer important opportunities for Money Management workers to share learnings and advocate on behalf of their clients. Moreover, their managers could also benefit from targeted networking opportunities with their peers, as part of ongoing organisational capacity-building across the sector.

4. **Develop and deliver ongoing professional development for Money Management workers**: Money Management workers who have completed the accredited qualifications would benefit from ongoing professional development opportunities, such as the development and delivery of ‘refresher’ modules, to keep their knowledge up to date.

5. **Sustained funding for the Money Management sector**: The Money Management sector requires sustainable, longer-term funding and other support, in order to keep up with growing demand, and increasingly complex client needs.

The following sections of this report discuss this evaluation in more detail. Chapter Two provides an overview of the evolution of the Money Management sector in Australia, and the establishment of the FMRSU program. Chapter Three describes FRA’s evaluation approach and methodology, whilst Chapter Four discusses the findings of the evaluation. Chapter Five concludes with key future recommendations for the Money Management sector in Australia.
2. Money Management Services in Australia: An Overview

The Financial Management Program (‘FMP’)^2 operated by the Department of Social Services (‘DSS’) and its precursor, the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (‘FaHCSIA’), aims to work collaboratively to help build the financial health and well-being of vulnerable and disadvantaged Australians. This program targets people who are:

- experiencing personal financial difficulties
- need to further develop their basic financial skills, capability and literacy
- are disadvantaged through some other form of financial exclusion

FMP aims to provide services to meet the continuum of their needs, from crisis assistance to support that helps people to build financial assets, longer-term financial capability and stability. Money Management services provide clients with education and information to help them manage their money, but do not provide financial advice or deal with complex financial/legal matters^2. Money Management workers are expected to facilitate access to financial counsellors and other relevant services, in order to assist individuals who may require these more complex services.

A performance audit of the Australian government’s Money Management service strategies in July 2009^2 found that FaHCSIA has implemented several Money Management Service Strategies (‘MMSS’) in partnership with Indigenous communities, under the FMP. These strategies aim to increase:

- capacity to overcome barriers to financial inclusion
- financial literacy, knowledge and skills
- assets and reduce debts

Two financial literacy programs included in this strategy are Family Income Management and MoneyBusiness. Family Income Management (‘FIM’) was first implemented in 2002 as a two year pilot program in the Cape York communities of Aurukun, Coen and Mossman Gorge. It was transferred to Cape York Partnerships Projects Pty Ltd in June 2006. FIM supports the development of budgeting and Money Management strategies, such as setting up automatic debits and saving accounts. A report published in 2007^4 found that FIM has helped 700 participants from 8 communities to improve their lives.

The inclusion of an ‘Income Management’ component distinguishes FIM from other Money Management programs. Whilst participation in FIM is voluntary, the program has been used to support Income Management to prescribed areas as part of the Cape York Welfare Reform trials, and the Northern Territory Emergency Response (‘NTER’). The aim is to use these Money Management services to assist Income Management clients to learn how to better manage their own money, and transition off this program.

MoneyBusiness, a voluntary adult financial educational program developed by FaHCSIA in partnership with ANZ Bank in 2005, was first implemented in six pilot sites (Katherine, Tennant Creek, Nguiu, Galiwinku, Geraldton and Kununurra) to leverage ANZ’s knowledge and experience in financial inclusion, and the governments’ role in overseeing service delivery in remote locations. The program was based on ANZ’s successful MoneyMinded program and was designed to assist families, individuals and communities in establishing budgets and prioritising their spending and savings. The MoneyBusiness materials were designed in consultation with Indigenous staff in the pilot sites, and reflect a range of cultural and learning styles suited to Indigenous participants in those communities.
MoneyBusiness has since been extended to reach over 33,000 participants in 320 communities, delivered by service agencies funded by the Government and trained by Matrix. In addition, ANZ has extended the program to a range of community partners including Anglicare SA, Kildonan Uniting Care, The Benevolent Society and Families SA, who service Indigenous clients across Australia.

The 2009 audit concluded that FIM and MoneyBusiness were supporting Indigenous clients to improve their Money Management skills, however it was difficult to conclusively measure the outcomes of the programs due to limitations of FaHCSIA’s performance frameworks and the qualitative nature of outcomes data. It also identified several areas of improvement including program administration, risk and information management, performance management and need for longer-term funding arrangements.

In 2010, Income Management under the NTER was replaced with a New Income management (‘NIM’) structure, covering all areas of the NT rather than confined to the prescribed areas. NIM has the option for individuals to participate in a voluntary capacity, known as ‘Voluntary Income Management’, as well as a mandatory element. The scope for mandatory Income Management has narrowed to targeted income recipients, with a process introduced for individuals to obtain exemptions.

In 2011, the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (‘AIHW’) undertook a review of the data collection for the Financial Management Program, in particular relating to Emergency Relief, Commonwealth Financial Counselling and Money Management services delivered through community service and/or welfare organisations. The objectives of this review were to reduce the data collection burden currently imposed on service providers, and improve the relevance and usefulness of data collected by FaHCSIA.

The AIHW report made a number of recommendations regarding changes to reporting requirements, governance arrangements for data collection methodologies and change processes, national feedback loops updating providers on information about the FMP and its data collections, and publicly available data reports on the number and types of service delivered by the FMP.

In 2012, DSS introduced Place-Based Income Management, a trial of new approaches designed to tackle entrenched disadvantage in ten specified locations across Australia. The ten place-based sites, chosen based on a number of factors including unemployment, youth unemployment, skills gaps, the numbers of people receiving welfare payments, and the length of time people have been on income support payments, include:

- Bankstown, Shellharbour and Wyong (New South Wales)
- Logan and Rockhampton (Queensland)
- Playford (South Australia)
- Greater Shepparton and Hume (Victoria)
- Burnie (Tasmania)
- Kwinana (Western Australia)

The place-based trial commenced in five selected sites in July 2012, including Playford, Greater Shepparton, Bankstown, Rockhampton and Logan.

In June 2014, the government announced a new way of working to recognise and support the work of civil society organisations, following which the Financial Management Program became the Financial Wellbeing and Capability Activity. These new arrangements are designed to offer more integrated support and better wrap around services which promote financial capability, and better help people avoid or resolve financial difficulties and achieve self-reliance. Under the new Activity, Money Management services are now known as Financial Capability services.
This program includes a focus on early intervention and prevention approaches. Financial Capability services under these activities continue to be voluntary, confidential and free, and are intended to enable Australians to:

- make better and informed decisions about managing their money, including household Money Management from payday to payday to ensure essential living expenses such as food, rent, clothing, education and regular bills, are covered
- plan and set goals for items such as whitegoods, furniture or car repairs, and to put something aside for their children and the future
- better use financial services to manage their household funds and access technology such as ATMs and phone and internet banking
- be aware of their rights as consumers, know how to avoid exploitation when using their money and how to get better deals when making purchases
- improve capacity to assist other people financially, or resist inappropriate requests for financial assistance
- have an understanding of the requirements attached to home ownership
- better deal with financial hardship and money stress

The key activities envisaged under this new program are summarised Diagram 1 below:

**Diagram 1: Financial Wellbeing and Capability Activity Diagram (DSS)**

Although at the time of writing this report, the full details of grant funding relating to many of these activities have not yet been released, DSS envisages that Financial Capability services may help people to build longer-term capability to budget and manage their money better and make informed choices. Financial Capability workers deliver financial literacy education, information and coaching and maintain a strong focus on supporting consumers to change their behaviour and ‘learn by doing’. Workers are required to be appropriately qualified, undertake relevant training or be planning to undertake relevant training.
2.1 Financial Management Resource Support Unit (FMRSU) & Workforce Development: A Comprehensive Background

In 2009, Matrix was appointed by DSS to provide resources, support and approved training to Money Management Service Providers (‘MMSPs’), and their staff, the Money Management Workers (‘MMWs’). The terms of reference required Matrix to deliver a nationally recognized qualification to meet the needs of Money Management workers, and to provide organisational support for the community sector providers who employed them. Given the very short timeframe, the Financial Management Resource Support Unit (‘FMRSU’) was established within a six-month period (from February to June 2009), during which time four offices were set up, and experienced staff recruited, to design and commence the necessary training.

The financial crises experienced across the world in the decades leading up to this development saw many people experience enormous financial pressures from a variety of sources. These included mortgage stress, credit card debt and increased cost of living, often experienced rapidly and simultaneously, within a broader context of lower employment, increased ill-health and family/social breakdown.

The multi-faceted, ever-shifting and complex nature of these difficulties meant that a highly skilled and flexible Money Management workforce was needed in order to appropriately assist clients. This was a challenge for the global community/social sector, where most of these workers were employed. A review of the social service sector in Scotland made the following observations regarding their own workforce:

“It needs to be forward looking, adapting traditional roles and professional boundaries or practices to address the changes in the sector. Care needs to be delivered through a team-working approach, which simplifies the service user's path through the social service maze. This means forging multi-disciplinary, multi-skilled and multi-professional working stretching across the health, education, justice and housing sectors as well as the social service sector and oriented around seamless and efficient service provision at the ‘front end’, rather than staff demarcations. This is a challenging change to make.”

In Australia, the challenges faced by the Money Management sector similarly included the lack of an appropriately experienced and qualified workforce, a need for organisations and their staff to keep up with ever-changing knowledge in order to inform evidence-based practice, and insufficient funding for the sector, as compared to client needs. Pathway qualifications were required to meet the entry-level needs of workers joining the community sector, and those taking up their first employment opportunity. Workforce development within the community sector was mostly focused on ‘training’, and no framework enabling the more holistic development of the Money Management workforce, was readily available.

A similar difficulty was being experienced in the Alcohol and Other Drugs (‘AOD’) sector in Australia, with a KPMG review observing that “workforce development must consider enablers and obstacles at the individual, organisational, sector and system levels, that impact the ability of workforce to effectively and efficiently support client and their families”.

The National Centre for Education and Training on Addiction (‘NCETA’) at Flinders University (South Australia) developed a ‘Workforce Development’ (‘WFD’) model for the AOD sector in response to this need. This model proposed a multi-faceted, systemic approach to building the capacity and sustainability of the AOD workforce, within the context of the ‘system’ as a whole. Matrix decided to adapt the NCETA WFD model to suit the needs of the Money Management sector, hence the FMRSU program was designed to encompass the Money Management system as a whole, in particular the following five elements:
1. workforce training
2. workforce knowledge, skills and experience;
3. organizational structure, systems and culture;
4. government policies and strategies;
5. work conditions and opportunities

This model offered the FMRSU a comprehensive way of thinking about and responding to the complex interplay of issues that affect the Money Management workforce. It moved the focus from merely ‘training’ individual Money Management workers to a more holistic program of capability development, which also considered organisations and systems. As illustrated in Diagram 2 below, training is only a sub-component of FMRSU’s overall workforce development framework.

Diagram 2: FMRSU’s Multi-tiered Workforce Development (WFD) Approach

As part of the DSS terms of reference, Matrix was responsible for negotiating and establishing a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the senior management of organisations funded to offer Money Management services. This MoU covered the following areas:

- Identification of individual development needs for participating MMWs
- Provision of formal mentoring for MMWs
- Accredited qualifications appropriate for the MMW role
- A program of training tailored to organisations and regions
- Enhanced support for leaders and managers, individuals and teams
- Organizational policy and system development activities
- Encouragement and support to join professional networks

The following chart (Diagram 3 below) captures a brief history of the FMRSU program, highlighting the key activities undertaken by Matrix. In 2009, the FMRSU program was established to service Money Management service providers and their workforce, in Western Australia and the Northern Territory. Initially, a third-party Registered Training Organisation (RTO) was contracted to offer the accredited training, whilst all training logistics and allowances for participating MMWs were paid for in full, by FMRSU. This function was taken over by Matrix in 2010, and an RTO established to commence delivery of accredited training from 2011 onwards.
Changes in DSS policy led to the remit of the FMRSU program being expanded in 2011, to include Emergency Relief providers who also delivered Money Management education programs. Other policy changes including the ATM reforms introduced in 2012 (relating to fee-free trials in selected remote communities), programs such as MoneyBusiness being recognised as an ‘Approved Money Management Course’, and the ASIC Licensing relief (2013) which led to the addition of specific training modules as part of the accredited training.

**Diagram 3: A timeline of FMRSU program highlights**
3. Evaluating FMRSU effectiveness: Approach & Process

There are many frameworks for evaluating the effectiveness of programs - given the FMRSU program was based on the NCETA Workforce Development (‘WFD’) model, the design of this evaluation was largely informed by NCETA’s WFD evaluation framework\(^4\). This framework sees evaluation as the "systematic assessment of the relevance, adequacy, progress, efficiency, effectiveness and impact of WFD programs, compared to a set of explicit or implicit standards".

Irrespective of the process and approach employed, evaluation is an essential component of program design, as findings can be used to:

1. **Render judgement**: determine if the program has done what it set out to do, from an accountability perspective
2. **Facilitate improvement**: monitor the program to identify what is working well and what is not, in order to modify the approach where necessary
3. **Generate knowledge**: contribute an understanding to the area addressed by the program
4. **Guide policymaking**: inform evidence-based policymaking, for the development or adjustment of policy

Evaluators can adopt many approaches to evaluate the effectiveness of programs – for example, evaluations can be conducted at a particular stage in the life-cycle of a program i.e. at the very outset (typically a ‘needs assessment’), during the course (a ‘formative’ method) or at the end of the program cycle (a ‘summative’ evaluation). They can also have a specific focus i.e. to assess impacts and/or outcomes, conduct a cost/benefit analysis or consider effectiveness of the program design and implementation.

Irrespective of the approach adopted, most evaluations involve three key steps\(^15\):

- **Planning**: determining the purpose, scope and design of the evaluation exercise
- **Implementing**: collecting and analysing primary data and other required information
- **Reporting & Using Findings**: effectively communicating and using results

The previous sections have highlighted the purpose and scope of the FMRSU evaluation. In the next section, we describe important aspects relating to the design of this evaluation.

3.1 FMRSU Evaluation Design

FRA has adopted a **mixed-methods** design for the FMRSU evaluation, combining the following methodological aspects:

1. **summative** method which traces the evolution of a program and considers its worth at the end of a program cycle
2. **multiple focus** to assesses the program design, implementation as well as outcomes and impacts
3. **realistic**\(^16\) approach which investigates the reasons why participants act/do not act upon the desired choices and/or behaviours encouraged by the program, the context within which this happens, and what might work in a **different context**

This approach allows FRA to retrospectively assess the effectiveness of the FMRSU program at the end of its current funding cycle, based on primary and other data regarding the processes used, the direct outcomes of the program as well as some wider impacts for participants. It is important to note however, that an evaluation of the impact of the FMRSU
program on individual clients, their families or the communities in which they live, is not within the scope of this study.

Given the brief to comprehensively document current and future needs of the sector, FRA has employed a ‘realistic’ focus on exploring what has worked, why it worked, for whom and in what context, as well as the ‘mechanisms’ which make the program work. We have also considered what may work in another setting, in an effort to make a useful contribution to the ongoing debate on the future directions for the Money Management sector.

The mixed-methods approach has therefore offered FRA a robust framework within which to document the evolution and significant changes experienced by the Money Management sector, assess the effectiveness of the FMRSU program, provide a ‘snapshot’ of current workforce capability and future needs, and inform the future direction of the government’s Money Management service strategies. This has been captured in Diagram 4 below:

**Diagram 4: FRA’s multi-methods approach to FMRSU Evaluation design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMATIVE METHOD</th>
<th>REALISTIC APPROACH</th>
<th>TYPE OF FOCUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• conducted at the end of the program to assess its worth</td>
<td>• Investigates why the participants act/do not act on desired choices /behaviours</td>
<td>• Impacts &amp; Outcomes – are we making a difference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• judges the processes, outcomes and impacts of the program</td>
<td>• focuses on what worked, for whom, the context and mechanisms which made it work</td>
<td>• Design – does the program make sense? Is the design likely to achieve the desired results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• contributes to an understanding of the area addressed by the program</td>
<td>• what could work in another setting</td>
<td>• Implementation – was the program implemented as planned?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.2 FMRSU Evaluation Implementation Process**

The process of implementing an evaluation exercise involves the following four steps:

1. Identify & establish governance, project reference group, obtain approvals
2. Design implementation plan with project timelines, deliverables and dependencies
3. Design project documentation, determine the types of indicators to be used
4. Decide on data collection methods, sample sites and participant groups

We discuss below the process followed by FRA in addressing each of these steps.

**3.2.1 Project Governance, Reference Group and Approvals:**

In October 2014, as part of a detailed proposal prepared to tender for the FMRSU evaluation exercise, FRA documented a project governance plan, and undertook a comprehensive assessment of all ethical and risk considerations. This proposal recommended a project
Steering group comprising of Nerida Nettelbeck (Managing Director Matrix) and nominated representatives from DSS and ANZ (as applicable), as well as a local Reference group comprising of nominated Matrix Client Managers.

The ethics and risk assessment conducted by FRA and the Managing Director (Matrix) found the project risk classification to be ‘Low Risk’ – this was subsequently endorsed by DSS. A project reference group was established under the lead of Brad Aitken (Matrix Training & Assessment Manager), which included the following Matrix Client Managers:

- Brad Aitken (Training & Assessment Manager)
- Cecily Petherick (Trainer & Assessor)
- Robynann Dixon (Client Manager & Training Coordinator)

Other Matrix staff who provided project assistance as required included:

- Lulu Wilson (Online Training & Assessment Manager)
- Lindsay Ingamells (Compliance Manager)
- Dinushi Gunasekara (Training Administration Officer)
- Treasa McCullagh (Senior Project Officer)

3.2.2 Project Implementation Plan

Throughout this evaluation exercise, FRA maintained a project implementation plan which identified key deliverables and milestones, timelines and identified dependencies. Table 4 below provides a snapshot of this implementation plan as at the time of writing this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones/Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline (Completed / Indicative)</th>
<th>Key dependencies identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft proposal agreed with Matrix</td>
<td>3 November 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level proposal agreed with funders</td>
<td>12 November 2014</td>
<td>As outlined in this document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Consultation (Matrix/Evaluator)</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised detailed proposal with Matrix</td>
<td>2 December 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft communications (email) for funder</td>
<td>2 December 2014</td>
<td>Matrix to forward to DSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with Matrix Client Managers</td>
<td>8 December 2014</td>
<td>Arranged in Darwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications inviting participation from funder</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Matrix to arrange with DSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Consultation (Matrix/Evaluator)</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>Required prior to fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork Site 1: Darwin</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>Availability of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork Site 2: Alice Springs</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>Availability of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data, desktop research, developing case-study</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Commence after fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present early snapshot of evaluation results</td>
<td>6 March 2015</td>
<td>Money Management Muster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft report to Matrix &amp; identified stakeholders</td>
<td>9 April 2014</td>
<td>Availability of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATIVE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report to Matrix</td>
<td>End April 2014</td>
<td>Availability of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Releasing report to MMS &amp; MMWs</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Matrix to schedule event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final copy of this plan will be submitted to Matrix along with the completed evaluation.

3.2.3 Evaluation Documentation & Selected Indicators

A robust evaluation program carefully considers how best to design and provide documents which provide necessary information to stakeholders and participants, particularly to ensure that prospective respondents understand the purpose of the evaluation, and the procedures involved. FRA designed a Plain Language Statement to explain the evaluation purpose and processes, and a Consent Form which were made available to Matrix staff.
Given the mixed-methods approach adopted by FRA, a range of indicators were selected across all three agreed areas of focus i.e. project design, delivery and outcomes. This enabled FRA to comprehensively assess the effectiveness of FMRSU processes, including program inputs, activities and outputs, as well as program outputs, impacts and outcomes.

In particular, the following types of indicators allow an assessment of the extent to which the FMRSU program has achieved its workforce development objectives:

- Changes in awareness, knowledge, and skills of participating MMWs
- Changes in behaviour of participating MMWs
- Increases in the number of clients reached/services offered by participating MMWs
- Changes in organisational capacity (skills, structures, resources) of participating MMSPs

Other indicators enable an assessment of the quality of the program delivered by FMRSU:

- Has the FMRSU program been conducted according to plan?
- What if any, were the changes made to the FMRSU program, and why were they made?
- What was the reach and scope of the FMRSU program?
- What was the quality of the FMRSU program?

### 3.2.4 Data Collection & Sample Sites

Generally, there are two kinds of data that can be gathered for an evaluation - quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative data uses numerical values which allow simple counts, frequencies and statistical tests to be conducted via survey instruments. Qualitative data are more descriptive, using words (written or spoken) and/or observations to reveal the meanings people attach to the program, and to explore how they have experienced it.

FRA selected a 'mixed-methods' approach to data collection, triangulating results via both quantitative and qualitative data. Three questionnaires containing both quantitative and qualitative questions, were designed to be flexibly employed during interviews with different participant cohorts - selected MMWs, MMSPs and other key stakeholders. The interviews were conducted via face to face meetings and telephone conversations. FRA also collected information from other sources (including a literature review, records from Matrix and other partners) in order to 'triangulate' and cross-check data gathered during interviews.

This evaluation aimed to include a maximum of fifty (50) participants from a minimum of fifteen (15) Money Management service providers who have participated in the FMRSU program. The project reference group (Matrix Client Managers), identified prospective participants across all three cohorts from these organisations, and facilitated all participant engagement and introductions for this evaluation exercise.

Participation in these interviews was entirely voluntary. Matrix staff sought permission from all prospective participants, and once permission was obtained, arranged to introduce the FRA evaluator and book appointments to conduct the interviews. In order to maximize the reach of this evaluation exercise, three field-trips were planned, which coincided with FMRSU's ongoing training, as follows:

3rd – 6th February 2015: Darwin (coinciding with week 5 of accredited training)
10th – 13th February 2015: Darwin (coinciding with week 2 of accredited training)
24th – 27th February 2015: Alice Springs (coinciding with week 4 of accredited training)

On each field-trip, the FRA evaluator was provided a list of prospective participants to interview, at face to face meetings or via telephone. Every attempt was made to include
participants with varying characteristics such as length of time in role, organizational decision-making authority, experience etc.

In all, the FMRSU evaluation exercise included a total of forty-eight (48) participants from twenty (20) Money Management service providers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money Management workers (MMWs)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Money Management workers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executives/Team leaders (MMSPs)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stakeholders (Matrix &amp; partners)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of Interviews</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 FMRSU Evaluation Reporting & Using Findings

In addition to deciding the evaluation design and implementation approach, it is also important to consider how the study will be documented and communicated to all key stakeholders. FRA has selected a ‘Theory of Change’ approach to facilitate the reporting and usage of these evaluation findings, retrospectively constructing a blueprint for how key partners and stakeholders had intended for FMRSU to achieve its long-term goals.

A theory of change (see Diagram 5 below) links the key program inputs (i.e. the financial, human and material resources used by the program) with the activities (i.e. what the program ‘does’ with the inputs) undertaken to produce desired outputs (i.e. the products, goods or services which result from the program). It also maps the outcomes (i.e. the changes that are expected to result from the outputs of the program) and wider impacts (i.e. the change in the ‘overall’ state) which result from the immediate outcomes of the program.

In describing a Theory of Change, evaluators are able to assess the efficiency with which the program is able to achieve required outputs, whilst performing planned activities that utilise identified inputs. The effectiveness of the program is also able to be assessed, by analysing the outcomes resulting from program outputs, as well as the impacts, or longer-term changes that result from immediate outcomes.

Diagram 5: OECD’s Theory Of Change Approach

The FMRSU theory of change has been discussed in more detail in section 5 below.
4. Findings from FMRSU Evaluation

Three sets of questionnaires were designed for this evaluation exercise, each focusing on feedback from a specific target audience group. Each questionnaire set therefore explored different aspects of the FMRSU program, as briefly summarised below:

1. **Key stakeholders**: Key staff from Matrix and other partners who have been closely associated with the FMRSU program design and/or implementation, were interviewed about their experiences relating to the evolution of the Money Management sector, and their contribution to the FMRSU program. They were also asked about changes to the sector and consequently the program design, and future directions for the sector.

2. **Money Management workers (MMWs)**: The questions included in this questionnaire explored various aspects of the MMW’s experiences with the FMRSU program, what worked for them and why, which aspects could be improved etc. The MMWs were also asked to consider future needs, capabilities and opportunities.

3. **Executives/team leaders from Money Management service providers (MMSPs)**: These questionnaires investigated the MMSPs experience with managing staff (i.e. the Money Management workers) who have participated in the FMRSU program, as well as their own training experience (if applicable). They also explored aspects of any broader involvement these participants may have had with FMRSU, including providing inputs / feedback relating to program design, and usage of organizational capacity-building modules.

The key findings from these three audience groups have been summarised in the following sections. This report then discusses the conclusions drawn from these findings, and key recommendations for further action from key stakeholders.

4.1 **Feedback from key stakeholders (Matrix & other partners)**

Eight (8) key stakeholders who have been closely involved in the design, development, implementation and/or delivery of the FMRSU program were interviewed for this evaluation. They were asked to trace their involvement in the Money Management sector prior to the establishment of the FMRSU (2009), inputs (if any) into the processes involved in the design and development of the program, and/or their experiences in implementing and delivering the program since 2010.

These key stakeholders were also asked about changes made to the program since it was established, why these were necessary and how the program could continue to identify and respond to the changing needs of the sector, in the future. The following sections summarise the feedback from these interviews, as well as other feedback obtained from speaking with executives from Money Management service providers, who had some involvement with the design and development of the FMRSU program.

All stakeholders were also asked to share any relevant data and information they had access to, which could provide an overview of the ‘state of the sector’ for the purposes of documenting this via this evaluation.

Discussions with Matrix staff highlight that the FMRSU program has undergone two significant changes since it was established, based on changing circumstances and needs within the Money Management sector. The first major change was in 2010, when the contract for the Registered Training Organisation (‘RTO’) which had originally been engaged to deliver the FMRSU accredited training, was discontinued in response to negative feedback received from participating service providers and workers.

Matrix executives contracted an external consultant to extensively engage with all key stakeholders to re-design the accredited training, including service providers, Money
Management workers and other partners. In particular the primary funding body, the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (later renamed the Department of Social Services), was instrumental in early program design. The process of establishing a dedicated Matrix RTO began in 2010, following which the redesigned FMRSU accredited training was delivered from 2011 onwards.

The second significant change was in April 2014, when funding uncertainty resulted in Matrix having to enact contingency plans for the potential closure of FMRSU. The possibility of winding up the Department of Social Services (‘DSS’) contract resulted in an internal staff restructure. Though funding was subsequently reinstated for a further twelve months in June 2014, the FMRSU program needed to be delivered in a different way from that point onwards. The program content and facilitation was refreshed, and accountability for the program delivery and ongoing client management was combined within the same Matrix team.

Other stakeholders (including service providers) comment that the bringing together of the management and delivery of the FMRSU program has largely resulted in positive changes. The four essential elements of the FMRSU program as it stands today, include accredited qualifications, non-accredited training, professional development via tailored mentoring, and ongoing coaching and support, as described in Diagram 6 below.

**Diagram 6: FMRSU’s program brochure**

The FMRSU process is initiated by service providers who refer their workers to Matrix, and begins with an individualised assessment of knowledge and skills gaps for each participant. This assessment informs the participant training and assessment profile maintained by Matrix, and is followed by an induction exercise. Following the completion of these initial steps, the participant is enrolled into the program.

The updated program has the following components within the **accredited** training modules:

(1) Certificate I in Work Preparation (Community Services) which is offered to staff who are relatively new in the Money Management role
(2) Certificate III in Community Services Work which all MMWs must complete or have an equivalent level of qualification
(3) Financial Literacy Education Skillset which all MMWs must complete

Matrix provides six-monthly performance reporting data to DSS under this contract, including the statistics and trends in Table 5 below, relating to **accredited training**. This data reveals...
that in all, 330 Money Management workers needed to undertake at least one of the three accredited training modules, since FMRSU was established in 2009. Of these, 63% are Indigenous.

Table 5: Matrix Reporting on FMRSU Program Accredited Training Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Certificate I Work Preparation</th>
<th>Certificate III Community Services Work</th>
<th>Financial Literacy Skillsets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 Enrolled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Enrolled</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Enrolled</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Enrolled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Enrolled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Enrolled</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Studying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion % to Enrolled</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FMRSU performance data can be compared to national statistics related to vocational education training, released by the National Centre for Vocational Education Research (2014). Their ‘Pocket Guide 2013’ reveals that of the 1.9 million students in Australia who were enrolled in the vocational education training (VET) system in 2012, only 4.6% were Indigenous. Moreover, less than 1% of the students were Indigenous people living in remote and very remote communities.

When these indicators are compared to the 63% Indigenous workers who have completed FMRSU training, they reflect that the FMRSU program has been particularly successful in engaging and training Indigenous people, including those from remote and very remote areas. When the challenges of undertaking extended training in remote contexts is factored in, this is a remarkable achievement for the Money Management workers involved.

The ‘Completion % to Enrolled’ ratio is a commonly-used indicator in the vocational training arena. NCVER data shows that 31% of enrolled students completed vocational training in 2012 – of these, only 3.2% were Indigenous. Comparing this indicator to the data in Table 5 above shows that the FMRSU program has outperformed the national completion averages achieved by the vocational training industry, in each component of the accredited training program.

In particular, the completion rates for relatively new Money Management workers (i.e. those who are required to enrol in the Certificate I Work Preparation Course), is more than two and a half times the industry average of 31%. The overall FMRSU completion rate for Indigenous staff is many multiples of the 3.2% completion rate achieved by the industry.

Another indicator tracked by the VET training industry relates to student satisfaction - on average, 87% of all students who completed VET courses in 2012, were satisfied with the overall quality of their training, and 78% found the training to be relevant to their current job. FMRSU data shows that all participants undertaking accredited training in the period July 2014 and March 2015 were satisfied - 44% rated this training as ‘excellent’ and the remaining 56% as ‘good’. 
Matrix performance reporting data also includes statistics and trends relating to the non-accredited training, mentoring and capacity-building components of the FMRSU program. These have been summarised in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Matrix Reporting on FMRSU Program – Other Training Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participating Organisations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Average 29 MMSPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MMWs Needing Training</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Average 151 MMWs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Capacity Building Projects Completed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73 Capacity-Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accredited Training Sessions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>486 Non-Accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Attendees for Non-Accredited Sessions (Note 1)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1,507 Attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Attendees per Non-Accredited Session</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Average 3.2 Attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Mentoring Sessions</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,733 Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Mentoring Sessions per Worker (Note 2)</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>Average 2 Mentoring Sessions per Worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Attendees would have attended more than one session. Sessions include MoneyBusiness Course & Kit, Family Payments Training, Money Management Workers Guide, Shopping Tools, ATM Fees and ASIC Licensing.

Note 2: Depending on the initial skills and needs assessment, some workers may have received multiple mentoring sessions, whilst others may not have needed any.

The data above shows that a growing number of Money Management service providers and their workforce, have undertaken non-accredited training via the FMRSU program since it was first established in 2009. A total of 486 non-accredited training sessions have been conducted in this period, with 1,507 attendees (many workers will have attended multiple sessions).

In addition to the non-accredited training, mentoring sessions have also been popular with the participating workforce. Newer workers, particularly those who are taking up their first employment, are typically prioritised for more support as they go through the accredited training modules.

The FMRSU program has also delivered 73 organisational capacity-building projects for participating Money Management service providers. The organisational capability-building component (Matrix staff estimate this to be around 5% of their total effort), offers MMSP’s the opportunity to develop customised support, based on the following criteria:

- Does it directly relate to Money Management work?
• Does it involve MMW’s who deliver Money Management Services?
• Does it enhance the organisation’s ability to deliver on their contract deliverables?
• Is it work that is going to have impact in the long term on improving service delivery?
• Does it fit within the allocated capacity building hours?

Matrix staff have clarified that smaller, Indigenous-owned and run organisations were prioritised for capacity building activities as the larger non-Indigenous organisations already had good organisational systems to support their service delivery in place. Examples of projects delivered include the following:

- Program budgets: Understanding Money Management Program budgets for Money Management (MM) staff and Directors
- Understanding Financial ReportsBoard and staff: Understanding Money Management service Profit & Loss statements and other MM related financial reports
- Board and governance responsibilities: Understanding governance and Board members responsibilities with respect to MM services
- Team planning: Working with the MM service to Develop a MM service vision and a mission, creating work plans and monitoring/reporting mechanisms
- Program Evaluation: Developing a framework to review an embedded MMW position on remote communities
- MMSP Service Delivery Feedback mechanisms: Working with Manager and/or Team Leaders to develop a framework, (process and implementation) to capture feedback from clients on service delivery.
- Policy and Procedure: Developing policies and procedures specific to MM team such as: remote travel, maintaining confidentiality, motor vehicle policies
- Review of recruitment and retention practises: Review existing documents and practises associated with the recruitment of a MMW- job description, places that the role is advertised, selection criteria, interview questions
- Leadership training for Manager, Team Leaders and for succession planning purposesTraining for MMW’s in leadership skills

In addition to Matrix executives and staff, ANZ staff were interviewed as part of this evaluation, and performance data sought in relation to MoneyBusiness®, their flagship financial literacy program for Indigenous people. ANZ has had a long history of research and program development aimed at promoting financial inclusion in Australia.

Table 7 below demonstrates that the MoneyBusiness program has grown considerably since it was launched in 2006. ANZ estimates that by 2014, this program had been able to reach more than 33,000 participants across 320 communities, via 462 trained MoneyBusiness facilitators and workers, from 40 organisations.

Table 7: Data on MoneyBusiness®

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants attending workshops</td>
<td>6,410</td>
<td>10,418</td>
<td>7,212</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>33,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of facilitators/workers trained</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of organisations funded</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of communities serviced</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above data, ANZ staff were also asked about the MoneyBusiness kit, and changes if any, made to this kit in response to changing community needs. Their responses
confirm that several improvements have been made to the MoneyBusiness kit since it was first designed, based on feedback obtained from participating MMWs and MMSPs.

This kit is now lighter, smaller and more durable than the previous version, which makes it easier for MMWs to carry it whilst travelling to service clients. Changes have also been made to render the kit less prone to damage in the harsher climatic conditions experienced in remoter locations. The new kit also includes a range of supporting resources including the following, designed to assist the MMWs in conducting client workshops:

- Nine (9) financial education workshops including ‘planning for the future’ and ‘making the money last until payday’. From late July 2010, three new workshops were introduced based on stakeholder feedback - ‘A roof overhead – Tenancy’, ‘Home Ownership’ and ‘Managing Paperwork’
- A Facilitators’ Guide (including case-studies, activity sheets and group discussions) and Participants Handouts
- Large picture prompt-cards
- Two card-games (Needs & Wants, Tenancy) and a board game (Slides-n-Stairs) to reinforce learnings
- A DVD

MoneyBusiness facilitators can conduct these client workshops over a single day or over a period of several weeks, depending on the needs and preferences of the local stakeholders. They are also encouraged to tailor the workshops and materials to better meet the local needs of each community they service. Many MMWs say they have customised materials and resources to offer a more ‘culturally appropriate’ service for their clients.

4.2 Feedback from Money Management Workers

Twenty-eight (28) Money Management workers (MMWs) from fifteen (15) service providers were interviewed for this evaluation. Of these, twenty-five (25) are currently employed in this role, whilst three (3) had previously worked as Money Management workers, but are now employed in other roles.

Of the twenty-five (25) MMWs who are currently in this role, nine (9) were completing the fifth week of their accredited training program, nine (9) were completing the second week, and another six (6) their fourth week of training. Table 8 below describes the key characteristics of the participating MMW cohort:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Key Characteristics of MMW participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of time in role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies as Indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works/worked with Indigenous clients &amp; communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works/worked with remote Indigenous communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A sizeable proportion (57%) of the MMWs interviewed, are Indigenous – this is significantly higher than the 4.6% of total VET students in Australia, who are Indigenous as per NCVER statistics. This proportion is consistent with FMRSU data which shows that 63% of all MMWs who have participated since 2009 are Indigenous. This validates the earlier finding
that the FMRSU program has been particularly successful in engaging and training Indigenous workers. Moreover, almost 90% of participating MMWs work with remote Indigenous clients, as compared to the less than 1% of all VET students in Australia, who are from remote or very remote areas.

Participating MMWs were asked to rate (from 1 to 10) various aspects of their own role-related knowledge and skills, before and after their participation in the FMRSU program. Table 9 below summarises the results from these questions, averaged across all participating MMWs.

Table 9: Key Findings relating to knowledge and skills of MMW participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before participating in FMRSU program</th>
<th>After participating in FMRSU program</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic language, literacy &amp; numeracy</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic workplace skills</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge relating to their role</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to apply knowledge in practice</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses above we conclude that participating MMWs feel that their knowledge relating to the Money Management role, as well as their ability to apply this knowledge in practice, have both improved significantly (almost 40 – 45% increase) as a result of their participation in the FMRSU program.

The average rating of 82% (knowledge relating to their role) and 84% (ability to apply knowledge in practice) provided by participating MMWs is higher than the average 74% of students completing VET training who felt that the training was relevant to their current job.

In addition to FMRSU training being relevant to their professional role, many MMWs also mention that they are putting their knowledge into practice in their personal lives, by managing their own money better. They also encourage their family and friends to share their learnings.

Moreover, participating MMWs have also improved basic language, literacy and numeracy skills, as well as basic workplace skills, including organising meetings, using email, word processing and spreadsheet tools, working with and presenting to teams. Whilst the average increase in these skills across the entire MMW participant cohort is between 10 to 13%, it is twice as high (24%) for those MMWs who have less than six months experience in their role. This validates feedback from FMRSU staff that they focus on staff who are new to their roles, particularly those who are working for the first time.

Participants were also asked about the number of clients they were servicing per week, before and after participating in the FMRSU program. The results show that on average, MMWs are able to almost double (45% increase) the number of clients they service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of clients serviced per week</th>
<th>Before participating in FMRSU program</th>
<th>After participating in FMRSU program</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They also feel that they are able to provide their clients a better quality of service, after participating in the FMRSU program. When asked why, the main reasons mentioned are the ability to conduct workshops which can include more people, their own increased knowledge as well as a sense of greater confidence in applying this knowledge to client needs in real-life. Many participants also highlight that the role-plays and scenarios they enacted as part of
the program, have given them more ideas about how to manage difficult situations and clients, which they previously lacked.

Although this evaluation did not seek to capture the wider impacts of the FMRSU program by assessing the change in clients’ knowledge, skills or behaviour, participating MMWs did comment that they have observed improvements in these elements, and shared anecdotal stories about clients who are now able to manage their money more wisely. This, combined with the flow-on benefits of improved Money Management skills within the MMWs’ immediate circle of family and friends, hints at indirect impacts from the FMRSU program.

Qualitative research acknowledges that success can mean different things to people – this questionnaire included an open-ended question where MMWs were asked to describe an ‘ideal’ Money Management worker. The tag-cloud representing their most-frequently used words (below) reveals that MMWs focused more on influencing skills and behavioural traits.

MMWs feel that a successful Money Management worker has to be a ‘jack of all trades’, combining competencies needed by bankers, educators, life-coaches, social workers, counsellors and health workers. In particular they highlighted the need for MMWs to have strong influencing skills, and to respectfully connect with their clients and the communities they live in.

This finding supports global research which demonstrates that sustainable change in consumer financial behaviour requires policymakers to focus not just on enhancing consumer knowledge, but also opportunities to build real-life skills. Also the use of psychological and behavioural triggers, such as positively reinforcing valued socio-cultural norms, is a proven way to influence longer-term behaviour.

The MMWs were also asked to rate (from 1 to 10) various aspects relating to the delivery and implementation of the FMRSU program. Table 10 below shows the average results across all participating MMWs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: Key Findings relating to knowledge and skills of MMW participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall FMRSU effectiveness including content &amp; practical experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMRSU implementation (logistics, venue, length/pace of sessions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMRSU delivery (trainers/mentors) and ongoing mentoring/coaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked what worked best in terms of the content and experiential learning approach employed by the FMRSU program, the most commonly-quoted responses were that the
content was comprehensive, relevant and useful, and improved the MMWs’ personal knowledge about money matters. This in turn increased their confidence in being able to use this knowledge to assist their clients, particularly those facing multi-faceted difficulties.

The practical experiences and capacity-building opportunities (scenarios, role-play, games etc.) were highlighted as particularly useful, particularly for those MMWs who are relatively new to their role. MMWs who work in very small teams and those who work in very remote areas, can feel isolated. The practical exercises and week-long interaction with colleagues who face similar challenges, helps them to share tips and new ideas.

Many participants say the opportunity to meet fellow-MMWs is an important part of their learning experience, and they will continue to network with their colleagues once they have returned to their workplace. Indigenous participants were most likely to mention the practical exercises and experiential learning opportunities as one of the highlights of the program.

When asked about the online training modules (introduced late 2014) some participants mention that these were useful for building personal knowledge, allowing them to learn flexibly in their own time. Other say the online modules helped them prepare for the face to face training. Some MMWs in remote areas find the lack of high-speed internet can make it difficult to access modules. Irrespective of how useful they find the online delivery, MMWs say that they prefer to reinforce their learnings via face to face, facilitator-led sessions.

When discussing the logistics, including the venue, length and pace of the FMRSU training sessions, there was general agreement that holding the training in an offsite location (away from the place of work) was the most useful option, as it allowed the MMWs to focus solely on the training, rather than getting distracted with business as usual needs.

Some MMWs, particularly those who have worked in other roles, mention that the pace of the lessons can sometimes be slow, as the mix of skills in the classroom is diverse. They question whether it would be easier to stream classes based on participant skillsets. Others disagree, saying that the diverse skillsets amongst classmates made it easier for those with lower skills to learn from others’ experiences. They suggest that having to work with others to build their skills is in fact, good training for the real-life context of working in a Money Management role. Overall, more participants agreed with the latter suggestion.

Participants are mostly satisfied with the delivery of the FMRSU program. The program facilitation and support offered by the trainers and mentors, including ongoing mentoring and coaching support offered outside of the classroom, were singled out as the best part of the program delivery.

All MMWs were also asked whether they felt the FMRSU program appropriately catered for the needs of Indigenous staff, and equipped them to adequately address the needs of Indigenous clients. Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants acknowledge that the program is accessible to, and culturally appropriate for, the needs of Indigenous staff. One Indigenous respondent suggests that FMRSU sessions be opened with a ‘welcome to country’ from the local Indigenous community. Having travelled from her community to attend the training in Darwin, this participant felt that she was on ‘someone else’s lands’ and would feel more comfortable if she had been invited by the local community, to participate.

MMWs were also asked to identify opportunities for improvement, particularly in relation to how their future needs could be better addressed. There were multiple suggestions to include more credit-related content, as more clients are presenting with complicated credit and debt-related issues. MMWs also requested a greater coverage of local regulatory obligations, particularly as legislation is state-based. Recent policy changes have resulted in a need to service different locations, hence increased attention to these issues will ensure they do not inadvertently provide wrong information to clients.
MMWs also feel that in future, they need to become more familiar with how to identify and appropriately refer a range of non-financial challenges faced by their clients, including ill-health (particularly mental health), drugs and alcohol-related issues, family violence and child abuse. Although they would not be expected to deal with these issues themselves, being trained in how to identify them and knowing where to refer clients to, would allow them to offer a more holistic service to their clients.

An Indigenous participant also suggests that in future, MMWs be trained to seek a ‘welcome to country’ from local leaders in every community where they hold a workshop or service Indigenous clients. When travelling to other remote areas, being welcomed by local elders would help her to feel more comfortable in offering knowledge and advice, and asking clients to share their personal and confidential information with her.

MMWs who service very remote areas also suggest that the unique context of service delivery in these locations (including language difficulties, literacy and numeracy barriers, geographic isolation, higher costs, physical and climatic hardship etc.) may be better addressed by more context-specific content. Matrix staff train MMWs to develop their own resources to suit the needs of their clients – examples are shared via the Matrix online portal.

The practical and experiential learnings embedded in the FMRSU program could also be enhanced by engaging existing MMWs as part of future training sessions, and inviting them to share their stories about servicing clients in different real-life contexts. In particular, their experiences with clients who present with multiple problems, and tips about handling difficult clients would be invaluable. More opportunities for MMWs to continue to network and share learnings with one another after the FMRSU training has been completed are needed, in addition to the online portal which has shared content.

MMWs were also encouraged to consider future work opportunities, and describe how these may be supported. A major challenge mentioned by almost all the MMWs is the uncertainty of future funding for the sector, and their ongoing role. Whilst most MMWs were yet to complete the FMRSU training hence more focused on first acquiring this qualification, some do mention they will continue to develop their professional skills by undertaking the Diploma in Financial Counselling. Three MMWs who have moved into new roles (community services and government) felt that the FMRSU training gave them a foundational learning experience which they have since successfully transferred into their new area of work.

4.3 Feedback from Executives/Team Leaders from Money Management Service Providers (MMSPs)

Twelve (12) executives, program managers and team leaders from participating Money Management service providers (MMSPs) were interviewed for this evaluation. Of these, seven (7) have completed the FMRSU training whilst in past roles. Table 11 below summarises the key characteristics of the participating MMSPs executives, program managers and team leaders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Key Characteristics of MMSP Executives/Program Managers/Team Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Female, 2 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of time in role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies as Indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indigenous, 8 Non-Indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works/worked with Indigenous clients and communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works/worked with remote Indigenous communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Yes, 1 does not service remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed FMRSU training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Yes, 5 No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participating executives, managers and team leaders were asked about their organisations’ service delivery objectives, and the role of the FMRSU program in facilitating this. Most executives describe their mission in terms of equipping their clients to achieve financial independence. They see the role of FMRSU as providing their staff with the necessary professional knowledge and skills, and the ability to apply this within the real-life context of the communities they service.

MMSP participants were also asked to rate (from 1 to 10), various aspects of the role-related knowledge and skills of their staff, before and after participating in the FMRSU program. The table below summarises the average results from participants’ responses to these questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12: Key Findings – MMSPs assess knowledge and skills of MMWs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before participating in FMRSU program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic language, literacy &amp; numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic workplace skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge relating to their role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to apply knowledge in practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it is clear that executives and team leaders from participating MMSPs feel that the role-related knowledge and skills of their staff have significantly improved as a result of having participated in the FMRSU program (average 50% improvement). They also feel that their staff members’ basic language, literacy and numeracy skills, and general workplace skills have improved (average 20%) as a result of their participation.

Minor differences were observed between the responses of MMSPs who have completed the FMRSU training themselves, as compared to those who have not. MMSP executives and team leaders who have not undertaken the FMRSU training, rate the program marginally higher when judging the change in their staff’s basic workplace skills (33% improvement vs. 26%) and knowledge relating to their role (59% improvement vs. 51%). They also feel their staff are able to service a marginally higher number of clients per week (average 17 vs. 16), following the completion of the program.

Also MMSPs in general, rate their staff’s pre-training knowledge and skills (see Table 12 column 2) lower than the MMWs themselves rated each of these elements (see Table 9 column 2). This probably explains why they assess their staff had improved by a higher percentage (see Table 12 column 4) than the MMWs had rated themselves (see Table 9 column 4).

When asked about changing needs in the sector, the communities and clients they service, executives say that some progress has been made in improving clients’ money-related knowledge and skills, yet the need for Money Management services is growing rapidly and clients are increasingly presenting with more complicated problems. Asked to describe their ‘ideal’ Money Management worker, executives too highlight that skills, attitudes and individual psychological and/or behavioural traits are more essential for success in this sector, than knowledge alone.

One executive mentions that she has stopped advertising externally for vacant MMW roles, as she finds that often those who ‘look good’ on paper in terms of their knowledge and prior experience, are not able to ‘fit in’ with the real-life context of the clients and communities they are expected to work in. She now relies instead on word of mouth referrals from existing/previous staff or the communities, as these candidates are more likely to be familiar with local customs and cultural protocols. They are also more likely to have a flexible attitude to the daily realities of servicing remoter areas, and are often known to, and trusted
within the community. These behavioural traits are more important to her than the candidates’ knowledge. She relies on in-house training and the FMRSU program, to bring their knowledge up to the required standard.

MMSP executives and team leaders were also asked to rate (from 1 to 10) the effectiveness of each element of the FMRSU program - the results are summarized in Table 13 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13: Key Findings - MMSP Executive/Team Leaders assess FMRSU program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMRSU implementation</strong> (including logistics/venue/length/pace of sessions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMRSU delivery</strong> (including trainers/mentors, ongoing mentoring/coaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMRSU organisational capacity-building</strong> (provided by 6 of 12 respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall FMRSU effectiveness</strong> (including content &amp; practical experiences)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average ratings provided by the executives and team leaders as above, are marginally lower than those provided by the participating MMWs. Some differences are also observed in the responses provided by those MMSP executives and team leaders who have undertaken the FMRSU training themselves, when compared to those who have not. MMSP participants who had not undertaken the FMRSU training rated each element of the program higher (22-28% more) than those who had.

When asked what in their opinion, worked best for each of these elements, the MMSPs responses showed that they consider the FMRSU training content to be comprehensive, relevant and useful for the MMWs in their team. They feel their staff are able to service their clients’ needs in a much more professional manner, after their participation. They also notice an improvement in their staff’s personal knowledge about money matters, and an increased confidence in dealing with clients.

Those who service remote/very remote communities say that they provide additional contextualised training to prepare their staff for the realities of working in these locations. They also help their staff to customize and tailor some of the materials provided during the FMRSU training, and provide additional materials developed in-house, which they feel offer their staff the best chance to engage their clients effectively.

When asked about the logistics involved in the implementation of the FMRSU program, the executives and team leaders report that their staff found this satisfactory. Whilst most respondents feel that holding the training at an offsite location is useful, one executive did mention that they would have preferred to have the program conducted at their remote premises. All MMSPs agree that their staff greatly appreciate the support provided by the FMRSU trainers and mentors in delivering the program, particularly the ongoing mentoring and coaching provided during and after the completion of the course.

Some MMSP participants also mention that they provide additional in-house training and support for their staff, including more detailed knowledge about credit and debt-related issues, and legislative obligations particular to the locations they service their clients. Those who also offer financial counselling services also make it a point to differentiate between the two roles (i.e. Money Management worker and financial counsellor) and provide more support relating to the escalation and referral protocols between these roles.

An area of difference in the MMSP questionnaire was the investigation of their experience (if any) with organisational capacity-building programs offered by FMRSU. All the MMSP respondents who participated in this evaluation exercise were asked whether they had enquired about and/or utilized any of these organizational capacity-building initiatives. Half
i.e. six of the twelve participants say they have enquired about these tailored programs - four (4) discussed support with developing budgets, planning and reporting, three (3) sought assistance with mentoring, recruiting, retaining staff and related HR policies, whilst one (1) organization each, enquired about developing volunteer capacity and financial accounting.

Of these, only three (3) respondents report actually using this service - two had initial discussions which did not eventuate into an actual program, whilst another could not recall whether their organisation did use the service. Their feedback is that the tailored programs were useful in the early stages of their own development – once they were better established, they set up their own policies and procedures, which better cater to their specific needs.

The organisations which have not either enquired about, or made use of capacity-building initiatives, similarly feel that their own processes are robust enough that they do not need external support. This is consistent with feedback from Matrix staff that the demand for organisational capacity-building initiatives has dropped off as the sector matured, and the need for external assistance with capacity-building has diminished.

When asked to consider the future needs and opportunities for their workforce, MMSP executives and team leaders talk about the uncertainty regarding future funding for this type of work. The existing accreditation is vital for new Money Management workers, however they also mention that their staff are increasingly having to deal with clients presenting with multi-faceted problems including health, drug and alcohol-related challenges and family violence. Whilst they acknowledge that these areas are outside the direct scope of Money Management training, they do feel that there is a link between money and virtually every one of these areas. Some executives suggest that in future, Money Management staff could be trained to identify and appropriately refer these problems to the relevant service providers.

Many executives also mention that their staff would benefit from ongoing professional development such as a refresher course conducted at regular intervals, following FMRSU program completion. They also suggest that ongoing networking opportunities would allow their staff to share learnings and experiences with their peers. Moreover, opportunities for the executives and team leaders to network with their own peers would also be a useful way to build organisational capacity.

Many of their clients’ money-related problems arise from dealings with the banking and telecommunications industry, so more industry-wide forums such as the recent Money Management Muster (held by FMRSU in Darwin in March 2015), would be particularly beneficial, in addition to peer to peer networking opportunities.

They also say that they encourage their staff to continue their professional development by undertaking the Diploma in Financial Counselling, attending public forums/conferences such as those held by Financial Counselling Australia and MWANT, and developing other specific skillsets such as presentation skills, communicating with larger audiences and influencing others.

Given their capacity to influence decision-making and strategic direction, executives were asked how the FMRSU program could better respond to changing sector-wide and organisational needs. A common response was to seek feedback from organisations at regular intervals (one respondent suggested at the point of annual contract review), so that their inputs and suggestions can guide future design and delivery.

Although some participants have provided feedback to Matrix which resulted in changes made to the program, a more formal process which proactively seeks executive feedback and engagement in determining changes (if any) at a regular interval, could work better in future.
5. Evaluation Conclusions & Recommendations

As briefly discussed earlier, the findings of an evaluation can be used to render judgement about whether the program has done what it set out to do, to facilitate future improvement, to generate knowledge about the area addressed by the program, and to inform evidence-based policymaking. Accordingly, we discuss the implications of the FMRSU evaluation under each of these categories, in the sections below.

5.1 Assessing FMRSU Program Efficiency & Effectiveness

This evaluation focused on assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of three key areas of the FMRSU program – program design, delivery and outcomes. Each of these is discussed in further detail in the following sections.

Program Design:

The focus of the investigation here was whether the program design (including any changes made) met the needs of participating Money Management workers and their organisations, and was appropriate for Indigenous staff/clients. The average score relating to these elements, obtained from feedback provided across all three levels of participant cohorts over the course of this evaluation, is summarised below:

| Table 14: FMRSU Overall Effectiveness Score                                      |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Overall FMRSU effectiveness         | Rating (out of 10)              | Weight          |
| (workforce development)             | 8.13                            | 100%            |
| Overall FMRSU effectiveness         | 6.50                            | 12.5%           |
| (organisational capacity-building)  |                                 |                 |
| Overall FMRSU Weighted Effectiveness|                                 | 7.95            |

The Overall FMRSU Weighted Effectiveness Score of 7.95 has been calculated based on the weighted average of responses relating to workforce development (scored by all 48 respondents) and organisational capacity-building (scored by 6 of 48 respondents). This suggests that the holistic workforce development approach adopted by the FMRSU program, encompassing workers, organisations and the system as a whole, has been effective in meeting the needs of the Money Management sector.

Broadening the focus from merely providing Money Management workers with accredited training, to also developing other workplace capabilities at an individual, team and organisational level, has been a successful strategy. The provision of ongoing mentoring and coaching to MMWs outside the classroom and after the completion of the FMRSU program, has been a highlight for all participants.

Executives feel the sector has developed a professional workforce. In future, additional ‘refresher’ courses offered to successful participants following the completion of the FMRSU program could enhance ongoing professional development for Money Management workers. Few participating service providers have utilised the organisational capacity-building programs, offering scope for future implementation and delivery of such programs.

The FMRSU program is accessible to, and appropriately caters to the specific needs of, Indigenous staff, clients and the communities they live in. Incorporating the suggestions made by participants relating to culturally-shaped local protocols, and developing context-specific content and resources to support service provision in very remote areas, could promote the ‘culturally-appropriate’ status already enjoyed by this program.

Changes made to the program, including those initiated by Matrix (establishing an RTO to deliver accredited training in-house, restructuring the content, facilitation and client
management) and ANZ (improving the MoneyBusiness kits) have addressed sectoral needs. Building in a more formal process of engaging executives to provide feedback at regular intervals, and involving them in discussions regarding future changes, could further enhance FMRSU’s ability to identify and respond to, changes in sector-wide and organisational needs.

**Program Delivery:**

The specific areas of focus relating to program implementation and delivery included an analysis of the workforce development strategies utilised by FMRSU, and whether the key activities undertaken effectively support these strategies. The ability of the FMRSU program to support the service delivery objectives of participating organisations, and key lessons learned for future implementation and delivery were also explored.

A holistic program adopting workforce development strategies would include a focus on training, knowledge, skills and experience for individuals and teams, efforts to strengthen organisational structures, systems, culture, working conditions and opportunities, as well as more ‘system-wide’ considerations such as response to changes in government policy. The latest FMRSU program brochure and discussions with Matrix staff show that efforts have been made to include relevant opportunities across each of these elements (i.e. individuals & teams, organisations and the system) into FMRSU program activities.

The average score allocated to FMRSU program implementation and delivery, based on feedback from all participant cohorts (Table 15 below) shows that Matrix has been effective in delivering a program which facilitates the objectives of participating Money Management service providers and their workforce.

**Table 15: FMRSU Overall Delivery Effectiveness Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rating (out of 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall FMRSU effectiveness</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(logistics, venue, length/pace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of sessions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall FMRSU effectiveness</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(trainers/mentors, ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentoring/coaching)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall FMRSU Delivery</td>
<td>8.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key lessons for future implementation and delivery include maintaining a focus on a holistic workforce development model, providing face to face facilitation and experiential learning via trainers and inviting existing MMWs to share their real-life experiences as part of the facilitated training sessions. Supporting the workforce through mentoring and coaching, both as a part of the training program and as an ongoing development opportunity, is clearly a highlight which should also be continued in future delivery.

**Program Outcomes:**

The desired outcomes from the FMRSU program include improving the workplace capability of participating MMWs, the organisational capacity of participating MMSPs, and the sector’s ability to service clients’ needs. From the extensive discussions and supporting data provided above, we can conclude that the Money Management workforce and executives from participating organisations, both judge the FMRSU program as being effective in improving workers’ knowledge and ability to service client needs. In particular, the training is seen as essential for new workers, in order to help them succeed in their role.

Participating in this program has also allowed MMSP organisations to extend their reach, as their workforce can service more clients. Average results from all participants shows that this reach has almost doubled as a result of participating in the FMRSU program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before participating in FMRSU program</th>
<th>After participating in FMRSU program</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of clients serviced per week</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions for future opportunities to improve the capability of the workforce include developing content for ongoing professional development, and additional networking (possibly at an industry-wide level) for workers and their managers to share learnings. In addition, opportunities for seeking regular feedback from executives of participating organisations will further enhance the ability of the program to provide relevant and topical support for participating service providers.

5.2 Contributing to knowledge and evidence-based policymaking in the Money Management sector

Robust research, such as studies which measure and evaluate programs, can make a valuable contribution to knowledge and theory, as well as provide evidence to inform policymakers in industry, government and community sectors. This evaluation exercise aims to contribute to ongoing debate amongst key decision-makers about the current and future state of the Money Management sector in Australia, via three areas of specific focus.

The first major area of focus is mapping the changing needs of the Money Management workforce, beginning from past needs that led to the establishment of the FMRSU, current needs which the program can incorporate in order to improve services, as well as future needs which can enhance program outcomes. These are described in Diagram 7 below:

**Diagram 7: Mapping the changing needs of the Money Management workforce**

The establishment of the FMRSU was a response to the needs of the sector at the time – these included a lack of formal qualifications and training for Money Management workers, and low organisational capacity, in a context of rapidly changing policy frameworks and client needs. The FMRSU program has addressed these needs through the workforce development model, yet could be improved by updating content, offering more opportunities
for mentoring and networking, and developing resources particularly suited to remote/very remote contexts. Future needs, particularly given the uncertainty of ongoing funding, include the training of new staff, ongoing learning and mentoring of existing staff, and an ability to identify and refer complex often non-financial issues, which clients are increasingly presenting with.

The second major area of focus for this evaluation is on informing capacity-building efforts in the Money Management context, particularly amongst Indigenous participants. Global research on financial capability-building finds that participants respond most positively to education when it takes into account their cultural context, including their values and beliefs about money. The person delivering the education (the ‘messenger’) is important to learning outcomes, and longer-term behaviour change is most pronounced when the messenger shares the personal characteristics of the participant cohort.

Indigenous participants respond best to a ‘learning by doing’ style, where facilitator-led knowledge is reinforced by practical, experiential opportunities to apply the knowledge in practice. Content and resources that are explicitly tailored to suit local Indigenous cultural norms and values, result in better learning outcomes.

Although Indigenous people around the world are amongst the ‘most researched’ community groups, there is little research on their world-views relating to money and Money Management. The findings of this evaluation support this global research, and contribute new insights to global theory and knowledge on Indigenous workforce development, including capability-building and enhancing economic participation.

The third area of focus for this study is to contribute to evidence-based decision-making, particularly for key policymakers who are charged with enhancing the Money Management capabilities of disadvantaged Australians. Globally, there are calls for designing more ‘culturally appropriate’ policies for Indigenous people, yet few studies discuss how to practically design and implement Indigenous-centred products/services, including capability-building initiatives.

The detailed discussions and practical suggestions documented in this report therefore provide valuable insights for decision-makers in Australia and overseas, who wish to design more ‘culturally appropriate’ policies including workforce development training and support, for Indigenous people in future.

5.3 Facilitating Improvements - developing a Theory of Change for the FMRSU program

The Theory Of Change developed for the FMRSU program (as per Diagram 8 below) can inform improvement opportunities for future programs, by providing a snapshot of how overall program efficiency and effectiveness can be assessed.

This evaluation has considered program efficiency via a range of relatively quantitative indicators, including the number of participants requiring different elements of the FMRSU workforce development activities (accredited and non-accredited training, mentoring and coaching as well as organisational capacity-building projects); the number of sessions held; training completion rates; hours of support provided per participant and number of projects delivered.

It has also assessed program effectiveness via including a range of relatively qualitative indicators, such as changes in knowledge, skills and behaviour of participating MMWs and their clients; organisational capacity and sector-wide benefits.
Diagram 8: Theory of Change for the FMRSU Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS OUTCOMES</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in:</td>
<td>Increase in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients served by MMWs</td>
<td>MMW confidence/leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client attitudes/confidence</td>
<td>MMW knowledge/skills/competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client knowledge/skills</td>
<td>MMW professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client behaviour/outcomes</td>
<td>MMW ability to access information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence-based practise</td>
<td>Management ability/supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes**

- Trained and qualified money management workers, adequately supporting clients and their families by combining education and training with developing workplace skills and experience
- Sustainable organisations, with an experienced and qualified workforce providing quality service by providing an integrated workforce development program to money management service providers & staff

**Activities**

- Accredited Training (CHC10118)
- Non-Accredited Training
- Mentoring & Coaching
- Organisational Capacity

**Inputs**

- FTEs & Other (materials etc.)

**Outputs**

- No. participants p.a.
- No. of sessions p.a.
- No. of completions p.a.
- No. of participants p.a.
- No. of sessions p.a.
- No. of hours of support p.a.
- No. of projects delivered

From the data provided, we can see that **non-accredited** training has been well attended. The mentoring and coaching sessions have also been popular. MMWs attribute the **experiential learning style** and ongoing mentoring incorporated into the program, as key factors enabling their success. There is evidence of career progression within the sector, and employment options in other sectors, as a result of transferable workplace skills.

Key stakeholders feel that **organisational capacity** has improved since 2009 - the service providers who offer Money Management services, their workforce and sector as a whole, has become more ‘professional’. The increasing professionalism has also resulted in the sector having a ‘voice’ and being able to influence industry-wide policy.

These findings validate the workforce development approach adopted by FMRSU, and the decision to focus on providing the Money Management workforce and service providers with more holistic development opportunities, not just accredited qualifications.

When compared with national statistics on vocational education and training, the FMRSU program outperforms national averages in relation to completion rates, student satisfaction and relevance to the workplace. Also the program has been particularly successful in training Indigenous workers, especially those from remote/very remote locations.

We can therefore conclude that the FMRSU program has succeeded in its stated objectives of developing a qualified Money Management workforce and sustainable organisations which can deliver quality services to their clients. Future programs which build on this successful approach, whilst incorporating the series of improvement opportunities identified throughout this evaluation exercise, could be particularly appropriate for engaging remote Indigenous workers.
5.4 Recommendations for the future

Based on the findings and discussions contained in this study, five key recommendations can be made, relating to future directions for the ongoing enhancement and development of the Money Management sector in Australia. These have been summarised in Table 16 below.

Table 16: Key Recommendations from FMRSU Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Recommendations</th>
<th>Suggested Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver professional qualifications for new Money Management workers</td>
<td>Continue to deliver professional qualifications for new Money Management workers, using FMRSU’s successful workforce development approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer ongoing mentoring and coaching support for Money Management workers</td>
<td>Mentoring and coaching support for Money Management workers, both inside and outside the classroom is a particularly effective intervention. Peer to peer mentoring can supplement the support currently offered via dedicated mentors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase networking opportunities for Money Management workers and organisational executives</td>
<td>Networking opportunities offer important opportunities for both Money Management workers and their executives, to share learnings with their peers, and advocate on behalf of their clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and deliver ongoing professional development for Money Management workers</td>
<td>Money Management workers who have completed the accredited qualifications would benefit from ongoing professional development opportunities (including ‘refresher’ modules), to keep their knowledge up to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained funding for the Money Management sector</td>
<td>Maintain sustainable funding and other support to enable Money Management service providers to keep up with growing and increasingly complex client needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These five recommendations are inter-related (Diagram 9 below) and essential for the ongoing ability of the Money Management sector to assist Australians with managing their money wisely. New workers must be professionally qualified, particularly those servicing remote Indigenous communities. Existing workers must be adequately supported and able to develop professionally. Money Management service providers must have the organisational capacity to adequately support and lead their workforce, and service client needs, wherever they live. Sustained funding is an essential precursor to achieving these objectives.

Diagram 9: Key Recommendations for the Future Sustainability of the Money Management Sector in Australia
Together, these five actions will enable the Money Management sector to achieve the twin goals based on which the FMRSU was established in 2009 i.e. to develop a trained and qualified Money Management workforce, and sustainable service providers, in order to adequately support clients and their families, to achieve financial independence.
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