
Grants Program – Measurement Framework

This is a document outlining a measurement framework for outcomes expected from the VLSB+C Grants Program.

Table 1 provides a set of likely outcomes aligned with the VLSB+C Grants Theory of Change and indicators that Grantees can use to demonstrate measurable progress against those outcomes.

- It is expected that Grantees will identify the relevant Long-Term outcome and select at least two of VLSB+C's suggested indicators when they report on progress against their Grants.
- Grantees are not expected to report on all the outcomes or indicators
- This indicator set does not preclude Grantees from reporting additional information

This list of outcomes and indicators have been developed by the VLSB+C through the following process:

- Refinement of the VLSB+C Grants Theory of Change to ensure alignment between the types of work we fund and the change we want to see
- A workshop with 2022 Grant recipients to map the expected outcomes from their funded projects to the VLSB+C Grants Theory of Change
- A review of Project Plans and Applications submitted by the 2022 and 2023 Grant recipients
- A review of existing publicly available outcomes measurement frameworks

Table 1 - Grants Program Theory of Change – Intermediate outcomes and indicators

Grants Theory of Change – Long term outcome	Indicators
<p>Community has increased capability to address or prevent legal problems</p>	<p>1a. Number of legal information resources accessed or downloaded by community 1b. Number of individuals who report “I better understand my legal rights”</p> <p>2a. Number of individuals who report “I feel confident to exercise my rights” 2b. Number of individuals who report “I understand how to deal with my legal problem”</p> <p>3a. Number of legislation ‘explainer’ resources accessed or downloaded by community 3b. Number of individuals (including workers) who feel informed about relevant legislation</p> <p>4a. Number of community members who feel informed about the legal and social justice issues of [insert stakeholder group] 4b. Number of community workers who feel informed about the legal and social justice issues of [insert stakeholder group]</p> <p>5. Number of workers who feel confident to identify legal needs of their clients</p> <p>6a. Number of workers who know how to refer their clients for legal support 6b. Number of referrals received by CLC that are considered appropriate and timely</p> <p>7. Number of workers who feel better able to assist their clients</p>

Grants Theory of Change – Long term outcome	Indicators
<p>More people experiencing vulnerability or disadvantage can access legal support when needed</p>	<p>8a. Number of individuals who received legal advice, casework or representation 8b. Number of individuals who received legal support with identified vulnerability factors 8c. Number of individuals who received legal support who otherwise would not have (e.g. referrals you may have previously turned away due to lack of capacity or relevant expertise)</p> <p>9a. Number of clients who indicate that they felt comfortable discussing their issues with the legal practitioner 9b. Number of clients who indicate that the legal assistance provided was safe and inclusive</p> <p>10a. Number of clients who indicate that they better understand their legal issue and options 10b. Number of clients who indicate that the legal assistance they received was useful</p> <p>11a. Number of clients who feel confident seeking help with a legal issue in future (from your service or another) 11b. Number of clients who feel confident navigating the justice system in the future</p> <p>12a. Demonstrated examples of how service response has improved 12b. Service partner feedback on quality of legal service response</p> <p>13a. Number of clients whose legal problem was resolved indicate that “The lawyer helped me fix my legal problem” 13b. Number of clients whose legal problem was resolved indicate that “the outcome was better than I would have received without assistance”</p>
<p>Policy & law reform achieves improved justice outcomes</p>	<p>14a. Number of media mentions or articles 14b. Number of targeted decision makers who indicate they have reviewed the [relevant] evidence base</p> <p>15a. Number of targeted sector stakeholders who indicate they have an improved understanding of [relevant] legal issues 15b. Media mentions of improvement recommendations made by grantees</p> <p>16a. Examples of additional or enhanced legal protections 16b. Examples of additional or enhanced legal protections that reflect litigation or advocacy efforts and recommendations</p> <p>17a. Examples of fairer legislation / policy / process 17b. Examples of any policy, process or legislative changes that reflect litigation or advocacy efforts and recommendations</p>

Grants Theory of Change – Long term outcome	Indicators
<p>Funded organisations have authoritative voice and influence government policy and practice</p>	<p>18a. Examples of information documented and shared 18b. Number of website visits and/or resources downloaded 18c. Number of media mentions or articles</p> <p>19a. Examples of research, data and/or case studies documented and shared 19b. Number of website visits and/or resources downloaded 19c. Number of media mentions or articles</p> <p>20a. Documented endorsement or collaboration from multiple organisations 20b. Attendance numbers at launch events (or similar) 21a. Examples of how advocacy work was informed by partners and those with lived experience 21b. Examples of clients speaking to media or decision makers 21c. Documented feedback from partners and those affected that they were satisfied with how their input was obtained and used</p> <p>22. Examples of specific improvements identified in advocacy / campaigns / submissions</p> <p>23. Policy decision-maker or sector stakeholder feedback on contribution of litigation or advocacy efforts (e.g. if law reform is successful, or even if not, did the decision maker(s) view grantee’s contributions as valuable)</p>
<p>Justice system is trauma informed and prioritises restorative practices</p>	<p>24a. Number of staff receiving training or support to build capacity 24b. Number of staff who report confidence in their ability to facilitate restorative justice [or similar]</p> <p>25a. Examples of how evidence base on trauma-informed and restorative practices shared with legal practitioners 25b. Number of legal practitioners reporting an increased understanding of trauma-informed and restorative practices [or similar]</p> <p>26a. Number of victims and offenders who participate 26b. Number of victims and offenders who report satisfaction with restorative processes</p>

Grants Theory of Change – Long term outcome	Indicators
<p>Justice is recognised as cross-sectoral: key non-legal and legal sectors working together to demonstrate value of holistic and systemic responses</p>	<p>27a. Documented referral agreement/processes/MOU between grantee and other services 27b. Number of ‘warm/ facilitated’ referrals received/made and taken up between grantee and other services 27c. Grantee confidence in making a referral to other services</p> <p>28a. Number of people who are triaged and receive support or referral within 60 days of their legal and/or non-legal issue emerging [or similar] 28b. Number of people referred who are triaged and receive support within 7 days of referral 28c. Number of people who report that their legal and non-legal support needs were met in a timely, co-ordinated manner</p> <p>29a. Increase in number of referrals and/or source of referrals between grantee and related sector agencies 29b. Number of staff from multiple services who report that the services worked well together 29c. Number of staff who report that collaboration led to improved outcomes for individuals and/or communities</p> <p>30a. Level of participation in professional development / capacity building activities among services 30b. Number of staff who report an improvement in their organisation’s capacity to meet community legal and related needs</p>
<p>Early intervention diverts people away from the justice system</p>	<p>31a. Average wait time for individual to receive requested legal assistance (I.e. time from first contact to receiving service, if eligible) 31b. Number of clients who received legal assistance within 3 month of their legal problem emerging (or similar) 31c. Number of files at closure where practitioner records whether they felt the client came to me at the right time / too early / too late(I.e. client received support early enough to give them more options to address their matter)</p> <p>32a. Number of individuals who receive legal assistance prior to a court date 32b. Number of individuals who access non-legal assistance prior to a court date 32c. Number of individuals who maintain engagement with supports and services, e.g. AOD, health, education, employment, etc.</p> <p>33a. Increased use of cautions and other diversionary tools 33b. Reduction in custodial sentences</p> <p>34a. Reduction in criminal convictions 34b. Reduction in recidivism</p>

