

Appendix C: CfC Service Coordination Survey

This is an appendix to the *National Evaluation (2004-2008) of the Stronger Families and Communities Strategy 2004-2009* (Muir, et al. 2009). It was prepared for the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs by the National Evaluation Consortium (Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, and the Australian Institute of Family Studies). This appendix should be read in conjunction with all other components of the evaluation.

Authors

Roger Patulny, Saul Flaxman, Christiane Purcal, Kristy Muir, Ioana Oprea and Thomas Longden with assistance from the SFCS Consortium¹

¹ The SPRC research team has contributed to the development of every component of the evaluation, and any comments are to be addressed to the SPRC as a whole rather than to individual authors.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Methodology.....	1
	2.1 Instruments.....	2
	2.2 Sampling	2
	2.3 Recruitment, distribution and administration.....	3
	2.4 Response and analysis.....	5
3	Results.....	6
	3.1 Strategic Level Coordination	8
	3.2 Day-to-day coordination and Partnerships.....	13
4	Conclusion.....	14

Tables

Table 1: Snapshot questionnaire – domains and indicators.....	2
Table 2: Service Coordination Study Sampling Frame and Response Rates	4
Table 3: SFIA Sites Wave 1 Sample Frame and Response Rates	5
Table 4: Respondents’ position within their service agencies (per cent)	6
Table 5: Service agency activity in the LGA/CfC site specifically devoted to services for 0-5 year olds and their families	7
Table 6: Service agency’s role in relation to CfC	7
Table 7: Proportion of services devoted to 0-5 year olds and their families by Service agency role in CfC	8
Table 8: Interagency involvement in various activities (per cent), and helpfulness average score	10
Table 9: Collaboration between staff from different services	12
Table 10: Level of coordination between services	12
Table 11: Day-to-day Coordination.....	13

Abbreviations

CfC	Communities for Children
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
FP	Facilitating Partners
LE	Local Evaluator
SFIA	Stronger Families in Australia
SPRC	Social Policy Research Centre
SFCS	Stronger Families and Communities Strategy

1 Introduction

The logic model of Communities for Children (CfC) indicated that outcomes for children and families depended not only on the number of services in a community, or on overall spending on service delivery, but also on how services and activities were coordinated. Therefore, the National Evaluation of CfC included a Service Coordination Study. The Study was designed to ascertain to what extent service agencies in CfC sites were working together and in what ways they were collaborating.

The Service Coordination Study consisted of two components: a quantitative snapshot survey and qualitative fieldwork interviews. The snapshot survey was completed by agencies that provided services for children aged 0 to 5 years and their families in the CfC sites, including both agencies that were involved with CfC and those that were not. The fieldwork involved visits to 10 CfC sites where in-depth interviews were conducted with key CfC personnel. Both components were conducted twice: the first wave provided a baseline understanding of how services in the sites worked together at the beginning of CfC, and the second wave showed how service coordination had developed during the program.

The snapshot survey and fieldwork complemented each other: the survey provided a quantitative overview of the level of coordination across CfC sites while the fieldwork gave qualitative insights into the implementation of service coordination under CfC and into the conditions that helped or hindered improvements in coordination. This report focuses on the snapshot survey. Fieldwork results are summarised in the SFCS National Evaluation final report (Muir, et al. 2009).

2 Methodology

The snapshot survey was designed to assess how services in CfC sites worked together to achieve outcomes for children aged 0 to 5 years and their families. The term ‘snapshot’ was used to denote that the two survey waves took ‘pictures’ of the extent and nature of coordination at two points in time during the life of the CfC program. The survey baseline was conducted in 2006, with the follow-up conducted in early 2008.²

Various aspects of the snapshot methodology are outlined in turn: development of the survey instruments, sampling of CfC sites and agencies, recruitment of service agency staff to complete the surveys, and methods for distributing and administering the surveys. The methodology was adjusted during the course of the study, in response to feedback from the CfC sites. All methodological aspects and changes were approved by the UNSW Human Research Ethics Committee.

² Initial consultations in four sites containing remote Indigenous communities indicated that the survey was not culturally appropriate for the service providers in those areas and consequently, the snapshot survey was not conducted in three of these areas (see 2.2 Sampling for further detail).

2.1 Instruments

Initially, two questionnaires were developed: one for assessing service coordination at the strategic level and one at the operational level but the two questionnaires were ultimately condensed into a single survey.³

Questions were developed following a literature search of indicators measuring collaboration. Survey questions were underpinned by a number of previous studies (Sullivan, Gilmore and Foley, 2002; Walker, 2000; Himmelman, 2001; National Center for Family Support (United States), 2000; VicHealth Partnerships Analysis Tool, 2003; Fine et al., 1998).

Both questionnaires were piloted with strategic and operational level personnel in three CfC sites.⁴ Both questionnaires were then refined according to feedback from interviewees and other researchers, including CfC local evaluators. Many services found it confusing to deal with two separate questionnaires. Consequently, the strategic and operational level questionnaires were condensed into a single snapshot questionnaire (see Appendix F for all evaluation instruments). This questionnaire explored different aspects of service coordination as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: Snapshot questionnaire – domains and indicators

Domain	Indicators
Better service coordination	Involvement in joint activities Ratings of joint activities Level of staff involved in coordination History, extent and ratings of service coordination
Facilitators of coordination	Facilitating factors
Barriers to coordination	Hindrances
Use of key principles of SFCS	Use of information to guide planning Incorporation of key principles

For the second survey wave, the snapshot questionnaire was modified slightly and condensed in order to make it more suitable to administer by telephone (see Appendix F). Some questions were amalgamated, reworded or deleted because they were either not necessary for a second wave of data collection in the same site or had not yielded useful responses in the first wave of data collection.

2.2 Sampling

The sample for this study was derived from information gathered through the Service Mapping component of the National Evaluation. Initially it was envisaged that all of the 4,576

³ The original strategic questionnaire was designed to establish the level of interagency cooperation in planning, coordinating and commissioning services. The operational level questionnaire addressed how well services reported they worked together on the ground.

⁴ Questionnaires were piloted in Miller, East Gippsland and Mirrabooka CfC sites (strategic level questionnaire: n = 9; operational level questionnaire: n = 8).

agencies listed in the Service Mapping component would be included in the sampling frame. However, information provided by FPs and LEs about services across sites varied. The sampling frame was trimmed down to a select (purposive) sample including only those agencies that were directly providing support for children aged 0 to 5 years and their families within the CfC sites. The study included both agencies that were involved with CfC, and other agencies providing services to children aged 0 to 5 years and their families in CfC areas that were not directly involved in the initiative. In this way, the study examined changes in coordination throughout the service network supporting families and children in the sites rather than only between CfC funded services.

The first round of service mapping provided service agency names and contact details for the first snapshot surveys. The sample for the second survey wave comprised all agencies that had participated in the first wave and all other agencies identified in the updated service maps.

The sample included service provider agencies in 41 of the 45 CfC sites. Consultations with the Facilitating Partners (FPs) and Local Evaluators (LEs) of four sites containing remote Indigenous communities indicated that the survey was not culturally appropriate for the service providers in those areas. Consequently, the snapshot survey was not conducted in Katherine, East Kimberley, East Arnhem and the Tiwi Islands. However, Palmerston was included in the sample since it is an urban area with a mainly non-Indigenous population.

2.3 Recruitment, distribution and administration

The first wave of the snapshot survey was designed as a mail survey, distributed via post and e-mail. Initially both questionnaires were sent to a single contact in each service agency. That contact was then asked to forward each questionnaire to two relevant staff members in their agency (an operational level staff member and a strategic level manager). Respondents were then encouraged to mail back responses. In order to respect confidentiality, recording of identifying information was not mandatory. This created some problems in matching responses between Wave 1 and Wave 2 data at a later stage in the project.

Follow-up with FPs and LEs indicated that this step in the process was confusing for some agencies. Small agencies, which may have only one staff member performing both strategic and operational roles, found this particularly difficult. In response, the strategic and operational snapshot questionnaires were condensed into a single snapshot questionnaire.⁵ The response rates are outlined below in Table 2.

Response rates were initially poor in some areas. In an effort to improve the response rate in these areas, FPs and LEs were further consulted, and the distribution of the survey was tailored according to their advice. In some cases, surveys were accompanied by an introductory letter from FPs and LEs. Many FPs and LEs also distributed the questionnaires in person throughout their communities and at interagency or other meetings.

Despite these efforts, which also lengthened the data collection period, the overall response rate remained below expectations. The overall response rates across all 42 CfC sites included

⁵ Completed Strategic and Operational questionnaires were included in the final analysis as the individual questions were consistent.

in Wave 1 of the Snapshot Survey was 20 per cent. Several sites had particularly poor responses, with Brimbank, Cranbourne, Deception Bay, Gladstone, inner North ACT, Raymond Terrace, and South East Tasmania all recording response rates less than 10 per cent.⁶ The poor response in several sites, and the overall low response rates suggest that the findings should be looked at broadly, rather than within individual sites, and some caution should be applied generalising results from the Snapshot Survey to the entire CfC population as a whole.

Response rates for Wave 1 were better for SFIA sites (see Table 3). The overall response rate was 40 per cent (though this was reduced to 35 per cent once data was cleaned and several surveys excluded from analysis). Caution should be exercised in generalising on the basis of data from Cairns and Palmerston, as these sites had low response rates (18% and 23% respectively). However, the poor response rate in Cairns was due to the sample frame being almost as large as the entire population, and results should be considered as reasonable as any other site. Once again though, it is better to generalise results to the SFIA sites as a whole, rather than to any one individual site.

As a consequence of the overall response rates in Wave 1, the researchers changed the methodology for the Wave 2 survey, and engaged the company ACA Research to conduct the survey via telephone using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). Organisations that had completed Wave 1 of the survey were contacted via e-mail where an email address was available. Where the researchers did not have email addresses for individual respondents, organisations were approached directly by ACA Research by telephone.

A large proportion of those contacted a second time completed repeat surveys (150 responses, or 74%), but because of the lack of organisational identifying data from Wave 1 of the survey, only 86 service agencies could be identified and assigned as longitudinal data from both waves. The small number of agencies is distributed fairly evenly across sites, and seems appropriate for making inferences across time. It is important to contrast longitudinal and cross-sectional results, however, to see if discrepancies arise which may be a result of sample bias.

Table 2: Service Coordination Study Sampling Frame and Response Rates

	Wave 1		Wave 2	
	Total	Repeat	New	Total
All 45 CfC Sites				
Organisations in Area (Population) ^a	4,576	4,528	612	5,140
Sample Frame	2,179	203	171	374
Response after cleaning	(482) 442 ^b	150	152	302
Response Rate	20%	74%	89%	81%
10 SFIA Sites				
Organisations in Area (Population)	886	869	157	1,026

⁶ Findings related to the Snapshot survey as a whole cannot be applied to these specific sites with confidence.

Sample Frame	362	47	58	105
Response after cleaning	(144) 127 ^b	33	27	60
Response Rate	35%	70%	47%	57%

Notes: a. Estimates of the population of organisations in the each area were derived from the Baseline Service Mapping Study. b. Numbers in parentheses are initial responses, those after are responses after data cleaning

Table 3: SFIA Sites Wave 1 Sample Frame and Response Rates

SFIA Sites	Responses	Sample	Response rate (%)	Estimated Organisations in Area
Bendigo	16	28	57	104
Cairns	18	98	18	101
Frankston North	14	28	50	69
Inala	21	33	64	92
Launceston	12	24	50	55
Miller	9	22	41	70
Mirrabooka	15	42	36	128
Palmerston	6	26	23	74
Salisbury	19	29	66	56
Shellharbour	14	32	44	94
Total	144	362	40 ^a	843

Notes: a. The 'total' response rate is an average of the response rates for each individual SFIA site.

2.4 Response and analysis

A total of 744 responses were received over both survey waves (from 442 service agency staff in Wave 1 and 302 in Wave 2), with 86 longitudinal responses. Results were analysed by SPRC researchers using the SPSS statistical package. Longitudinal analysis normally involves particular statistical techniques conducted on the basis of repeated observations. However, in utilising only the small longitudinal sub-sample (n=86), the remaining dataset would not have been used and representativeness and statistical power would have been lost.

The researchers therefore conducted both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses to obtain both the most representative and accurate time-variant estimates of service coordination. In the tables below, initial analyses have been conducted for all responses in the sample (n = 744), treating each wave as independent cross-sectional data. These are followed by longitudinal analyses of data collected from service agencies that participated in both waves of the survey, hereafter referred to as 'repeated agencies' (n = 172; 86 service agencies).⁷ Sample sizes may vary across questions, as individual respondents may not have answered every question. Unless otherwise stated, significant differences were tested in the cross-sectional analysis of all agencies using chi-square Pearson's R, and in the longitudinal

⁷ Service agencies that responded to both survey waves were regarded as repeated observations whether or not the same agency *staff members* responded.

analyses of repeated agencies using McNemar’s test for difference between paired categorical observations.

Table 4.A and Table 4.B summarise the position of respondents within their agencies. In both samples, the majority of those who responded were Service Co-ordinators or Managers (in Wave 2, 42 per cent of all respondents and 47 per cent of repeated organisations). The proportion of Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) and Senior Area Managers who participated in the survey has more than doubled between Wave 1 and Wave 2 (from 15% to 35% for all respondents and 13% to 22% for repeated organisations). The phenomenon of increased numbers of senior staff participating in the survey in Wave 2 may reflect the increased profile of the SFCS 2004-2009 program between Waves 1 and 2. The increased number of respondents in senior positions may also be due to a larger number of respondents correctly attributing their position in Wave 2.

Table 4: Respondents’ position within their service agencies (per cent)

A. All agencies	Wave 1 (%)	Wave 2 (%)
CEO	5	14
Senior or Area Manager	10	21
Service Co-ordinator or Service Manager	33	42
Frontline Worker	14	17
Other	38	7
n	442	302

P-value:0 .000 – Results highly significant (Chi Square test)

B. Repeated agencies	Wave 1 (%)	Wave 2 (%)
CEO	6	7
Senior or Area Manager	7	15
Service Co-ordinator or Service Manager	41	47
Frontline Worker	14	24
Other	33	7
n (both waves)	86	86

P-value: 0.001 – Results highly significant (McNemar test for repeated observations)

3 Results

The proportion of agencies’ activities devoted to 0 to 5 year olds has remained relatively consistent throughout the initiative. Looking at all service agencies, there was a slight increase between Wave 1 and Wave 2 in the proportion of agencies which devoted half or most of their services to activities specifically targeted at 0 to 5 year olds (see Table 5). A contradictory pattern emerged when looking at repeated agencies, with a decrease in the proportion of agencies which devoted half or most of their services to these activities. However, all changes were non-significant, suggesting that the proportion has remained consistent.

Table 5: Service agency activity in the LGA/CfC site specifically devoted to services for 0-5 year olds and their families

A. All agencies (a)	Wave 1 (%)	Wave 2 (%)
All or most of it	49	51
About half	11	12
Some or very little	40	38
n	376	302

B. Repeated agencies (a)	Wave 1 (%)	Wave 2 (%)
All or most of it	52	51
About half	14	10
Some or very little	34	40
n	73	73

(a) Results not significant.

Note: All columns add to 100% except in cases of rounding error.

Unsurprisingly, the number of service agencies which provided CfC-funded services increased significantly between Wave 1 and Wave 2. CfC-funded services grew to 51 per cent of services provided by all responding agencies and 55 per cent of repeated respondent agencies in Wave 2 (see Table 6). In contrast, membership of CfC committees declined to 24 per cent of all responding agencies and 29 per cent of repeated agencies in Wave 2.

Table 6: Service agency's role in relation to CfC

A. All agencies	Wave 1		Wave 2		P-value
	(%)	N	(%)	N	-
None	21	383	27	302	0.099*
Provides services funded under CfC	33	383	51	302	0.000***
Member of Communities for Children Committee	42	383	24	302	0.000***
Other	22	383	11	302	0.000***

(Chi Square test)

B. Repeated agencies	Wave 1 (%)	Wave 2 (%)	N (both waves)	P-value
None	24	20	75	0.347
Provides services funded under CfC	32	55	75	0.008**
Member of Communities for Children Committee	45	29	75	0.063*
Other	21	15	75	0.396

***Results significant at 0.000 significance level (McNemar test for repeated observations)

**Results significant at <0.05 significance level

*Results significant at <0.1 significance level

Both CfC consortium members and other agencies providing services funded by the initiative reported increases in the proportion of their services devoted to 0 to 5 year olds and their families between Waves 1 and 2. However, all such changes were non-significant (Table 7).

Table 7: Proportion of services devoted to 0-5 year olds and their families by Service agency role in CfC

A. All agencies	Member CfC (%)		Provides Services funded under CfC (%)		None (%)	
	Wave1	Wave2	Wave1	Wave2	Wave1	Wave2
All or most	41	49	55	56	54	44
About Half	18	12	11	14	7	11
Some or very little	41	38	34	31	40	44
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
P-value	0.763		0.632		0.670	
N wave 1			366			
N wave 2			302			
All results non-significant (Chi Square test)						
B. Repeated agencies	Member CfC (%)		Provides Services funded under CfC (%)		None (%)	
	Wave1	Wave2	Wave1	Wave2	Wave1	Wave2
All or most	45	53	50	58	59	39
About Half	23	11	18	15	12	8
Some or very little	32	37	32	28	29	54
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
P-value	0.345		0.687		0.652	
N both waves			71			
All results non-significant (McNemar test for repeated observations)						

3.1 Strategic Level Coordination

The strategic level coordination component of the study aimed to establish the level of reported interagency cooperation relating to how services were planned, coordinated and commissioned, and to measure changes during the funding period.

For the purposes of the snapshot survey, interagency working and cooperation activities were grouped into five categories: planning, service delivery, shared information, professional development and other. Respondents were also asked which interagency activities they believed were most helpful and to record a ‘helpfulness’ score for each activity on a scale from 1 (least helpful) to 5 (most helpful).

Most respondents reported that their agencies performed a range of interagency activities and these were found to be quite useful in both Wave 1 and Wave 2 (see Table 8). Overall, there was an increase in both the proportion of agencies undertaking most activities, and the perceived helpfulness of these activities, which is a positive result for the CfC program.

The standout activities were referring clients and interagency staff training (which were consistently rated as very helpful and enjoyed the greatest rise in popularity between Waves 1 and 2). Exchanging information and joint planning enjoyed the greatest rise in perceived helpfulness, and were also popular choices of activities across waves and samples.

Agencies undertook similar activities in both the total and repeated agencies samples. Almost three-quarters of all agencies and repeated agencies (73% and 72% respectively) reported that they were involved in joint service delivery/case management in Wave 1. These figures did not change significantly by Wave 2, with 72% and 71% of all and repeated agencies respectively involved in service delivery and management.

Initially popular in both samples were interagency meetings (83% all, 87% repeated), referring clients (86% all, 85% repeated), and exchanging information (85% all, 82% repeated) while joint planning was more popular in the repeated sample (83%) than in the wider sample of all agencies (71%). None of these four activities declined and nearly all increased between Wave 1 and 2, but none changed significantly except for referring clients in the sample of all agencies, which increased to around 92 per cent by Wave 2.

Interagency staff training was the activity that enjoyed the greatest rise in popularity, with proportions rising from just over half (57% all, 59% repeated samples) to three quarters (73% all, 71% repeated) by Wave 2, changes which are highly significant in the sample of all agencies.

The perceived helpfulness of activities was more varied between the full and repeated samples. In accordance perhaps with the rising popularity of these activities, referring clients and interagency staff training were initially considered to be the most helpful activities in the sample of all agencies (mean of 4.1 for both activities). Referring clients and co-location of services were initially perceived to be equally helpful in the repeated sample (mean 4.2 both).

The perceived helpfulness of most activities increased in 'all agencies' sample, but not in the repeated sample. The two greatest improvements in perceived helpfulness were for exchanging information and joint planning. Exchanging information increased significantly from a mean of 4 to 4.2 in the sample of all agencies, and with minor significance in the repeated sample. Joint planning was the biggest improver, increasing significantly in both samples from a mean of 4 to 4.2 in the sample of all agencies, and from 3.9 to 4.3 in the repeated sample.

Table 8: Interagency involvement in various activities (per cent), and helpfulness average score

A. All agencies	Agencies involved					Average helpfulness				
	Wave1 (%)	n	Wave2 (%)	n	P-value (Chi-Sq)	Wave1 (1-5)	n	Wave2 (1-5)	n	P-value (T-Test Indep.)
Joint planning	71	417	76	293	0.148	4.0	285	4.2	222	0.000***
Interagency referrals	86	427	92	293	0.017*	4.1	345	4.2	266	0.531
Joint case management/ service	73	425	72	293	0.607	3.9	298	4.0	210	0.312
Information exchange	85	423	85	293	0.894	4.0	346	4.2	249	0.010**
Interagency staff training	57	416	73	293	0.000***	4.1	227	4.0	211	0.116
Interagency meetings	83	432	86	293	0.207	4.0	342	4.0	253	0.415
Co-location	45	415	49	293	0.352	4.0	179	4.1	143	0.150

***Results significant at 0.000 significance level (Chi Square test).

** Results significant at <0.05 significance level (Chi Square test).

* Results significant at <0.1 significance level (Chi Square test).

B. Repeated agencies	Service agency involved (%)				Average helpfulness (1-5)			
	Wave1 (%)	Wave2 (%)	N (both wave)	P-value	Wave 1	Wave 2	N (paired sample)	P-value (Paired Obs. T-test)
Joint planning	83	83	80	1	3.9	4.3	46	0.023**
Interagency referrals	85	91	81	0.359	4.2	4.2	59	0.907
Joint case management/ service	72	71	79	1.000	2.9	4.0	37	0.000***
Information exchange	82	92	78	0.268	4.0	4.3	53	0.116
Interagency staff training	59	71	78	0.233	4.1	3.7	25	0.161
Interagency meetings	87	89	82	0.824	4.1	4	59	0.903
Co-location	48	55	79	0.522	4.2	3.9	21	0.666

***Results are significant at 0.000 significance level (each response was paired across the two waves, and McNemar test for repeated observations used).

** Results are significant at <0.05 significance level (McNemar test for repeated observations).

* Results are significant at <0.1 significance level (McNemar test for repeated observations).

There was a significant increase in collaboration between staff from different services between Wave 1 and Wave 2 (Table 9). In Wave 1, only 35 per cent of all agencies and 34 per cent of repeated organisations said that staff from different services worked closely together most of the time. By Wave 2, this figure had increased to 60 per cent and 66 per cent respectively. Corresponding to this, 16 per cent of all agencies and 21 per cent of repeated organisations reported that staff from different services knew little about each others' work in Wave 1, while in Wave 2, only 5 and 4 per cent of respondents believed this to be true. These changes are highly significant and demonstrate that reported collaboration increased between Waves 1 and 2.

Table 9: Collaboration between staff from different services

A. All agencies		
Staff from different services...	Wave 1 (%)	Wave 2 (%)
Work closely together most of the time	35	60
Work closely together occasionally	50	35
Know little about each other's work	16	5
n	376	302

p<0.001—results highly significant (Chi Square test).

B. Repeated agencies		
Staff from different services...	Wave 1 (%)	Wave 2 (%)
Work closely together most of the time	34	66
Work closely together occasionally	45	30
Know little about each other's work	21	4
n (both waves)	71	71

Responses were paired across the two waves, and McNemar test for repeated observations returned significant values (p=0.031 and p=0.002 at 95% significance level) when testing the statistical significance of the changes across waves in the number of staff from different services who work closely together most of the time and the number of staff from different services to know little about each other's work respectively. The change in the number of staff from different services to work closely together occasionally is not statistically significant.

Note: All columns add to 100% except in cases of rounding error.

As in the previous example, respondents reported increasing coordination between services as CfC progressed. Respondents were significantly more likely to report that services worked in a coordinated manner in Wave 2 than they were in Wave 1 (see Table 10). Just 15 per cent of all agencies and 10 per cent of repeated organisations reported that services in their area worked as a well coordinated team in Wave 1 compared to almost half (44% and 46% respectively) in Wave 2. Similarly, a quarter of repeated respondents (25%) described the service network in their area as separate and uncoordinated in Wave 1. By Wave 2, only 6 per cent believed that services in their area were largely uncoordinated.

Table 10: Level of coordination between services

A. All agencies (a)		
	Wave 1 (%)	Wave 2 (%)
A well coordinated team of services	15	44
A partially coordinated team of services	68	47
A group of separate, uncoordinated services	17	9
n	387	299

p-value:<0.001—results highly significant (Chi Square test).

B. Repeated agencies		
	Wave 1 (%)	Wave 2 (%)
A well coordinated team of services	10	46
A partially coordinated team of services	65	49
A group of separate, uncoordinated services	25	6
n	72	72

Responses were paired across the two waves, and McNemar test for repeated observations returned highly significant values (p=0.000 to and p=0.001 at 95% significance level) for the change in the number of agencies to have reported a well coordinated team of services in wave1 and wave2 and the change in the number of agencies to admit to describe the level of coordination between services as a

group of separate, uncoordinated services respectively. The change between wave1 and wave2 in the number of agencies who have a partially coordinated team of services is not statistically significant. Note: All columns add to 100% except in cases of rounding error.

3.2 Day-to-day coordination and Partnerships

An index of day-to-day coordination was created for the ten Stronger Families in Australia (SFIA) sites⁸ using a composite of responses to two questions.⁹ A separate index of partnerships was created using a composite of responses to another two questions.¹⁰ Results from each set of questions were combined and values were calculated on a scale from 1 to 9 (Table 11).

Between Wave 1 and Wave 2, significant increases in level of day-to-day coordination and partnerships were reported in SFIA sites. Day-to-day coordination increased from a mean of 3.18 out of 5 in Wave 1 to 3.91 out of 5 in Wave 2 for the all agencies sample and from 2.99 to 4.04 for repeated agencies. Increases in coordination were not constant across all sites. Day-to-day coordination increases were reported by repeated agencies in 8 out of 10 sites and in 6 out of 8 sites by all agencies.

Partnerships also increased significantly from 6.05 out of 9 for all agencies in Wave 1 to 6.67 out of 9 in Wave 2. Similarly, partnerships increased from 5.99 to 6.66 for repeated agencies. Again, the reported increase in partnerships was not distributed evenly between sites and partnership increases were reported by repeated agencies in 6 out of 10 sites and in 3 out of 8 sites by all agencies. From this small sample of sites, it appears that partnerships were less likely to increase in regional and remote sites. This may be because these sites had a limited number of services to coordinate with or had a limited number of pre-existing partnerships in comparison with urban locations. In many cases, the four year SFCS 2004-2009 program was too short for services to establish effective partnerships in the absence of pre-existing relationships (see Flaxman et al., 2009 for further discussion).

Table 11: Day-to-day Coordination

A. All agencies	Day to Day (1-5)		Partnerships (1-9)	
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2
Mean	3.18	3.91	6.05	6.67
Std Dev	1.08	1.01	1.72	1.65
T-Test - Mean Diff	-8.98		-4.71	
Sig	.000***		.000***	
N	370	299	376	292
Means in Available SFIA Sites				
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2
<i>Bendigo</i>	2.6	3.6	5.1	5.4

⁸ SFIA was a longitudinal study of families and children which was undertaken in ten CfC sites as a part of the SFCS National Evaluation (see Edwards et al., forthcoming).

⁹ Questions 12 and 13, Snapshot Questionnaire 2006 and Questions 5 and 6, Snapshot Questionnaire 2008 (see Appendix F).

¹⁰ Questions 14 and 15, Snapshot Questionnaire 2006 and Questions 8 and 9, Snapshot Questionnaire 2008 (see Appendix F).

<i>Cairns</i>	3.4	3.4	6.0	6.3
<i>Frankston No</i>	3.0	4.5	6.0	7.9
<i>Inala-Ipswich</i>	3.2	3.6	6.2	6.0
<i>Launceston</i>	4.0	4.0	9.0	6.0
<i>Miller</i>	3.7	3.5	7.0	6.0
<i>Mirrabooka</i>	3.7	4.0	6.8	7.0
<i>Palmerston/Tiwi Islands</i>	4.0	3.6	7.2	6.0
<i>Salisbury</i>	2.9	3.2	5.5	5.8
<i>Shellharbour</i>	3.1	4.3	6.3	7.1

***Results significant at .000 significance level (Chi Square test)

**Results significant at <. 05 significance level

*Results significant at <.1 significance level

B. Repeated agencies ^a	Day to Day (1-5)		Partnerships (1-9)	
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2
Mean	2.99	4.04	5.99	6.66
Std Dev	1.15	.91	1.81	1.67
T-Test - Mean Diff	-1.06		-.68	
Sig	.000***		.012**	
N	70		71	

Means in Available SFIA Sites

	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2
<i>Bendigo</i>	3.0	4.3	6.0	4.0
<i>Cairns</i>	4.0	3.0	7.0	7.0
<i>Frankston No</i>	2.7	4.3	6.3	8.0
<i>Inala-Ipswich</i>	3.8	4.8	5.8	8.5
<i>Mirrabooka</i>	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
<i>Palmerston/Tiwi Islands</i>	5.0	3.0	9.0	5.0
<i>Shellharbour</i>	3.0	5.0	6.0	6.0
<i>Bendigo</i>	3.0	4.3	6.0	4.0

***Results significant at 0.000 significance level (McNemar test for repeated observations)

**Results significant at <0.05 significance level

*Results significant at <0.1 significance level

^a Data from Miller and Launceston were excluded in this table as no service agencies completed these survey questions in both Waves 1 or 2.

4 Conclusion

The proportion of service agencies' activities devoted to 0 to 5 year olds remained consistently high during both waves of the survey. Service coordination improved in tandem with the rising profile of the CfC program. Service agency staff reported that they were more likely to engage in almost every collaborative activity (with the exception of joint service delivery/case management and exchanging information, which remained stable). Service agency staff were increasingly aware of cooperative activities and were increasingly likely to report that they engaged in cooperative or collaborative activities following the implementation of CfC.

Coordination between services increased significantly, with services more likely to report that they worked in a coordinated manner in Wave 2 than in Wave 1. There was a similar increase in collaboration between staff from different services. By Wave 2, service agency staff were more likely to know what other agencies were doing and more likely to report working closely with other agencies. Referring clients, interagency staff training and meetings, exchanging information and joint planning were the activities which were perceived to be most helpful by respondents.