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Executive Summary

Program Overview
On behalf of Martin Foley MP, the Minister for Equality, Victorian Government’s first Gender and Sexuality Commissioner, Ro Allen, and the Department of Premier and Cabinet undertook an LGBTI Equality Roadshow along with representatives from state-based organisations supporting LGBTI communities, and LGBTI advocates. The team spent eight weeks between November 2016 and June 2017 visiting 23 towns in rural and regional Victoria on a Victorian Police Bus with the aim of raising awareness of and promoting LGBTI equality and inclusion.

The roadshow engaged local LGBTI people, allies, CEOs, local business leaders, decision makers, representatives of service providers and local government in their communities. It included a series of workshops, community dinners, inclusive planning sessions, networking opportunities and other community events. The roadshow provided a demonstration of the Victorian Government’s commitment to addressing discrimination against LGBTI people and promoting LGBTI inclusion across all of the State and an opportunity for government to consult directly with LGBTI communities in rural and regional settings.

Value for Money

The LGBTI Equality Roadshow represents excellent Value for Money. Economy and efficiency were well supported through program design and implementation, with the program team undertaking sound program management and logistics, creating cost savings and efficiencies across the program. Very strong leveraging occurred, with community members, organisations and other government departments contributing time and effort, ideas, resources, materials and funding support which has meant that the program has produced more for what it put in.

The overall efficiency of the roadshow has been slightly diminished by insufficient communications for regional and rural communities which is likely to have reduced the attendance levels of roadshow events.

The program achieved exceptionally high effectiveness. The strategies used to achieve change have effectively led to the outcomes sought and activities were implemented to a high-quality standard. The program has achieved strong scale and reach and significance of change, with several respondents reporting that the program was “life saving” and “life changing”.

Evaluation Report for the LGBTI Equality Roadshow – Submitted by Storyscape
Impact

“This roadshow has opened so many doors, and I think those doors are not going to be shut again”.

The roadshow achieved an impressive range of important and significant impacts for LGBTI people. The program effectively linked in with and supported LGBTI people, building their skills, confidence and motivation to publicly drive change and advocate for equality and inclusion. It has led to the establishment of eight new LGBTI groups which have provided a platform for LGBTI people and allies to become involved in their communities and contribute their ideas, resources and networks. Networks have continued to grow their membership and have undertaken a range of actions to promote equality and inclusion in their communities.

Important systemic changes have been achieved within some service providers. At an organisational level, the roadshow has resulted in an increased awareness, prioritisation and commitment among participating service providers, with attitude and practice shifts taking place. The program enhanced staff understanding of LGBTI inclusion issues and how inclusion can be strengthened. The roadshow team helped to build confidence that things can change, provided practical ideas for getting the ball rolling, helping organisations to bringing about small but important wins, and drive momentum for change. For some organisations, the roadshow has garnered wider support within the workplace, and helped them to push the boundaries and scale up their inclusion work. A range of projects and partnerships have been established between mainstream organisations and LGBTI people and groups, which have helped service providers to implement LGBTI inclusion plans.

Key achievements

Key highlights and achievements of the program include:

- More LGBTI people have been empowered, becoming leaders and advocates in their communities
- Eight new LGBTI groups / networks that have formed between LGBTI people, individuals and service provider representatives across Victoria which are actively progressing inclusion across communities
- Headspace, a youth Mental Health Foundation created an LGBTI youth worker role
- The program encouraging police to nominate themselves and volunteer to become GLLOs officers (LGBTI liaison) in the communities they serve, with the number of GLLOs increasing from 170 to 240 since the roadshow
- More service providers have developed LGBTI inclusion plans and progressed their implementation.

Appropriateness

of the model

“It draws people together, and invites people from within the community, no matter where they sit in the alphabet, to come to connect, and to make a difference”.

The approach of bringing resources to people and designing the program locally and working with and through LGBTI people within communities has been highly effective. Engaging a broad range of mainstream stakeholders, creating opportunities for people to link and connect, and building community capacity to lead action has created a high degree of ownership in communities and has been critical to the program’s success.
The program’s approach of investing in face to face engagement and establishing trust and connections between local people and state-based policy makers was appropriate and is highly appreciated by rural and remote Victorian communities. The second phase of the program is well positioned to further strengthen and deepen the outcomes achieved under the first phase, promoting systemic changes and fostering sustainable groups and networks that support LGBTI inclusion.

Recommendations

For the LGBTI Equality roadshow:
1. Adopt more agile and adaptive communications that can respond to changing circumstances and ensure that the program is able to be promoted through radio and print in regional local areas to broaden participation
2. Continue to support the capacity building of individual LGBTI advocates and the institutional strengthening of LGBTI groups and the links between them
3. Strengthen engagement and alignment with existing Equality Branch, other government departments and initiatives at the state and regional levels, embedding linkages across the program
4. Continue to make government approachable, accessible and accountable to community.

Based on lessons learned from the Roadshow the following are recommendations that could be applied to other government programs:

(A) When working with and supporting marginalised groups
1. Engage the broader community and a diversity of organisations, creating opportunities for supportive allies from the mainstream to link in with and support marginalised groups
2. Identify and engage people from marginalised groups as equal partners in the design and decision-making process, working with them to identify and create safe environments, and supporting their leadership and engagement within their communities
3. Invest in strategically targeting influencers including those who are resistant, and in bringing them to the table using an encouraging and non-judgmental approach
4. Prioritise the creation of an informal and fun environment to assist communities to have challenging and difficult conversations, working towards the positive experience of participants as an aim in and of itself.

(B) When co-designing community centred engagement projects
5. Travel to communities in the planning phase to undertake the ground work by spending time in communities, meeting people face to face, learning about the context, developing relationships, and returning and following up, taking community timeframes into account
6. Build sufficient flexibility into the design to enable the program to listen to community and adapt elements of the program to meet the needs and contexts of different communities
7. Explore ways to connect small towns in the one shire to increase connections and links, enabling people from different towns to share resources, ideas, connections and effort
8. Invest in working directly with particular communities and monitoring risks at the local level (i.e. if leaders move away or experience burn out) when developing a ‘regional program’ to ensure local community capacity and engagement.
1 Introduction

1.1 Program background

On behalf of Martin Foley MP the Minister for Equality, Victorian Government’s first Gender and Sexuality Commissioner, Ro Allen, and the Department of Premier and Cabinet undertook an LGBTI Equality Roadshow along with representatives from state-based organisations supporting LGBTI communities, and LGBTI advocates. The team spent eight weeks between November 2016 and June 2017 visiting 23 towns in rural and regional Victoria on a Victorian Police Bus with the aim of raising awareness of and promoting LGBTI equality and inclusion.

The roadshow engaged local LGBTI people, allies, CEOs, local business leaders, decision makers, representatives of service providers and local government in their communities. The roadshow included a series of workshops, community dinners, inclusive planning sessions, networking opportunities and other community events. The LGBTI Equality Roadshow (the “program”) was an initiative of the Victorian Government.

The program has five objectives:
1. Raise awareness of homophobia, biphobia, transphobia and discrimination against intersex variations and its impacts
2. Reduce discrimination encountered by LGBTI communities
3. Help local service providers to better understand the needs of local LGBTI people, including barriers to using services
4. Establish, or build capacity of existing, LGBTI networks
5. Link LGBTI people into services

The roadshow provided a demonstration of the Victorian Government’s commitment to addressing discrimination against LGBTI people and promoting LGBTI inclusion across all of the State and an opportunity for government to consult directly with LGBTI communities in rural and regional settings. The program sought to provide a practical response to the disparity between LGBTI inclusive services in Melbourne and outside of metropolitan settings. The roadshow also aims to increase awareness and support of sexual and gender diversity amongst communities and mainstream services across the State.

Non-local organisations supporting LGBTI communities who joined the roadshow team on the bus included: Switchboard Victoria; Victorian AIDS Council; Victoria Police (GLLO Program); Victoria Local Government Association; Victoria Legal Aid; and FTM Shed. Other organisations such as Bi-Alliance Victoria, Diversity Project Shepparton, Zoe Belle Gender Centre, Beyondblue and Carers Victoria provided resources and education materials to take to communities. The roadshow also received support from several Victorian Public Service organisations including Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, WorkSafe, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Justice and Regulation, Department of Education and Training and VicRoads.

The Commissioner and supportive organisations delivered a program of education and training to combat homophobia, biphobia, transphobia discrimination against intersex variations. The roadshow targeted areas including: education; youth services; mental health; health; aged care; disability; Aboriginal communities; multicultural communities; local government; legal services; sport; law enforcement; human rights; and media.

The roadshow was funded through the Combating Homophobia initiative (2016-17 BP3, p103) with a funding allocation of $500,000. The program was delivered within the allocated budget.
included: travel; promotional and educational materials; accommodation for staff and individuals involved in delivery of the roadshow; venue and catering costs; and administration and staffing costs including two Equality Branch staff members who led the roadshow team and undertook extensive consultation in towns prior to and after the roadshow. The program received a range of pro-bono supporting including from Victoria police who provided the bus, driver and petrol, and a range of resources provided by state-based LGBTI supportive organisations.

The roadshow sought to link with and complement other government programs including organisational development programs and the LGBTI grant scheme. A subsequent phase is currently being delivered in 2017/2018.

1.2 Evaluation objectives

The objectives for the evaluation of the LGBTI Equality Roadshow were to:

1. Assess the impact of the program on regional Victorian communities
2. Assess the effectiveness of the program’s process
3. Assess the relevance of the program’s approach
4. Assess the value for money of the program
5. To engage regional communities using creative and participatory techniques, so they can tell their own stories
6. To produce creative and engaging evaluation products (evaluation report, video, program story E-Document) that provide evidence and document the model for engagement.

1.3 Methodology

The evaluation used mixed methods and adopted a participatory approach. For each key evaluation question, various lines of evidence were gathered from a range of sources. Data collection consisted of: a desktop review of existing documentation; development of a Program Logic (presented in Appendix 5.1), interviews and focus group discussions with program stakeholders, use of the Most Significant Change technique, and an Evaluation Verification Workshop with the program staff. A short film and program story E-Document were also produced as part of this evaluation.

Data collection took place during April to June 2018. In-depth semi-structured face to face interviews and focus group discussions were carried out with program participants in two locations visited by the Roadshow: Wycheproof (a small regional town in the centre of the Shire of Buloke in north western Victoria) and Horsham (a regional city in the Wimmera region of western Victoria). These locations were selected to assess the relevance of the program to localities of varying sizes. A range of participants from other localities were also interviewed during phone interviews and face to face interviews held during an event in Melbourne related to the second phase of the program.

In total 44 stakeholders including LGBTI people (25), service provider representatives (16) and program staff (3) were consulted as part of this evaluation. While the evaluation sought to engage a balanced representation across stakeholder groups, difficulties were encountered in securing the participation of police and CEOs / leaders, which is a limitation of the evaluation. A more detailed description of the evaluation methodology is included in Appendix 5.5.

---

1 Throughout this report, the term ‘service provider’ refers to a range of community, government and private organisations providing services in communities including: local government councils; health service providers; community services; schools and colleges; and police.
1.4 Evaluation team and management arrangements

This is an external evaluation carried out by Michelle Besley from Collective Insights, who produced the evaluation report, and Pip Chandler from Storyscape who produced the film. The evaluation was funded by VicHealth.

1.5 About this document

This document presents the findings of the evaluation of the program. Findings are presented using a Value for Money Framework. An overview of this framework is provided in Appendix 5.2. Components of Value for Money are closely assessed in relation to the program’s logic, which is referred to throughout the analysis. The full Program Logic is presented in Appendix 5.1. The main body of the report also includes lessons learned and recommendations. Additional information relating to program results is presented in Appendix 5.3 and Most Significant Change stories are included in Appendix 5.4. A detailed evaluation methodology is included in Appendix 5.5.

2 Findings

The judgements presented in this evaluation are formulated in relation to evidence drawn from the desktop review, interviews with key stakeholders, Most Significant Change stories, and the participatory Evaluation Workshop. Quotes from program stakeholders obtained through evaluation consultations have also been included throughout the document. The evaluation did not capture comprehensive data across all localities visited by the roadshow; the findings presented in this report reflect the experiences of stakeholders who participated in the evaluation.

2.1 Value for Money Assessment

Value for Money (VfM) is the ‘optimal use of resources to achieve the intended outcomes’. Optimal means ‘the most desirable possible given expressed or implied restrictions or constraints’. Value for Money is not about achieving the lowest price without regard for quality. Value for Money is commonly assessed in relation to three core dimensions known as the ‘3Es’: economy, efficiency and effectiveness. Within the concept of Value for Money, economy, efficiency and effectiveness are interdependent, such that “Value for Money” cannot be determined in the absence of one or more of the 3Es.

The LGBTI Equality Roadshow represents excellent Value for Money. As represented in Table 1 below, the program received a High Value for Money Rating, the maximum overall rating category. The program’s component scores for the 3Es are presented in Figure 2 and Table 1 below. The program received high economy and high effectiveness, the maximum rating for each component. For economy, the evaluation found that the program invested in working with the right stakeholders, and purchased the right resources needed to bring about the desired changes. It also used a range of cost-saving measures, purchasing high quality program resources at low costs. The program’s effectiveness is rated high, with the roadshow achieving an impressive range of important

2 The authors of quotes are not referenced as confidential interviews were conducted, with respondents de-identified in the use of stories and quotes throughout the document.

and significant impacts for LGBTI people, members of participating organisations and the wider communities visited, with sustainability well factored into the program’s design and delivery.

The program received a good efficiency rating, scoring 5 out of 6, the second highest rating for the component. The roadshow team created a range of efficiencies, using a tailored and highly effective co-design and implementation model, strongly leveraging off of a range of stakeholders to increase outputs for the program inputs generated through available program funds. The roadshow visits were not promoted through local newspaper outlets and radio due to a restriction placed as a result of internal government communications protocols. While this decision was outside the control of the immediate roadshow team, it is likely to have impacted the attendance levels of roadshow events. This factor has diminished efficiency, resulting in a decreased rating in this component.

Figure 1: Overall Value for Money rating

Figure 2: Value for Money component ratings

Table 1: Value for Money sub-component rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Economy (6/6)</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-component 1: Program Logic</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-component 2: Competitiveness</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Efficiency (5/6)</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-component 1: Productivity</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-component 2: Leveraging</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Effectiveness (6/6)</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-component 1: Reach, Depth, significance</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-component 2: Sustainability</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complete Value for Money Assessment

Economy: Reasonable investment (time and costs) to acquire good quality inputs that will enable realisation of the desired changes

Economy Sub-category 1: Program Logic assessment

Has the roadshow invested in engaging the right program stakeholders and purchasing the right resources to achieve the changes sought?

“The Commissioner drew a range of people to the events who would perhaps not have otherwise attended. When your head person comes out, it shows that this is an important issue and we all should be sitting up and listening; leaders and heads of service provider organisations felt that the roadshow was something that they should attend”.

A large portion of the program’s investment (approximately 65.1 %) was directed towards the community co-design and planning processes which sought to ensure the roadshow brought the right people to the table in each community visited. This occurred through face to face planning consultations, in which the program engaged a small group of LGBTI people and allies in the co-design process\(^4\) in each community to understand the town context, roadblocks and key influencers. Program staff then invested in following up with key individuals and organisations on a case by case basis to encourage and secure their attendance. The individuals that the program partnered with in the co-design process also promoted the events within their communities and worked to garner interest.

The evaluation validated the program’s investment in working extensively to target and engage the right program participants and stakeholders in communities. It found that the engagement of a wide range of mainstream organisations such as representatives of health providers, schools, local councils and police, as well as allies and individuals has been critical to the success of the program. As the program adopts a convening and community capacity development model which relies on participants themselves leading change after the roadshow events, investment in bringing the right people together to form links to drive and create change together was paramount. The program’s strong achievement in this area is evidenced by the number of LGBTI inclusion groups and networks established, partnerships formed and projects undertaken by LGBTI advocates and mainstream organisations who attended the roadshow, as outlined in the effectiveness section below.

The program’s investment of time in making direct contact with CEOs, decision makers and leaders prior to the roadshow was also critical to the program’s success. There is typically one person within a service provider who holds responsibility for driving LGBTI inclusion work across their organisation\(^5\). These representatives noted that they often struggle to progress inclusion due to a lack of prioritisation by senior management and buy-in and interest from different sections or departments across the organisation. It was widely noted that the high status of the Commissioner was pivotal in drawing the attendance of leaders and senior managers to roadshow events. Staff tasked with progressing inclusion in their workplaces reported the importance of the roadshow’s engagement of staff in senior management roles, and that since the roadshow they have seen an increased prioritisation and commitment, with greater support garnered across their workplaces. This shift in prioritisation has enabled them to make important gains in progressing LGBTI inclusion.

\(^4\) This process is outlined in Appendix 5.1 Table 2.

\(^5\) LGBTI inclusion is not the sole focus of their role, but is one of many minority issues they are tasked with progressing.
4.3% of project funds were also spent on honorariums for LGBTI advocates and a small number of staff from Victorian LGBTI supportive organisations such as Switchboard Victoria. LGBTI advocates attended the roadshow to share their experiences of living in rural and regional Victorian towns, and the barriers and challenges they encounter. Several respondents from service providers reported that hearing advocates tell their stories was one of the most impactful experiences of the roadshow. This process effectively educated people about the barriers LGBTI people experience in accessing services and sparked empathy and understanding. This process was also of benefit to LGBTI advocates, who reported experiencing a greater sense of belonging and connectedness through the sharing of their personal journeys. Accompanying organisations such as Switchboard Victoria provided a technical resource and helped to inform people of the services available for LGBTI people in Victoria. The value of having these individuals and groups on the roadshow is illustrated through Most Significant Change Story 6 in Appendix 5.4.

Other program costs (approximately 26.1%) were directed towards the physical resources and supplies associated with implementing the roadshow including: costs associated with the team physically travelling to and hosting events within communities such as accommodation and venue hire; materials and supplies used for educational and planning events; food and refreshments for community dinners and other events; and program merchandise given to participants. The approach of having the Commissioner and program staff travel to and deliver a program in a community (along with face to face follow up visits to support the work of LGBTI inclusion groups established through the roadshow), resulted in participants feeling prioritised and heard by state government.

The approach also enabled the program to be tailored to a specific community, and facilitated the sharing of ideas and resources with a wider group of people when compared with initiatives that fund a select number of individuals to travel to Melbourne. Delivering the program in communities spurred a high degree of momentum, motivation and place-based collective action that is unlikely to have been achieved to the same extent through an online or centrally located program. The investment in food and refreshments was also validated, with the program’s approach of creating a comfortable and fun environment and discussing challenging content while ‘breaking bread’ was core to the program’s success.

The evaluation did not identify any use of funds that were not well directed towards achieving program outcomes, with no unrelated or unnecessary allocation of funds noted. The program’s logic was tested and validated through the evaluation which found that the roadshow team had a sound understanding of the best ways to bring about the outcomes sought in regional and rural Victorian communities. Program investment was strongly aligned with the theory underpinning the delivery model, resulting in a high degree of economy.

**Economy Sub-category 2: Competitiveness Assessment**

To what extent has the program kept costs reasonably low while maintaining quality in light of the operating environment?

“We didn’t stay in the Ritz. Anywhere we could we used restaurants in TAFE colleges and we tried to put back into social enterprise. It wasn’t a roadshow with 20 staff with a team of people scribing up the back during sessions; everybody had butcher’s paper and pens and they had to do their own work. It was government meets grassroots.”

The program used a range of measures to keep costs low without compromising the quality of the roadshow which came in slightly under budget. The program used a no frills operating model, with the team staying in low budget accommodation, hiring inexpensive local venues and using lower cost restaurants. In addition to keeping costs low, and enabling the budget to be stretched to cover
more localities, the low-cost model aligned with the program’s grassroots community engagement approach of making government more connected, approachable and accessible to community.

A range of low cost program merchandise items were purchased and given to participants such as small foam buses and LGBTI pins. Several stakeholders reported that they continue to display the buses and wear the pins in their workplaces along with their colleagues as a way of publicly displaying their support for LGBTI people and making their workplaces more inclusive. The team also found cost-effective ways of creating a sense of occasion without spending large amounts of funding such as by purchasing items that could be made meaningful and reused. For example, in each community, a large map of Victoria was displayed, with a representative from each town visited placing a pin on the map at the Community Dinner. There was also an interactive and stylised bus prop that attendees could take a photograph with and display. These were all visual representations for attendees to see how they fit within the project.

Table 2: Economy rating rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Economy Rating: High Economy 6/6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2 – Poor Economy, 3 Low Economy, 4 Fair Economy, 5 Good Economy, 6 High Economy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Logic: 3/3</th>
<th>Competitiveness: 3/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well has the program directed resources to bring about planned outcomes?</td>
<td>Have costs been kept reasonably low while maintaining quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not clear if resources have been closely linked to outcomes; a judgement cannot be formed</td>
<td>It is not clear if investment has been kept costs low and quality maintained; a judgement cannot be formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment directed to achieve changes is largely inappropriate</td>
<td>Program investment either unreasonably high or too low affecting quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some forms of investment directed to achieve changes are appropriate with scope for improvement</td>
<td>Some costs are reasonable and some costs could have been reduced or redirected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment directed to achieve changes is largely appropriate</td>
<td>Costs are largely reasonable and quality has been maintained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficiency: A measure of productivity; how much you get out in relation to what is put in (increasing output for a given input, or minimising input for a given output, with a regard for maintaining quality)

Efficiency Sub-category 1: Productivity Assessment

To what extent has the program created efficiencies and minimised inefficiencies?

“I believe that the best thing about this process was the fact that it wasn’t the Equality Branch or the Roadshow team coming into town and dictating what had to happen. One team member came through first, had a cup of tea with us and said to me, ‘Can you find the people that you need to put into a room to get something done?’ And I said, ‘Yes, I’ll do that.’ I went and liaised with six different people, got them in the room for the next time he came back through, and we were able to continue planning who was going to be in the room for the roadshow based on that. I think this idea of asking the people who know what is happening in the community, rather than just putting a sponsored event on Facebook, or just sending a couple of emails is a far better approach. Having someone
Efficiency was well supported through program design and implementation, with the program team undertaking sound program management and logistics, creating efficiencies across program elements that were in their scope of control. Efficiencies were achieved by: using an evidence-based approach to decision making; having a consistent team with strong expertise working in rural and regional Victorian communities, and using an effective co-design process which enabled the government to understand and meet community expectations and build trust.

The roadshow team used an evidence-based approach to decision making which informed the design, adaptation and delivery of the program. A pilot of the roadshow was first undertaken in Swan Hill and Mildura, with learnings documented and responded to prior to the delivery of the full roadshow. The team regularly reflected on performance after events, analysed different delivery options and made a series of changes to enhance the program. This is demonstrated by the decision to change the initial structure of having the same LGBTI advocates travel to all towns throughout the roadshow to having different LGBTI advocates travel to a group of towns within their own region. This approach enabled a greater number of LGBTI advocates to be involved (and benefit from the experience) for the same cost. It has also supported LGBTI advocates to form network and links with other LGBTI people and allies in their region, which have been maintained after the roadshow, strongly enhancing program impact. These learning and continuous improvement processes have created efficiencies by ensuring the program does not waste program resources on elements that are not performing optimally and obtains the best results for the inputs available.

The prior knowledge, experience and connections of the roadshow team in working with remote and rural communities across Victoria was a key factor which enhanced the efficiency of the program. The Commissioner has previously worked in regional Victoria and held a high degree of credibility and respect among communities. The two program staff members also had extensive experience working in regional Victoria in the areas of community engagement and logistics. Team members drew on their knowledge of what works when implementing activities in towns, as well as their existing relationships within communities. The program has maintained a consistent team throughout the roadshow. This has supported efficiency as team members have built strong partnerships with community members through face to face planning processes and have become familiar with the journey and stakeholders of each town. This has enabled them to provide tailored support based on a good understanding of need and context when required.

The co-design process which engaged local LGBTI people and their allies as equal partners in the planning and decision process has made for an efficient program. The approach involved asking local partners what they wanted, listening, and making all efforts to respond to their requests and advice. In addition to making events relevant and safe for LGBTI people, this process built a high level of buy-in and ownership among community partners who have remained highly active participants after the completion of the roadshow. The roadshow has been a large success, with the majority of respondents reporting a strong appreciation and satisfaction with what it gave to communities. The co-design process has potentially saved additional program time and resources in the long run, which can result from the need to address issues and manage community backlash in the event that expectations and needs are not met.

The overall efficiency of the roadshow has been slightly diminished by insufficient communications for regional and rural communities which is likely to have reduced the attendance levels of

\[6\] LGBTI advocates travelled on the bus to share their stories with communities as part of the program’s education component.
Respondents commonly highlighted the importance of local newspapers and radio in promoting events to local residents, stating that if they (or the Victorian government) had been able to promote and advertise the events through these avenues they would have received a much higher turnout. The promotion of the roadshow would have required a relatively small input which could have significantly increased the number of people reached and impacted through their participation in events.

Efficiency Sub-category 2: Leveraging Assessment

To what extent has the program leveraged off the ideas, skills, funds and resources of other individuals / organisations, and government?

“When we look at all the changes made by communities, and all the actions listed on whiteboards during the inclusive community planning sessions that they have now ticked off on, we (the Department of Premier and Cabinet) did not do one of those things; the community did them all on their own. The communities haven’t realised how much work they’ve all done, and they just say, ‘It’s the roadshow’.”

Very strong leveraging occurred across the program, particularly in relation to communities. The range of contributions received by different individuals and organisations in the form of time and effort, ideas, resources, materials and funding support has meant that the program has produced more for what it put in, or what it could have produced with the available program budget.

The program leveraged the knowledge, ideas and links of individuals met within each community during the planning phase to create a strongly tailored program. The convening and community capacity building model used meant that the work taken to progress inclusion was actually carried out by communities themselves. This is evidenced by the range of people that have subsequently become involved in LGBTI planning groups and networks, who have contributed their time, ideas and resources to implement a range of actions which have advanced inclusion. The roadshow sparked interest, commitment and momentum, with communities themselves driving change without external resources being provided by the program. In addition to supporting efficiency, this approach has served to create ownership within communities and support sustainability.

The program also linked in with and garnered support from other Victorian government agencies including Victoria Police, Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, WorkSafe, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Justice and Regulation, Department of Education and Training and VicRoads and state-based LGBTI community organisations including Minus 18, Rainbow Families, Switchboard Victoria, Transgender Victoria and Victorian AIDS council.

Support included assistance with promotion, providing venues for workshops, local intel and leveraging their networks to participate. Victoria Police contributed the bus, petrol and driver on a pro-bono basis, resulting in a large cost saving for the program. LGBTI and other state-based organisations including Bi-Alliance Victoria, Diversity Project Shepparton, Zoe Belle Gender Centre, Beyondblue and Carers Victoria contributed resources and education material for dissemination at the roadshow. Victorian organisations and other government agencies also helped to raise awareness of the program in workplaces, schools, sports centres, community legal centres, health and aged care facilities and in Aboriginal communities and multi-faith communities. The program leveraged off the good will of businesses and organisations based in the towns visited, many of which provided a range of pro bono or low bono resources such as venues, materials and supplies.

The value of strong government engagement is highlighted by the participation of government departments that played key roles in the planning process. The Regional Director of the VicRoads in Benalla ensured the VicRoads team attended the LGBTI inclusion workshop. The Regional Director of
the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning also played a strong role across the program, personally calling the CEOs of local government areas to garner support and encourage their attendance. VicHealth provided the roadshow team with local intel and aligned their work with the roadshow. As a result of these efforts, there are now gender-neutral toilets on the Hume Highway. These examples highlight the value of linking and leveraging off the knowledge, networks and influence of local government leaders. There is opportunity for the program to further embed the approach of linking with other government departments, at state-based and regional levels.

Table 3: Efficiency rating rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Efficiency Rating: Efficiency 5/6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2 – Poor Efficiency, 3 Low Efficiency, 4 Fair Efficiency, 5 Good Efficiency, 6 High Efficiency)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity: 2/3</th>
<th>Leveraging: 3/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well have efficiencies been created during program implementation?</td>
<td>How well has the program strategically mobilised resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not clear how the way in which the program was implemented has supported efficiency; a judgement cannot be formed</td>
<td>It is not clear what leveraging has occurred place; a judgement cannot be formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program design and implementation was largely inefficient, affecting program quality</td>
<td>No/very limited leveraging occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some efficiencies have been created by the way in which the program has been designed and implemented with room for improvement</td>
<td>Some leveraging occurred and some opportunities were missed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program has been designed and implemented in a way that strongly supports efficiency and maintains quality</td>
<td>Strong leveraging occurred, extending and enhancing outputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness: Is the program generating positive and sustainable outcomes?

Effectiveness Sub-category 1: Reach, Depth and Significance of Change Assessment

Has the program produced reasonable reach, level and significance of change in relation to the level of investment, and facilitated outcomes that are important and valuable to stakeholders?

“After the roadshow our local paper asked us to get a photo with us, so we were on the main drag of the town, with this huge rainbow flag. I’ve done those sorts of things before, and copped abuse from people driving by. But on that day, people were beeping their horns, yelling out, “Go the gays!” and really celebrating with us. To stand there and not be abused, but be celebrated, was a huge validation, and I think the processes now of integrating us into what we call ‘normal society’ is part and parcel of moving forward”.

The program achieved exceptionally high effectiveness. The strategies used to achieve change have effectively led to the immediate outcomes sought during the roadshow and subsequent flow on outcomes expected in the months following the roadshow (intermediate outcomes) as outlined in the Program Logic (Appendix 5.1). The theory underpinning the program was validated, and strong performance was evidenced with program activities implemented to a high-quality standard. The program has achieved strong scale and reach, producing a range of important impacts at individual,
organisational and community levels. The program exceeded stakeholder expectations, with several respondents reporting that the program was “life saving” and “life changing”.

The program has brought about significant changes in the lives of LGBTI people. LGBTI participants have developed connections and friendships with people in their communities that have been maintained, and they have become more involved in their communities. This has decreased their isolation and increased their sense of welcoming and belonging in their own communities. LGBTI advocates who shared their stories reported the deep personal impact of being seen and known by others and being accepted and embraced by communities. Of particular noteworthiness is the program’s achievements in empowering a number of LGBTI people to become leaders and advocates in their communities, building their skills, confidence and motivation to publicly drive change and advocate for equality and inclusion.

The increased awareness generated by the roadshow along with the actions taken by individuals and organisations to display their support have led to LGBTI people feeling safer and more included and supported. This was particularly important for LGBTI people in the lead up to the marriage equality vote, which occurred after the roadshow. Respondents reported that local organisations and businesses demonstrated support by displaying the buses and wearing the pins provided by the roadshow, signing public statements of endorsement and displaying posters and flags. Individuals have also displayed personal acts of support, with one LGBTI advocate reporting that 38 people had handed envelopes directly to him, asking them to post their Yes vote. Respondents commonly noted that a far greater number of people attended LGBTI events such as IDAHOBIT day than the previous year. Program participants said that the roadshow has strongly contributed to these wider attitude and practice shifts towards social inclusion.

While most service providers are in the early to mid-stages of LGBTI inclusion, there is evidence of an increase in the number of services available to LGBTI people brought about through the roadshow. The program has contributed to several organisations receiving funding support for LGBTI roles and support groups. This has resulted in a greater number of LGBTI people accessing counselling and participating in youth support groups. One LGBTI counsellor also noted that due to the roadshow, more LGBTI people have accessed counselling to discuss coming out, which they are now considering due to the opening up of their communities.

At an organisational level, the roadshow has resulted in an increased awareness, prioritisation and commitment among participating service providers, with attitudes and practice shifts taking place. Service provider respondents reported that the educational session had helped staff to understand the barriers experienced by LGBTI people in accessing their services, and shifted those who were resistant or did not understand that they were not being actively inclusive by ‘treating everyone the same’

Education on correct language has made staff more comfortable in discussing their inclusion practice, with some organisations continuing to use pronoun introductions during workplace meetings. The program also enhanced staff understanding of how inclusion can be strengthened, with the roadshow team providing practical ideas for pursuing low hanging fruit, and bringing about small but important wins within their organisations.

Staff of service providers interviewed during the evaluation reported that LGBTI inclusion had been successfully kept on the agenda and had retained a focus in the context of multiple competing priorities. For some organisations, the roadshow has garnered wider support within the workplace, with several staff now involved in progressing inclusion instead of one individual. Service provider

---

7 The role played by LGBTI advocates was particularly important in fostering empathy and understanding among staff through the sharing of lived experiences. Insights into how the program helped to educate and transform staff perceptions is outlined in Most Significant Change Story 8, in Appendix 5.4.
staff stated that securing the participation of the executive level was essential in ensuring inclusion work was endorsed and prioritised across the agency. Several organisations have seen some success in mainstreaming LGBTI issues across their organisation, with LGBTI inclusion shifting from something that just sits in one section, to something that is taken up by each section. For example, one council reported that their assets and infrastructure team has integrated non-gendered toilets and signage into future infrastructure design, and that their media team is now using inclusive language in media, and using photos which show a variety of families and relationships. For some, the roadshow has helped them to scale up their inclusion work from undertaking ad hoc activities with a few individuals, to establishing projects and partnerships with other organisations which has enabled them to extend impact. A list of these partnerships is provided in Appendix 5.2.

Important systemic changes have been achieved within some service providers. Success in this area is exemplified by the program’s role in facilitating youth mental health organisation Headspace to create a LGBTI youth worker role8 and in encouraging police to nominate themselves and volunteer to become GLLOs officers (LGBTI liaison) in the communities they serve, with the number of GLLOs increasing from 170 to 240 since the roadshow. The program has spurred service providers to develop and / or progress implementation of LGBTI inclusion plans. Common ways in which service providers have progressed inclusion include: bringing diversity into position descriptions: changing the sex question in registration forms to enable responses other than that of male or female; displaying posters and reading materials in waiting rooms; raising the rainbow flag; making events safe and inclusive; and discussing inclusion regularly in their workplace, calling people out for inappropriate comments and using inclusive language. Several organisations reported that they are in the process of developing an LGBTI inclusion staff training program to ensure all staff are trained.

Importantly, the roadshow has helped organisations to progress inclusion in partnership with LGBTI people and has helped to link organisations with LGBTI individuals and groups to obtain their ideas and inputs. There is now a greater number of LGBTI people contributing to reference groups and being engaged by organisations to provide technical advice to help make workplaces and services more inclusive of and accessible to LGBTI people.

Staff of services providers that had begun to progress inclusion prior to the roadshow reported that the roadshow had helped them to strengthen their stance and take inclusion further. Some staff reported that they were initially reticent to attend the events as they were concerned they had not done enough in the area, but found the roadshow praised and endorsed their work, leaving them feeling supported and encouraged. One school reported that the roadshow validated their inclusion stance that they had been struggling to defend due to the conservative views of some parents. The roadshow gave them the impetus to sign up as a safe school and start to talk to the wider community about the school and what it expected from its students and community members. Since the roadshow, this school has seen a range of changes (detailed further in Appendix 5.4 Change Story 4) including holding a Rainbow Day, having a same sex kiss in the school production, televising the marriage equality vote, and instituting gender-neutral toilets and uniforms.

At a community level, the roadshow was commonly reported to have started a conversation that can be difficult to have in rural environments, opening up and pushing boundaries. It has increased community capacity to identify issues, establish networks and work together to address needs and drive community-led action. One of the most important outcomes to result from the program is the establishment of eight new LGBTI groups / networks formed between LGBTI people, individuals and service provider representatives. These groups have provided a platform for LGBTI people and allies to get involved in their communities and contribute their ideas, resources and networks. The

8 This outcome is outlined in Appendix 5.4, Story 5: The kickstart that was needed to support local, grassroots LGBTI advocates.
membership of these groups has continued to grow, with groups developing visions and action plans. The list of these newly established groups is provided in Appendix 5.2 along with examples of the actions they have taken. The program has since supported cross-regional networks and the creation of additional LGBTI networks in the second phase of the roadshow.

Respondents commonly noted a more visible LGBTI presence within their community associated with the roadshow coming which has continued due to the subsequent advocacy, events and discussions that have occurred. The roadshow increased awareness of the work previously being done in communities, and has helped to dispel the myth of a lack of support for LGBTI people in rural communities, with a range of individuals, local organisations and businesses donating equipment and supplies, and providing meeting spaces free of change to address needs during inclusion planning workshops. The roadshow witnessed increased coverage of LGBTI issues and initiatives among local newspaper outlets, with 18 articles produced about the roadshow. In many cases, this was the only time a positive LGTBI story had featured in the local paper. Collectively, these factors have created a groundswell of support which in some instances has widened the political space and increased public political support.

The program met the expectations of different stakeholder groups, with all respondents interviewed stating that the roadshow either met or exceeded their expectations. The program met the needs of LGBTI people who commonly experience isolation and disconnection from services and community, and lack support and connections to drive change, with many reporting that prior to the roadshow they felt like they had to ‘do it alone’. The program has been of extremely high value to LGBTI people. It shined a spotlight and raised the profile of LGBTI issues, brought allies out to support them and built momentum for change. While the program engaged health providers and hospitals, one transgender respondent observed the program could have placed greater focus on engaging GPs who play a critical role in ensuring the physical and mental health of transgender people. It also increased their awareness of available state-based services. Through the program, LGBTI people have established direct links with the Victorian government and LGBTI policy makers. Participants were highly appreciative of the direct line of contact afforded by the Commissioner and the team which enables them to reach out and seek support if needed. The needs of services providers were also well met by assisting staff to understand LGBTI issues, barriers and correct language, identify practical ideas to progress inclusion, garner senior level commitment, and by linking them with LGBTI people and groups to gain inputs to support policy development and implementation.

**Effectiveness Sub-category 2: Sustainability Assessment**

To what extent has sustainability been factored into the program and to what extent are outcomes sustainable, or likely to be?

“In less than 12 months (since the roadshow occurred) we are running a support group with between 14 and 18 young people attending every week. We also took a group of 10 LGBTI young people to the Minus 18 Queer Formal. It is a little prom night for them; all these kids who really would prefer to be wearing a suit, and they’ve been told by their schools they’ve got to be in the white dress – they can dress the way they want to. That’s something that would never have been able to happen before. This roadshow has opened so many doors, and I think those doors are not going to be shut again”.

The program logic for the roadshow has three levels of outcomes: immediate (expected to result during the event), intermediate (expected to result 6 months to 2 years after the event), and longer-term outcomes that the program seeks to contribute to in the longer term. The immediate

---

9 This issue is exemplified in Most Significant Change Story 5, in Appendix 5.4.
outcomes achieved in relation to individual empowerment, formulating of connections friendships, and the knowledge gained by service providers on inclusive languages and practices can be expected to be sustained without additional support. For intermediate outcomes, the evaluation found good evidence of likely sustainability, or evidence of efforts underway to deepen and sustain these outcomes in phase 2. While it is too early to measure the program’s contribution to longer-term outcomes related to economic retention, mental health and well-being, and inclusion and social connectedness, it is likely that the individuals who experienced changes in these area as a result of the roadshow will continue to experience these benefits.

The roadshow’s success in fostering catalytic links and connections between people and organisations both within towns and between surrounding towns, building community commitment and ownership, and developing the capacity of community to analyse, plan and take actions to make their towns more inclusive have helped to foster sustainability. As illustrated in the section above, the momentum and changes sparked through the roadshow have continued to grow, with LGBTI inclusion groups and networks continuing to meet, plan and implement action plans. A range of service providers have also continued to progress inclusion as demonstrated by the partnerships formed between organisations to implement inclusion projects.

The roadshow team are cognisant of the risks to sustainability associated with the delivery of a high-profile event which garnered a high degree of enthusiasm and commitment, that relies on communities progressing LGBTI inclusion in the aftermath. In particular, team members noted the fragility of the LGBTI groups and networks established after the roadshow that are in their early stages of development, and the need to continue to monitor and support them to become self-sustaining. While it is not feasible to expect this degree of sustainability during the first phase of the roadshow, the program has taken good steps to promote sustainability to the extent possible, adopting a strategy of providing remote support, mentoring and encouragement, working behind the scenes to continue to open doors, and conducting follow up visits 3-6 months after the roadshow. During visits the team monitored the progress of LGBTI inclusion groups, and revisited agreed actions identified during inclusion planning workshops to see if they had been achieved. Community respondents reported that they welcomed this process, stating that it helped to hold them to account and continued to motivate them.

Several risks threaten the sustainability of LGBTI groups and networks. A higher demand has now been placed on LGBTI advocates, who lead and participate in groups and are being approached by mainstream organisations to provide inputs into the implementation of diversity plans, resulting in a greater demand for their time and higher workload. LGBTI advocates and allies work on a voluntary basis using their own time and resources, and face risk of burn out. There is also lack of succession for leadership in small towns, with gaps in the confidence and leadership skills of others to take on these roles. Respondents commonly informed of challenges related to obtaining funding support for resources to take forward their inclusion work. It should however be noted that since the roadshow, some groups have been successful in receiving funding grants from local councils.

These risks and challenges related to sustainability have been well identified and responded to in the second iteration of the roadshow which aims to strengthen the institutional capacity of LGBTI groups and networks, and create systemic links between them. To this end, the roadshow has become a regional program which works with and through these structures, and supports them to become self-sustaining. For example, a Community of Practice event was held in 2018 as part of Roadshow 2.0 which enabled different groups across Victoria to come together to share and discuss experiences and communicate priority issues and areas of support required to the Victorian government. The program has also made links with other government initiatives such as the LGBTI
leadership program to support the capacity building of LGBTI advocates, and is linking groups in with grant programs to help them obtain funding.

**Table 4: Effectiveness rating rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Effectiveness Rating: Effectiveness (6/6)</th>
<th>Reach, Depth, Significance of Change: 3/3</th>
<th>Sustainability: 3/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2 – Poor Effectiveness, 3 Low Effectiveness, 4 Fair Effectiveness, 5 Good Effectiveness, 6 High Effectiveness)</td>
<td>How well is the program achieving its intended outcomes?</td>
<td>To what extent are program outcomes likely to be sustained beyond the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U It is not clear if the program is achieving its intended outcomes; a judgement cannot be formed</td>
<td>U It is not clear to what extent the program has addressed sustainability; a judgement cannot be formed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Outputs led to a small level of scale, depth and significance of outcomes</td>
<td>1 Sustainability has not been well considered and/or it is not clear how program outcomes are likely to be sustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Outputs led to a good level of scale, depth and significance of outcomes</td>
<td>2 The program has been designed and implemented with sustainability in mind, though there is room for improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Outputs led to a high level of scale, depth and significance of outcomes</td>
<td>3 Strong efforts have been made to ensure sustainability and evidence of likely sustainability is strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 Factors underpinning the program’s success

“It draws people together, and invites people from within the community, no matter where they sit in the alphabet, to come to connect, and to make a difference”. “It brought out people who otherwise you wouldn’t have known were supportive... if it hadn’t been for that, because no one’s ever walked down the street before and said, come over here if you are supportive of the LGBTI community”. “You’ve got to have allies”.

The following set of factors underpinned the roadshow’s success:

- **Commitment and drive of individuals in communities** - the LGBTI people, allies and others which the program worked with and through in planning and implementation;

- **Team experience and dynamics** - the strong experience of the team in rural community engagement and logistics, and ability to maintain energy and enthusiasm throughout;

- **Engaging LGBTI people as equal partners in the design process** – investing in building relationships, asking and listening, not rushing, and being accountable to them;

- **Physically leaving Melbourne and planning and implementing the program face to face** – to demonstrate commitment and support a genuine two-way exchange;

- **Fostering a broad scope of engagement** - bringing together a range of diverse people including from mainstream, and providing a platform for all interested people to engage and contribute;

- **Use of a strength-based approach** – building on the strengths of individuals and organisations, and acknowledging achievements so that the town and the individuals in it feel celebrated;
• **Use of a community-based approach** – building community capacity and facilitating community led solutions in accordance with the community resources available;

• **Leveraging the power and status of the Commissioner** - to draw people to events and secure the participation of leaders, decision makers, CEOs and senior staff;

• **Use of a multi-faceted approach** to engage resistant people – engaging positively and in a non-adversarial way without endorsing their standpoints;

• **Defining success as more than just getting development outcomes** – planning to ensure participants are comfortable and have a fun and positive experience;

• **Holding events in small, cosy venues** – that are selected by community members themselves that make people feel safe, comfortable and welcome rather than large formal venues;

• **Using a flexible model, not a standard formula** – that has the ability to tailor and adapt program activities to meet the needs of specific towns;

• **Adopting a connected, approachable and grassroots approach** – facilitating direct access to state-based policy makers and using a ‘servant leadership’ style approach;

• **Balancing the delivery of a pre-planned community program with the need to diverge and refocus efforts** – especially when critical individual needs arise.

• **Allowing the regional model to evolve from the community up** - to foster community engagement and community to community links, rather than imposing a regional model and pre-selecting regions from the outset.

2.3 **Challenges and areas for improvement**

“The timelines in small communities are very different, which is something that is quite difficult from a government standpoint. Coming from the city, a lot of the time government departments can have a deadline, and they can get things organised in a week. That’s not the way it works in a small community.”

The roadshow team and program stakeholders identified challenges and areas for improvement:

• **Challenging timeframes and lead time** – making it difficult for partners to promote the roadshow and secure attendance from those requiring advanced notice such as schools;

• **Engagement of hard to reach individuals and groups such as GPs and LGBTI people** – there is a lack of understanding of the barriers and a need to develop targeted engagement strategies;

• **The need to include and formally invite other mainstream community minded groups** - that may not necessarily be inclusive of everyone, such as Lions, Rotary, Probus;

---

10 Members of the team made personal contact with resistant leaders who had expressed discriminatory views, before the event, putting them at ease about the approach, encouraging them to attend. In some cases, the team found it was better not to engage some people, and instead raised the issue to others in the community to solve.

11 The Commissioner and the team adopted a ‘can do’ style of working. In several communities, individuals experienced issues which the team worked quickly to respond to. The team reported that sometimes the session just had to be about that individual and the plan had to be deviated from. The team worked extensively to address the issues of key individuals. This is illustrated through Most Significant Change Story 7 in Appendix 5.4 which shows how the team worked to address the issues of transgender children raised by their mother over the course of a town visit.

12 The team stated that had they forced given regions as the initial model, they would not have had engagement at the local level. While the roadshow has evolved into a regional program, the team reported that the program would not have been successful if they had simply picked the five regions from the outset.

13 Some LGBTI advocates reported that they experienced challenges in engaging other LGBTI people in the roadshow due to a perception among LGBTI people in rural communities that change will come slowly and that it is better to keep a low profile and not advocate.
• **The need for practical policy development tools** – for service providers to draw on in developing LGBTI inclusion policies (examples of templates, plans and guidelines);

• **The need for training guides and LGBTI resources to disseminate** – for service providers developing LGBTI staff training programs and packages;

• **The need to establish closer links within government** - strengthening communication with other departments to foster endorsement and the systematic participation of regional directors.

### 2.4 Learnings for replication

“Anyone that works with any kind of minority could use the roadshow model and do it in a similar way, and have a lot of success from it. Because I feel like Ro Allen, and Martin Foley, and the whole Department of Premier and Cabinet should really be commended on what they’ve done there. It should be used for other minorities as well”.

The roadshow model holds learnings for other government programs working with marginalised groups:

• **The value of physically implementing programs in communities** - bringing in resources, shining a spotlight and focus on the issues and advocates in the town;

• **The value of working in equal partnership with individuals from marginalised groups** - including asking, listing, responding and being accountable to, and supporting them to share their experiences with their communities and play key roles in program;

• **The importance of selecting safe venues and spaces** – asking marginalised groups where they feel safe and creating a safe and non-judgmental environment to have challenging conversations;

• **The importance of identifying and engaging influencers and decision makers** – including those who create roadblocks and bringing them into the process;

• **The importance of bringing in wider mainstream community groups and individuals** – to create links and connections, enabling others to work with and support marginalised groups;

• **The value of developing a basic training model that the community can take back and replicate** – in programs were community is expected to continue to lead its own action.

### 3 Recommendations

12 recommendations have been identified to assist the government to strengthen future phases of the roadshow, and to replicate the development model in other types of programs.

**For the LGBTI Equality roadshow:**

1. Adopt more agile and adaptive communications that can respond to changing circumstances and ensure that the program is able to be promoted through radio and print in regional local areas to broaden participation

2. Continue to support the capacity building of individual LGBTI advocates and the institutional strengthening of LGBTI groups and the links between them

3. Strengthen engagement and alignment with existing Equality Branch, other government departments and initiatives at the state and regional levels, embedding linkages across the program

---

14 The value of this approach is outlined in Appendix 6.4 Most Significant Change Story 1.
4. Continue to make government approachable, accessible and accountable to community.

Based on lessons learned from the Roadshow the following are recommendations that could be applied to other government programs:

(A) When working with and supporting marginalised groups
1. Engage the broader community and a diversity of organisations, creating opportunities for supportive allies from the mainstream to link in with and support marginalised groups
2. Identify and engage people from marginalised groups as equal partners in the design and decision-making process, working with them to identify and create safe environments, and supporting their leadership and engagement within their communities
3. Invest in strategically targeting influencers including those who are resistant, and in bringing them to the table using an encouraging and non-judgmental approach
4. Prioritise the creation of an informal and fun environment to assist communities to have challenging and difficult conversations, working towards the positive experience of participants as an aim in and of itself.

(B) When co-designing community centred engagement projects
5. Travel to communities in the planning phase to undertake the ground work by spending time in communities, meeting people face to face, learning about the context, developing relationships, and returning and following up, taking community timeframes into account
6. Build sufficient flexibility into the design to enable the program to listen to community and adapt elements of the program to meet the needs and contexts of different communities
7. Explore ways to connect small towns in the one shire to increase connections and links, enabling people from different towns to share resources, ideas, connections and effort
8. Invest in working directly with particular communities and monitoring risks at the local level (i.e. if leaders move away or experience burn out) when developing a ‘regional program’ to ensure local community capacity and engagement.

4 Conclusion

The LGBTI Equality Roadshow was a highly successful program which represents excellent Value for Money. The approach of bringing resources to people and designing the program locally, and working with and through LGBTI people within communities has been highly effective. Engaging a broad range of stakeholders, creating opportunities for people to link and connect, and building community capacity to lead action has created a high degree of ownership in communities and has been critical to the program’s success. The program has facilitated important outcomes which have increased inclusion and changed the lives of LGBTI people in ways that are significant to them. The program’s delivery was appropriate to that of rural and remote Victorian communities, investing in face to face engagement and establishing trust and connections between people and state-based policy makers. The second phase of the program is well positioned to further strengthen and deepen the outcomes achieved under the first phase, promoting systemic changes and fostering sustainable groups and networks that support LGBTI inclusion.
5 Appendices

5.1 Program Logic

The Program Logic for the LGBTI Equality Roadshow was developed as part of the evaluation of the roadshow during the desktop review, before the commencement of data collection. It makes explicit the outcomes the roadshow expects to bring about in rural and regional Victorian towns, and how the delivery model and approach seeks to activate these changes. The Program Logic was tested during the evaluation, which validated the theory underpinning the model.

About the program logic

This program logic features three components:

1) A situational analysis which outlines the problems the roadshow seeks to address and the rationale for the program;
2) An outline of the co-design process including the key steps involved in designing the project in collaboration with communities;
3) A Theory of Change comprising of an outcomes chain which articulates the short, intermediate and longer-term outcomes the project aims to facilitate, and a Theory of Action which outlines how the roadshow expects to bring about the changes sought.

Situational Analysis

The LGBTI Equality Roadshow has been designed to respond to a set of issues experienced by LGBTI people identified through research studies and direct consultations with community members as outlined in Section 4, Step 1.

Social exclusion and lack of broader community support

- Experience of discrimination, marginalisation and alienation;
- Higher rates of harassment and abuse, and in some towns homophobic attitudes expressed by publicly by local leaders;
- A lack of local LGBTI visibility, with young people choosing to leave town before they come out due to a homophobic and transphobic climate in towns and lack of safe, stable employment for gender diverse young people;
- A lack of local visibility and support options for adult and older LGBTI people, as well as those friends and families supporting LGBTI people;
- Lack of priority given to LGBTI issues in the media, with some towns never having featured a positive LGBTI story in their local media.

Mental health issues and risks

- Poorer mental health as a result of feeling unsafe and excluded, suffering from addiction and psychological distress, and avoiding seeking care and support because of actual or fear of prejudice and challenges in identifying and accessing welcoming and knowledgeable services;
- Increased risks of self-harm and suicide (LGBTI young people living in rural, regional and remote Australia are over 14 times more likely to attempt suicide).

Lack of resources and accessibility of mainstream service providers

- Lack of education in the medical field about LGBTI issues and absence of resources;
• A lack of LGBTI inclusion in local services, such as local government areas and large health care providers who are commonly the main employers in towns (lack of understanding of the barriers to inclusion, how to create a safe and inclusive environment, and inappropriate use of pronouns by representatives of local services);
• Lack of openness and opportunities of people from remote and rural communities to come together and have conversations about LGBTI issues and experiences;
• A lack of connection and support from state-wide, metropolitan-based LGBTI organisations.

**Lack of continued engagement and support by government programs**

• History of one-off consultations and programs by government and lack of sustained relationships and engagement with state government;
• Opportunity for state government to develop trusting and enduring relationships and deepen its understanding of, engagement with and support of regional and rural LGBTI people.

**Co-design process**

The LGBTI Equality Roadshow used a community co-design process in which the roadshow team engaged with communities extensively before, during and after roadshow visits. The team worked with communities ahead of roadshow visits to understand their priorities and develop a tailored suite of activities for each town and identify the organisations, groups and individuals that should be part of the roadshow events. The co-design process sought to ensure the roadshow established trust with members of remote and regional communities and met their needs and expectations and engendered local ownership.

The core team working in each of the stages of the program included Daniel Witthaus (CEO of the National Institute for Challenging Homophobia Education) who has extensive experience in community engagement with LGBTI people in remote and regional communities and Rowena Doo (Senior Project Officer of the Equality Branch, Department of Premier and Cabinet) who has a background in working in logistics with LGBTI groups. The Roadshow included Ro Allen (the Commissioner for Gender and Sexuality) who has strong links and a respected history working in regional Victoria, representatives from state-based organisations supporting LGBTI communities, Equality Branch staff member David Bulafkin, and LGBTI advocates who travelled to regional and rural towns on a Victoria police bus.

The stages of the co-design process are documented in Table 1 below. While the process varied slightly in different communities, three visits were commonly carried out by the roadshow team prior to the roadshow featuring a series of informal consultations. 23 towns were visited during the roadshow which comprised a series of workshops, dinners and planning sessions (3 towns during the pilot phase and 20 in the main rollout). The Roadshow made a commitment to return to communities three months after the roadshow in response to a clear message given by communities that they wanted the team to come back and continue its support.

**Table 5: Stages of the Co-design process**

| Stage 1: First visit prior to the roadshow | Meet with prominent LGBTI people and other allies and discuss the situation in the town, the key roadblocks to inclusion, their ideas and expectations for the roadshow, what they do and do not want the roadshow to do, and ensuring it is safe and inclusive by asking LGBTI people which venues are safe and appropriate spaces. |
### Stage 2: Second visit prior to the roadshow

**Supportive and warm contacts in service providers**

Reach out to warm and supportive contacts within government and services providers known to LGBTI people. Ask them what local life is like for LGBTI people, how accessible their services are, the best way to engage with mainstream providers, if they would like to attend the roadshow and what they would like to discuss and know more about.

### Stage 3: Third visit prior to the roadshow

**Engaging decision makers and outliers**

Reach out to local decision makers and business leaders (i.e. mayors, CEOs, directors of community services) including those who would not typically engage or have been negative in the past. Invite decision makers to participate in the roadshow, emphasising the wide range of people already attending, and the welcoming spirit of the event.

### Stage 4: The roadshow visit

**Workshop**

Facilitate a workshop with LGBTI people, allies and local service provider representatives which teaches participants about issues faced by LGBTI people, statistics, language and correct terminology, with personal stories shared by local LGBTI advocates.

**Dinner**

Host a dinner (open to all) attended largely by high level leaders such as service provider directors, council, CEOs of businesses, LGBTI people and the Commissioner (networking strongly in the lead up to ensure people who would not typically attend including outliers, people with disability, and those who live more remotely are encouraged and supported to attend (providing transportation).

Support LGBTI people, allies and decision makers to develop LGBTI inclusion plans. Support participants to reflect on what is happening in their town and some of the things they can realistically achieve in the next 3-6 months (these could be simple acts such as offering a meeting space, re-convening the group, or establishing an advisory group). Encourage participants to nominate themselves for actions.

### Stage 5: Return to towns after the roadshow

**Strategising and moving inclusion forward**

Re-convene with the group of people that attended the inclusive planning session (and other interested people), providing an opportunity for them to come together again (while some groups were self-functioning, the majority required external support and a reason to reconvene). Support the group to reflect on what life has been like in the town since the roadshow, and revisit and update the actions outlined in the inclusion plan developed at the roadshow.

---

**Theory of Change**

The roadshow aims to bring about a range of interconnected individual and community outcomes. Figure 3 below depicts the immediate and intermediate outcomes that the program expects to facilitate. The roadshow intends to galvanise support and accelerate change in communities, with many of the intermediate outcomes expecting to flow on as a result of changes brought about during the workshop (with the exception of community capacity to collectively lead action). The diagram also outlines the longer-term outcomes the program aims to contribute to. It is not expected that these longer-term outcomes will be fully achieved, transforming each town through the roadshow alone. Rather, the program aims to contribute to these outcomes, which will continue to be advanced by Roadshow 2.0 and other programs such as the DHHS HEY youth LGBTI grant scheme. The depth and scope of outcomes achieved is expected to be varied depending on the level of inclusion and the degree of homophobia in towns prior to the roadshow.
The Roadshow engages local leaders and media to challenge homophobia and promote understanding.

**Strategies and activities**

- The commissioner, representatives from state based organisations supporting LGBTI communities and LGBTI advocates travel to rural and regional Victorian towns and facilitate information sharing sessions, workshops, dinners and inclusion planning sessions inclusive of a diverse group of local people including LGBTI people, allies, and representatives of local government and mainstream service providers.

**Activities carried out concurrently during the roadshow**

- Local leaders who have expressed homophobic or transphobic views and engaged and brought into the process in a non-adversarial manner
- Increased coverage and positively portrayed stories of LGBTI issues in regional and rural communities
- LGBTI people, allies, government and service provider representatives and decision makers given the opportunity to come together to discuss and analyse issues
- Mainstream providers have increased understanding of the needs, issues and barriers experienced LGBTI people in their communities
- LGBTI Inclusion Plans developed to help people think about how they can be more inclusive in small and realistic ways
- LGBTI people have a greater understanding and links to local and regional services
- LGBTI people make connections and networks with local groups and individuals

**Immediate outcomes** (during / immediately following the roadshow)

- LGBTI people feel safe and supported, welcome and included, and experience a greater sense of belonging and connectedness
- Increased access of and engagement with mainstream services by LGBTI people
- LGBTI people continue established connections and experience reduced isolation

**Intermediate outcomes** (6 months – 2 years)

- Increased community capacity and motivation to continue to analyse and address issues collectively and lead action
- Greater personal empowerment and leadership of LGBTI people and allies who continue to drive inclusive action
- Actions and attitudinal changes break down workplace and community barriers becoming more accessible and inclusion

**Longer term outcomes** (2 – 5 years)

- Inclusion becomes important to individuals and organisations and continues to deepen, strengthen and grow in select towns
- Greater retention and economic inclusion as LGBTI people stay in their communities
- Improved well-being and mental health of LGBTI people
- LGBTI people have a greater understanding and links to local and regional services
- LGBTI people continue established connections and experience reduced isolation

**Activities carried out after the roadshow**

- Strategies and activities
### Table 6: Theory of Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longer term outcomes</th>
<th>How the Roadshow seeks to activate the changes sought</th>
<th>Examples of the types of changes expected</th>
<th>Assumptions and risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1:</strong> Inclusion becomes important to individuals and organisations and continues to deepen, strengthen and grow in select towns</td>
<td>The roadshow aims to build priority for inclusion in towns by having the Commissioner and other state-based organisations travel to towns to publicly display support, focus stakeholders around LGBTI issues, and inspire wider community support. It also aims to raise the profile of LGBTI issues by engaging local media to take up and promote LGBTI issues and inclusion, which in turn is expected to positively influence the broader community who may not have attended the roadshow. The program aims to build the capacity of people to come together, discuss and analyse issues and develop realistic plans to progress inclusion, focusing on ‘low hanging fruit’ to give towns small wins and spur motivation. It aims to build capacity by facilitating sessions during the roadshow, and then providing follow up support afterwards to assist groups to plan strategically. The capacity of groups to be self-functioning and remain motivated is varied, with the majority expected to require ongoing support and to be given projects to organise around in order for collective action to continue. The roadshow also aims to strengthen individual leadership, by supporting LGBTI people to share their stories, and become more empowered, and by encouraging LGBTI people, staff of mainstream providers, and others to nominate themselves to lead change and become more active and visible in the community.</td>
<td>• Individuals who were involved in the roadshow believe inclusion is important and needs to happen in their towns. • Individuals take personal responsibility for contributing to inclusion. • Planning groups established are re-convened after the roadshow, achieving some of the actions and changes identified in inclusion plans. • Local media positively covers the roadshow and continues to cover LGBTI stories and keep issues on the agenda.</td>
<td>• Appropriate targeting of individuals and organisational change agents (individual leaders, decision makers, media). • There is a risk of ‘LGBTI fatigue’ which can be partially addressed through following up with communities. • The Roadshow is relying on the goodwill of staff from service providers to take actions and plans forward; there is a risk that they will be too busy to continue without external support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer term outcomes</td>
<td>How the Roadshow seeks to activate the changes sought</td>
<td>Examples of the types of changes expected</td>
<td>Assumptions and risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2: Greater retention and economic inclusion as LGBTI people stay in their communities</strong></td>
<td>Outcomes in this area are largely expected to result from the realisation of changes in the area of Outcome 3: Improved health and well-being. As society is made more inclusive, it is expected that young LGBTI people may not feel the need to leave rural and regional towns before they come out. This program also aims to contribute to this outcome by making local government service providers and large health care providers - who are commonly the main employers in towns – more inclusive. As this occurs, it is expected that service providers will become more inclusive employers and begin to hire more LGBTI people.</td>
<td>• Schools and families undertaking actions to become more inclusive, accepting and supporting of young LGBTI people. • Some employers hiring LGBTI people.</td>
<td>• This is a longer-term outcome that is not expected to occur unless other outcome areas are realised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3: Improved well-being and mental health of LGBTI people</strong></td>
<td>The Roadshow seeks to bring about this change by informing LGBTI people about the health services available to them at local, regional and state levels. It also works to support health services to become more accessible by informing people who work for health providers of the challenges faced by LGBTI people in this area, teaching them about correct and inclusive language, and giving them opportunity to ask questions in a safe and supportive setting. The roadshow format was designed to facilitate targeted discussions related to family violence, health and wellbeing. Planning sessions were designed to support staff of health providers to identify and take forward tangible actions to enhance accessibility. Activities undertaken to address the social exclusion experienced by LGBTI people in remote and rural communities as outlined below in Outcome 4 are also expected to contribute to this outcome.</td>
<td>• More accessible health service providers (language, inclusive plans, LGBTI people on advisory groups). • An increased number of LGBTI people accessing health services. • An increase in the support networks available to LGBTI people (ie groups, individuals and families). • Improved sense of wellbeing brought about by changes in the Outcome 4 area.</td>
<td>• Influences from service providers can be bought on board. • The roadshow will facilitate genuine interest and intentions among staff of service providers of the need to make changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer term outcomes</td>
<td>How the Roadshow seeks to activate the changes sought</td>
<td>Examples of the types of changes expected</td>
<td>Assumptions and risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4: LGBTI people feel safe and supported, welcome and included, and experience a greater sense of belonging and connectedness</td>
<td>The roadshow targets and actively challenges homophobic views expressed by public influences including mayors. This is achieved by the Commissioner meeting with such figures and trying to change their viewpoints, and having this dialogue covered by the local media, making such public statements increasingly unacceptable and in turn influencing local public opinion. Importantly, the roadshow aims to foster connections between local LGBTI people and other community members and organisations to reduce their isolation. This is expected to happen during the roadshow events, and continue to expand and deepen as LGBTI people continue to maintain links with some of the people they formed friendships and connections with. Local LGBTI advocates are encouraged to share their stories and take on visible leadership roles within their communities, increasing their depth of connection and sense of belonging in communities. The roadshow – and weight of the Commissioner and her role - also seeks to legitimate LGBTI people as part of the community. Educating individuals and groups about how to be more inclusive and kind, and reflect on how they can make small changes also aims to support inclusion at individual, organisations and community levels to support this higher-level outcome.</td>
<td>• Negative views made by local politicians are retracted or stopped, and an ongoing decrease in the public expression of homophobia. • Reduced displays of homophobia and discrimination expressed by individuals and community. • LGBTI people have more connections (friends, links and networks) in towns. • A sense of empowerment experienced by LGBTI people who shared their story. • LGBTI people more welcome and included (invited to council events, asked to help out, walking into services).</td>
<td>• The authority of the Commissioner and her role enables the roadshow to engage with oppositional figures. • The roadshow can galvanise enough support and challenge negative views and assumptions in strongly homophobic towns. • Connections made between LGBTI people and other individuals and groups endure without additional support from the roadshow team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overarching approaches underpinning the Theory of Change

In addition to the strategies and activities used to activate specific outcomes described in Table 2 above, the inclusion roadshow used five overarching strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building trust and local ownership</th>
<th>Co-design process and commitment to return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Image of handshakes]</td>
<td>The co-design process outlined in Section 4 which included designing the project in collaboration with local communities and making a commitment to return underpins the roadshow by fostering trust, local ownership and ensuring the program meets community expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-based</td>
<td>Having the roadshow in towns, rather than bringing people to urban locations or connecting people digitally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Image of location]</td>
<td>The roadshow model emphasises the importance of place, and of centering activities in communities, and tailoring the program to address the unique situations of each town / community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging the Commissioner and state government</td>
<td>Leveraging the authority of the Commissioner, State-Government, and the Victorian Police bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Image of decision trees]</td>
<td>The roadshow uses the authority and legitimacy of government to open doors, bring people to the table and inspire change. The roadshow puts on a show to give people and organisations who have not previously thought about or worked towards inclusion a reason and platform to engage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging outliers</td>
<td>Working extensively behind the scenes to engage influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Image of arrows pointing to a box]</td>
<td>The model recognises the importance of engaging influences and decision makers who block inclusion and would not normally be at the table, and of using the Commissioner’s standing to open doors and engage reticent individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a safe and non-judgement space</td>
<td>Creating a comfortable and informal environment for LGBTI people and service provider representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Image of plant]</td>
<td>The roadshow team asked LGBTI people where they were most comfortable and wanted events to be held. It also sought to make people who did not know much about LGBTI issues feel comfortable enough to ask silly questions, not worry about being too politically correct and have people leave feeling that they had had a good time at the sessions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Value for Money

Value for Money is the ‘optimal use of resources to achieve the intended outcomes. Optimal means ‘the most desirable possible given expressed or implied restrictions or constraints’. Value for money is not about achieving the lowest initial price. Value for Money is commonly assessed in relation to three core dimensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Costs and inputs - What went in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable investment (time and costs) to acquire good quality inputs that will enable realisation of the desired changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Inputs to outputs - What happened?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A measure of productivity; how much you get out in relation to what is put in (increasing output for a given input, or minimising input for a given output, with a regard for maintaining quality).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Outputs to Outcomes - What resulted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the program generating positive and sustainable outcomes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Value for Money assessment framework used to assess the LGBTI Equality Roadshow was first developed in 2014 by the evaluator, Michelle Besley. It has been slightly adapted to suit the program context.

The framework features key questions and a scoring system as presented below in Table X. Each of the three components of Value for Money (Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness) have two sub-components. Each sub-component has a maximum score of 3. When sub-components are combined, each component can achieve a minimum score of 2 and a maximum score of 6. These are aggregated to determine an overall Value for Money score, with the lowest score being 6 and the highest 18.

The approach recognises that development programs are delivered in complex settings, and that context specific factors determine Value for Money options and considerations. A program should therefore only be judged in relation to what it can feasibly and realistically achieve in light of these factors. The approach does not attempt to compare across contexts or programs; assessment is based on how well the program has been designed and delivered to bring about changes in light of the level of investment and operating context and what alternative approaches may have been possible.

Judgement was undertaken by the evaluator based on the evidence obtained from a range of sources outlined in the methodology section of this report. Participant ratings also informed on the assessment. The assessment framework recognises that an assessment can only be made on the basis of evidence; it does not make an unsubstantiated judgement due to lack of evidence or penalise programs by rating Value for Money as poor due to a lack of data. The rating table below features a ‘U’ rating (unknown), meaning a judgement cannot be formed due to lack of data.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Value for Money assessment framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 1: Economy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable investment (time and costs) to acquire good quality inputs that will enable realisation of the desired changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy Sub-category 1: Program Logic Assessment question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the roadshow invested in engaging the right program stakeholders and purchasing the right resources to achieve the changes sought?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy Sub-category 2: Competitiveness Assessment question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has the program kept costs reasonably low while maintaining quality in light of the operating environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Economy Rating: Economy ?/ 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 – Poor Economy, 3 Low Economy, 4 Fair Economy, 5 Good Economy, 6 High Economy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Logic: ?/3</strong> How well has the program directed resources to bring about planned outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U It is not clear if resources have been closely linked to outcomes; a judgement cannot be formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Investment directed to achieve changes is largely inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Some forms of investment directed to achieve changes are appropriate with scope for improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Investment directed to achieve changes is largely appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 2: Efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A measure of productivity; how much you get out in relation to what is put in (increasing output for a given input, or minimising input for a given output, with a regard for maintaining quality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency Sub-category 1: Productivity Assessment Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How well has the program created efficiencies and minimised inefficiencies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency Sub-category 2: Leveraging Assessment Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has the program leveraged off of its the ideas, skills, funds and resources of other individuals / organisations, and government?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Efficiency Rating: Efficiency 5/6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 – Poor Efficiency, 3 Low Efficiency, 4 Fair Efficiency, 5 Good Efficiency, 6 High Efficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity: 2/3</strong> How well have efficiencies been created during program implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U It is not clear how the way in which the program was implemented has supported efficiency; a judgement cannot be formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Program design and implementation was largely inefficient, affecting program quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3: Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the program generating positive and sustainable outcomes?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness Sub-category 1: Reach, Depth and Significance of Change Assessment Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the program produced reasonable reach, level and significance of change in relation to the level of investment, and facilitated outcomes that are important and valuable to stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness Sub-category 2: Sustainability Assessment Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has sustainability been factored into the program and to what extent are outcomes sustainable, or likely to be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Effectiveness Rating: Effectiveness (6/6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 – Poor Effectiveness, 3 Low Effectiveness, 4 Fair Effectiveness, 5 Good Effectiveness, 6 High Effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reach, Depth, Significance of Change: 3/3</th>
<th>Sustainability: 3/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well is the program achieving its intended outcomes?</td>
<td>To what extent are program outcomes likely to be sustained beyond the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>It is not clear if the program is achieving its intended outcomes; a judgement cannot be formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>It is not clear to what extent the program has addressed sustainability; a judgement cannot be formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Outputs led to a small level of scale, depth and significance of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sustainability has not been well considered and / or it is not clear how program outcomes are likely to be sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outputs led to a good level of scale, depth and significance of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The program has been designed and implemented with sustainability in mind, though there is room for improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outputs led to a high level of scale, depth and significance of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strong efforts have been made to ensure sustainability and evidence of likely sustainability is strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Program Results – supplementary information

Project and partnerships formed
A range of partnerships have been formed from connections between LGBTI people, individuals and representatives of community, with a range of joint projects and initiatives taking place including:

- Having LGBTI people / groups input into the Diversity Plans, sit on steering groups and consult on LGBTI inclusion issues and solutions for service providers and local businesses
- Establishment of a project between the LGBTI community and Neighbourhood House “Where is it safe, where can you go?” (funded by council)
- Establishment of a training program for people to be peer supporters for health workers, a collaboration between Alphabet Soup partnered with Neighbourhood house
- Establishment of the Rainbow Writers, Ballarat Scribblers; a group of around 8 LGBTI writers meet fortnightly (gives people over the age of 25 a space to connect, socialise and do some creative writing)
- Partnership formed between Bond Aluminium (major employer in the town linked nationally and to other workplaces) and pride network youth group (for employment links).

Increased number of LGBTI groups / networks formed
Eight LGBTI networks have been established since the program. These groups comprise of LGBTI people and individuals and allies from a range of mainstream organisations that attended the roadshow such as representatives from health providers, local councils, schools and police:

- North central LGBTI group (90 members)
- Swan Hill committee
- Wimmera Pride Group
- Ballarat Pride Hub
- Greater Shepparton LGBTI+ Community Alliance
- Albury-Wodonga alliance
- SCIN South Coast Inclusion Network
- The Pride of east Gippsland” (242 members).

Increasing the momentum of group activities and the number, scope and types of activities they have been able to get moving
- Increasing awareness and visibility through events such as IDAHOBIT day, Rainbow Days and balls
- Developing a performance ‘being frank’ sponsored by Transgender Victoria
- Development of training programs with the intent to roll out to other orgs and service providers using the roadshow’s concept
- Making certificates to thank businesses for their support
- Providing support to make places and events more inclusive (ie Greater Shepparton’s Inaugural Pride Cup, in football and netball clubs).
5.4 Most Significant Change Stories

**Story 1: A training model that is raising awareness and can be implemented locally**

The roadshow did an excellent job raising the awareness of different people and groups in the community through educating people about LGBTI language and issues. People from the local towns are not educated in these areas; they think there are just gay, lesbian and bi-sexual people. So, it was really important just to do those basics. When the roadshow team went through the alphabet, it really inspired a lot of people.

The roadshow created a lot of awareness; LGBTI people are being a lot more accepted now. I am an LGBTI person and live in a small community, and in the lead up to the marriage equality vote, when I was involved in the Yes campaign, I had 38 envelopes handed to me by people saying, “I want you to post my Yes vote”. People did this as a way of showing me their support.

When the roadshow came through our area (shire consisting of several towns), it brought the whole shire area together. Since the roadshow we have continued to network and have established a group made up of LGBTI people, allies, health professionals, school principals and the police that spans the area. We are a group of 15 people from different towns and we travel from community to community, having our meetings in different places. Our group’s motto is IES (Information, Education and Support) and we work on that basis. When I was growing up there was no support or information, that is why I’m very passionate about networks and education.

Our group is planning to running a similar training program across community organisations and health service providers to raise awareness. The model and approach used by the roadshow is a basic model. But it is also a model that we can bring back to and implement in our community to educate those that could not attend the roadshow workshops.

Our group is currently developing an awareness training session called ‘about me’. We’ve got people from our group located in different towns to tell their stories in the training. We’ve got myself as gay, another group member who is bisexual, and intersexual, another member who is transgender, and an ally who works at a health service. We’re going to do a 10-minute talk about what it’s been like for us growing up, and give people the opportunity to ask us any questions.

**Story 2: Systemic changes brought about by communities**

There have been a range of systemic changes that the communities have brought about as a result of the work taken forward by different community members, groups and organisations since the roadshow.

One of the greatest systemic changes is the increased number of LGBTI-specific workers in Headspace; this relates to federal and is not even in the jurisdiction of the Victorian Government. Systematic changes are also demonstrated by the number of local governments that raised flags and did things in IDAHOBIT this year compared to last year. The number of police volunteer Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex Liaison Officers (GLLOs) which has increased from 170 to 240 since the roadshow which the program encouraged by engaging with and educating the police. More community health services, hospitals and councils have also now worked to make their Diversity Plans LGBTI inclusive.
When we look at all the changes made by communities, and all the actions listed on whiteboards during the inclusive community planning sessions that they have now ticked off on; we (DPC) did not do one of those things – the community did them all on their own. The communities haven’t realised how much work they’ve all done, and they just say, “It’s the roadshow.”

But in fact, we just swept into town, created that environment, got the right people together and learned about the town and their issues. I think part of the success was that we didn’t do it with a stick, we did it with a carrot. Creating a safe, inclusive and non-judgmental space was key. We created spaces where people could break bread and engage with each other. All of a sudden, people found themselves on the same level, a transgender woman from the town, or gay couple that run the milk-bar would be in the same place as government regional directors, and would find themselves on the same level. Now that we’ve got them meeting each other and pushing their own barrows, it’s amazing.

**Story 3: Finding new connections and friendships**

I used to regularly travel from Melbourne for work up to one of the country towns. I was thinking of moving there and a lot of my friends said, “Look, you’re transgender; it won’t be safe to live in a country town.” I asked about the experience of other trans people in country towns, and people told me that they were just tolerated.

But the roadshow came through just before I moved up here. I thought we might get five or six people around a table, but here was about 40 people; we had teachers, nurses, police, and people from the community health centre and neighbourhood house. I think it really dispelled the myth that there was no support for LGBTIQ people in country towns. It was life-changing, because it made me feel welcomed. So by the time I actually moved into the town, I felt safe, and involved.

One of the most significant things for me was that we had people come along that weren’t necessarily from an organisation, and they weren’t LGBTIQ; they just came along to learn. Two of the best friends I’ve got in town came to that meeting, and if they hadn’t come to that, if the roadshow hadn’t come to town, I wouldn’t have met them. But when I first moved in, they invited me around to their place for dinner, and I think that sense of individual inclusion is really important, to be invited into a community. The roadshow was important for me in starting friendships.

The roadshow brought people out of the woodwork. Because it was high profile, it broke through a lot of the structures that we would typically come up against when trying to get involvement and commitment from different organisations, services and groups.

It was the first time that LGBTIQ issues were actually the agenda for a meeting. In country towns, often there’s a person in the community health centre that is there to talk about and work on a range of issues such as family violence, indigenous issues and LGBTI issues. There are all these things, and often they get overwhelmed. It was interesting just to have a meeting and a function that just centred around LGBTIQ.

**Story 4: The green light and endorsement for schools to embrace inclusion**

Our community is very conservative. I think people knew that there were members of the LGBTI community in our city and surrounding areas, but people chose to ignore it or pretended it didn’t exist. We, as teachers, knew that suicide rates were high in our areas and a lot of these were male
adolescents who were having gender identity issues. Our wellbeing staff here at school who work on
the ground with students knew that there were issues here.

Before the roadshow came, we had some students at the college who tried to start an LGBTI group
at school, who just wanted to meet. We also have a very supportive principal and were already
incorporating Respectful Relationships and Safe Schools materials into our classes and curriculum in
health and PE. But teachers were fearful of approaching the topic because they didn't really know
the framework of how to approach it. They were fearful they would be criticised and people would
come in and criticise the school publicly.

When the roadshow came along it all came together at a really good time because we were building
a new school culture and we wanted our new school to be as inclusive as it could be; whether that
be buildings or policies. In a way we just needed permission really to launch where we were
heading. The roadshow was the door that allowed us to open it up and show our support. It gave
everyone in the school community permission to be an ally and it put us up a gear in terms of where
we could go.

There were a couple of things we had started on which the roadshow created the momentum for us
to push forward on. Since the roadshow the college has: televised the marriage equality vote on TV
for students to see; raised the flag for IDAHOBIT; developed a diversity and inclusion policy; bought
staff rainbow badges; installed gender-neutral toilets and adopted a gender-neutral uniform. We
even had a same sex kiss on stage as part of our school production.

Another important change is that kids are picking up on language and reporting things if they hear
something is wrong, for example, if a staff member says "Don't throw like a girl". We have students
questioning some of our programs targeting girls or boys in a way that promotes gender stereotypes
that we are now looking into. I really hope these changes make LGBTI kids feel safe enough to be
who they want to be. I'm very proud to say that we actually have a student this week who decided
to change their gender and we are using a different name and pronouns. It's emotional for me
because years ago someone like that might have committed suicide; I think the roadshow has
helped all this.

**Story 5: The kickstart that was needed to support local, grassroots LGBTI advocates**

When it comes to LGBTI particularly in rural places, people talk about service gaps. But for LGBTI
there's nothing but gap most of the time which makes it really hard to work out clear priorities.
When people haven't even started to identify that it is a massive service gap; it's a vacuum. It can be
hard to get people to respond to that need because they haven't yet realised or decided it is an
issue.

I co-founded a regional LGBTI network / project and we were trying to address issues around service
gaps. The roadshow came and due to the influential people in the room, so many different people
came along to these events. We had business leaders, service providers, LGBTI people themselves,
local police, the local hospital, health providers and a lot of teachers. They hear that the State
Government is coming to town, and feel they need to be there. It was a big melting pot of everybody
we needed in a room to make decisions for our area. It has addressed so many issues, and has been
the kick start that so many people needed. As a result, the conversations I'd been trying to have for
two years before the roadshow, suddenly I could have them, because these service providers and
business people were on board.
At the inclusive planning session, where the roadshow asked what we can take back to do at our work, Headspace, which was just opening up in our area, said “we need to look for a support person for LGBTI youth; we’re going to take this back to our consortium, and we’re going to see if we can get a youth worker employed for LGBTI issues.” As a result, I am now their one day a week employed worker for LGBTI issues. This was one of the most tangible things in terms of immediate pay off. Our LGBTI network has now also got more funding and support.

In less than 12 months we are running a support group with between 14 and 18 young people attending every week. We also took a group of 10 LGBTI young people to the Minus 18 Queer Formal. It is a little prom night for them; all these kids who really would prefer to be wearing a suit, and they’ve been told by their schools they’ve got to be in the white dress. They can dress the way they want to. That’s something that would never have been able to happen before. This roadshow has opened so many doors, and I think those doors are not going to be shut again.

**Story 6: The power to be me, to speak up, and hold government to account**

When I moved to the town around ten years ago, there were not visible signs of LGBTI support anywhere; nothing was mentioned on the local shire or health services websites. I got very lonely and depressed and was thinking about suicide. I knew of a support group in Melbourne, so I used to go there for support, and to socialise because there was nothing here.

About three years ago, at the age of 64, I made the decision to identify my true self and began dressing myself as a woman and I found I could do it without any worry. There was a girl I knew through a work mate, and I attached myself to her and that started me getting out. Because I knew I could go to that supermarket near her work, and I knew I’d have someone there if I needed them.

The roadshow came to town and I got the invite to go on the bus to travel to different towns as a local advocate. Friendships really blossomed on the bus trip; we got to know and understand each other and have kept in contact. I told my story to different people including health workers, Shire people, police, community workers, and community members. I felt empowered again.

For me, personally, I grew because I actually got to speak my story in my home town. It’souted me in my home town more than I was before. It’s summed up by a guy who hadn’t seen me since I retired from work a year ago, who read an article about me and Ro Allen at the roadshow, he came up to me and said, “Haven’t you put yourself out there? Well done, good on you. You’ve probably saved a life, but you’ll never know it.” And I think, “That’s the roadshow.”

Personally, it gave me more power to be me. At community dinners every time Ro Allen stood up to speak, she would always do the traditional owners and welcome, and then she would acknowledge her LGBTI elders, and on one occasion she indicated she was referring to me. One day I said to her, “Ro, I’ve worked out what you mean by elder. It’s because of my age, and what I do, and what I know within the community.” And she just smiled at me; so I worked out what she meant. I’ve been given that power; I now use this when I speak at community events.

Our shire passed a motion that they would publicly support marriage equality, however they did not deliver on this commitment. I went to the local council community consultation meeting and I said “I’m standing here as an LGBTI elder”. The mayor said, “You’re here to talk about marriage equality.” I said, “No, I’m here to talk about council’s not promoting the motion which they committed to”. Because I became good friends with the general manager of Switchboard Victoria on the bus, I called her up beforehand and asked her what key statistics and information I should present to the council.
I presented these to the mayor and councillors, reporters and people in the public gallery and told them “it’s about time you really, really did, do what you said you would do”.

No action was taken, they just said “We better put our running shoes on hadn’t we? Thank you for your time.” As I left, a couple of old guys in their 70s got up and they all said, “Well done, you really gave it to them, and I’m voting, “Yes.”

**Story 7: My family, our rights, and saving lives**

I have children who are transgender, and who have been the first in their schools, and probably some of the most prominent in our region. We didn’t have any real resources or professionals that knew how to help us either. I’m quite an educated person myself, but I really didn’t know how to get the support within my community. All the supports that we had were in Melbourne, based at the Royal Children’s Hospital.

I didn’t know what the roadshow would be when I first heard about it. When I walked into the room at one of the roadshow events, I was very surprised and found it was a way of inclusively inviting all stakeholders in the LGBTI community, and allies, community members and partners to come together, share resources, share understanding, and just promote inclusion within the community, especially in the rural region.

What the roadshow did was give me the direct links within my community. But more importantly, they also informed us of our rights, and were able to help. By the end of the roadshow, and by the time that they’d left, my children for the first time had their own names on Medicare cards, Centrelink cards, and had some identification, rather than having to be a nameless, faceless someone, or using their pre-gender name.

Out of the roadshow, and out of some petitioning and other work behind the scenes with amazing people in our community, and our wonderful city council, we have a rainbow flag flying. For my children and the local youth group of gender-queer identifying kids, that was a symbol that it was okay, and that they had a place. They weren’t displaced; they were part of the town, and they were acknowledged as such.

For my family, it was lifechanging and lifesaving. In a time that was in the middle of the marriage equality plebiscite, where my children were a huge target, and were actively targeted by negative campaigning integrated into our homes (through television, media, social media), the roadshow gave me a forum to seek some safe, secure and genuine assistance.

In my family circumstance, it really was the difference between survival and non-survival. I also think that it’s opened up a new dialogue, and a new age in regional Victoria, where our community feel like part of the community. We’re not these little fringes anymore.

**8: Making health service providers and the broader community more inclusive**

I work for a health service as a Community Development Worker and am responsible for helping our organisation to implement its diversity plan. When discussing with our staff how accessible our services were for LGBTI people, the common thing people would say was ‘we treat everyone the same’. For me, that is a key indicator that we’ve got a long way to go because there are certain groups that need to be treated differently and we need to understand the accessibility barriers for those people and understand how they want to be treated.
I’m an ally; I’m not LGBTI, but I have LGBTI family members. I had an uncle, who’s no longer with us, who hid his sexuality all his life. He was never safe to come out and I don’t want to see that in our community. So for me, personally, it’s very important that we treat LGBTI people with respect, and that they’re safe and supported. I want to help be part of the change to make communities more inclusive, so that no one feels that they can’t be part of their community.

I was involved in spreading the word to all my contacts and getting the message out to the community and to all the other service providers, community groups to show that this is something that we all need to work on, not just the health service and the government, it’s all of the community. The significant change is that we’re talking; we’ve got community groups, local government, service providers, allies and supporters and community all talking about the same topic, about supporting LGBTI people.

The roadshow has been a great opportunity to raise that awareness of our staff and get them engaged. People from my workplace attended the roadshow including the CEO. They learned about the importance of knowing and respecting peoples’ pronouns, which was an eye-opener for people. Staff then attended an inclusive practice training where we all had to introduce ourselves and then state our pronouns. I found quite a few people after that event were actually introducing themselves using the pronouns as well in a meeting sense, so this has really caught on in our workplace. We also looked at our intake process for community health and made changes to the sex question on the registration form to provide more options than just male or female.

From the roadshow, we started an LGBTI regional network across our region which now has 90 members. The roadshow was a starting point, the start of the conversation and provided the networking and partnership building opportunities that we needed to get together the people who needed to be there. Some people from the health service provider I work for are also part of this group. It’s been important to get other people from my workplace on board to grow the momentum. I want to get it to the point where if I am unable to continue the LGBTI inclusion work in my workplace, that it doesn’t fall over. Having more passionate people in my workplace helps it to become sustainable.

**Story 9: Creating a groundswell to foster public political support**

I’m from a small rural community. The roadshow came at the perfect time, and supported the work that was beginning in our community. The most significant change was the personal impact the roadshow had on one of our LGBTI community advocates - a gay man who became very vocal and prominent in our community as a result of the roadshow.

At the time, he was starting a groundswell movement, and the roadshow really got him going. It created a lot of publicity and brought out people who otherwise you wouldn’t have known were supportive, to create a supportive environment and build momentum. It made the LGBTI community more visible, so there were people that were identified as either being part of that community or at least very supportive of it that you wouldn’t have known about if it hadn’t been for that. No one’s ever walked down the street before and said, come over here if you are supportive of the LGBTI community.

The LGBTI leader and advocate is capable, and has boundless energy, and he has been very generous with his time and has used his own resources to give to the community. But as capable as he is, he needs support in some areas too. The roadshow has enabled people to work with him and support him; we have an inclusion officer at the council who has been very receptive to working with him.
and has given him a lot of support. He has done a fantastic job. It couldn’t have worked any better, because he was kind of starting a groundswell movement, and that really got him going, and encouraged him to keep going.

We had the marriage equality vote come after the roadshow. The council in general were publicly supportive of LGBTI people - even though there were a few council members who I imagine were personally opposed and most likely would have personally voted no. However, if an issue was raised in the community, they would voice their support. Council members are politicians after all; when they see the groundswell of support, they are able to say “well, maybe this is not something I strongly believe in personally, but my community obviously does, therefore I’m going to support it publicly because it’s a vote that their constituents care about”. The roadshow played its part in that, I think, because it brought out that groundswell support.

**Story 10: A safe space for budding LGBTIQ writers to create and share**

I attended the roadshow as a person who was just interested in finding out what it is was. I am a queer-identified, cisgendered woman. I didn’t know all that much about the roadshow and I didn’t know it was coming. I saw the bus and Ro Allen and the merchandise was what actually got me there. My son went and picked up some merchandise, one of the little squeeze buses.

I missed the forum as a result of not having the awareness that the events were on. But I managed to make it to the dinner which was fantastic. I got to know and talk to a lot of people in my own community and learn about the things they were doing that I had no idea existed. I have since formed some pretty strong bonds with some of them. In terms of the dinner, that was that beginning space.

The inclusion seminar was where everything took off. I sat there and I listened and I watched what was written up on the board of existing facilities, programs and different things that are available for the LGBTIQ community. I saw a strong push towards younger people, and it wasn’t until towards the end I put two and two together. “Well, there’s the library, and there’s me as a writer-publisher, let’s see what we can come up with together”. As a result, I started a writing group for LGBTIQ people over the age of 25.

I had a series of conversations over the next six weeks that pulled together for us to launch in May 2017, with a once a fortnight group. I contacted the representative of the town library. The library has supplied us everything for free including the photocopying, tea and coffee supplies and a meeting room.

The creative writing group has been able to give LGBTIQ people over the age of 25 a space to connect and socialise and do some creative writing. It’s a connective space, with varying numbers. We’ve had a core group last year of about six to eight people. It’s just something that I’m so proud to say that I was able to manage. My dream is to be able to take it further and expand into other regional towns.

The writers’ groups were a space for me where I started writing stories 14 years ago for a hobby. A tutor in one of my six-week courses that I did at a Neighbourhood House said to me, “you actually have something here”. That little push was enough to nudge me into my career. Those writers’ groups that I attended with him were my saving grace. The other flipside of it was that I could not be an out, queer writer, with the genre that I write in. So when I established this writers’ group, I said the only specification for this group is that you have to identify on the spectrum of LGBTIQ so that we can all have a very safe space to be able to talk about whatever it is.
5.5 Detailed evaluation methodology

The evaluation adopted a mixed methods and participatory methodology. Methods were selected to cover the breadth of experiences across stakeholder groups, while also exploring the effectiveness and impact of the program. A series of in-depth consultations were carried out with respondents from different stakeholder groups. Two locations were selected for face to face consultations to support an assessment of how the program adapted and responded to different contexts including location size and levels of inclusion prior to the roadshow. These locations included Wycheproof (a small regional town in the center of the Shire of Buloke, in north western Victoria) and Horsham (a regional city in the Wimmera region of western Victoria).

Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluation was guided by a set of key evaluation questions:

1. What is the impact and value of the program?
2. How effectively has the program been co-designed and delivered to meet the needs and expectations of community stakeholders?
3. Does the program represent Value for Money?
4. What lessons can be learned and recommendations made to strengthen and replicate the program?

The main report includes a summary of findings and evidence against each key evaluation question. Findings in relation to questions 1-3 are presented using a Value for Money Framework in Section 2.1. Findings in relation to question 4 are presented in sections 2.2 and 4.

For each key evaluation question, various lines of evidence were gathered from a range of sources. The table below outlines the evidence collect against each evaluation question, and the methods employed to collect this evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key evaluation question</th>
<th>Evidence required</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What is the impact and value of the program? | • Stakeholder perceptions on the changes that have occurred at different levels (individual, organisational and community) and their likely sustainability  
• Stakeholder perceptions on the significance of the spectrum of changes achieved and their importance to them.  
• How LGBTI participants rate the value of the roadshow compared to alternative models. | • Desk-based review of existing documentation  
• Interviews with program stakeholders  
• Most significant change stories  
• Review of newspaper articles  
• Follow-up planning group reports which record the extent to which inclusion planning groups have achieved planned actions. |
| 2. How effectively has the program been co-designed and delivered to meet the needs and expectations of community stakeholders? | • Expectations of the different stakeholders prior to the roadshow’s commencement  
• Stakeholder perceptions on the quality and value of the co-design process and implementation of activities  
• Extent to program activities appropriately consider the needs of different stakeholder group  
• Perceptions of program stakeholders on the activities that were most useful in helping to address the problem | • Pre-roadshow consultation notes/reports  
• After-event monitoring reports featuring participant feedback  
• Interviews with program stakeholders  
• Most significant change stories |
### Key evaluation question | Evidence required | Data collection methods
--- | --- | ---
3. Does the program represent value for money? | • Program budget and list of all program costs and funding expenditure  
• List of resources, materials and funds provided to the program on a pro-bono or low-bono basis  
• Strategies used to maximise efficiencies and missed opportunities  
• Investment in learning and implementation of learnings for program improvement  
• Outcomes and sustainability of outcomes | • Program budgets and financial expenditure reports  
• Project pilot learning documentation and how this is used in design documentation  
• Interviews with participants and program staff  
• Information drawn from question 1 related to outcomes and their sustainability |
4. What lessons can be learned and recommendations made to strengthen and replicate the program? | • Stakeholder perceptions on what did and did not work well and what could have been improved  
• Factors underpinning success  
• Challenges encountered by the program team and how they were addressed  
• Evidence drawn from other evaluation questions | • Program documentation outlining lessons learned during pilot phases and throughout implementation  
• Interviews with program participants and staff  
• Independent analysis based on findings in relation to questions 1-3 |

### Document Review

The desktop review entailed an analysis of program documentation related to the program from the period February 2016 to December 2017 provided by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Other data such as newspaper articles and social media articles written by project participants. Included documents were coded thematically according to the key evaluation questions. Recurring themes from the data were then identified within each of the key evaluation questions and drawn together in a summary of findings. The following documents were included in the desktop analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>Pilot LGBTI Equality Roadshow pilot reflection</td>
<td>Program documentation</td>
<td>2/12/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>LGBTI Equality Roadshow 1.0 – Framework and Outcomes Titled ‘Attachment A’</td>
<td>Program documentation: Co-design and Engagement Framework</td>
<td>26/10/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>LGBTI Equality Roadshow 2.0 – Framework and Policy Direction</td>
<td>Program documentation for Phase 2 framework</td>
<td>23/8/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>Project Concept Note – January 2016</td>
<td>Program design documentation</td>
<td>4/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>Charter Rural and Regional Roadshow</td>
<td>Program Charter</td>
<td>20/5/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>Roadshow Planning Charter</td>
<td>Program planning parameters, frameworks, protocols</td>
<td>31/5/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bendigo Advertiser</td>
<td>Families navigate gender diversity Parent support imperative</td>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bendigo Advertiser</td>
<td>EDITORIAL Life not black and white for gender-diverse</td>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>12/1/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colac Herald</td>
<td>Equality vote thrills mum</td>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>11/12/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents
A total of 44 people were consulted as part of the evaluation from the following stakeholder groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Number Consulted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI people</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service providers: local councils (2), schools (5), CEO (1), Health service providers (8)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those consulted took part in semi-structured interviews or focus group discussions. Interviews were carried out during face to face visits to the two localities, and during an event held in Melbourne as part of the subsequent phase of the roadshow that brought participants together. A series of phone interviews were also conducted with people from different stakeholder groups from a range of different localities. Data collection took place April to June 2018.
While the evaluators sought to engage a balanced representation across stakeholder groups, they experienced difficulties in securing the participation of some stakeholder groups including police and CEOs / leaders (with only one CEO interviewed). While the evaluators made several attempts to contact representatives of these respondent groups. This is a limitation of the evaluation that needs to be considered alongside the findings of this report.

**Most significant change stories**

Interviews with program participants also included the collection of Most Significant Change. Ten of these stories have been documented and presented in Appendix 5.4. These stories were then analysed by program staff at the Evaluation Workshop. These stories form part of the evidence base that have informed the evaluation findings.

**Evaluation Workshop**

The Evaluation Workshop was held with the roadshow team in July 2018. This workshop provided staff an opportunity to input their own perspectives on the interpretation of the data. The key purposes of the Evaluation Workshop were to present and test the information collected, the preliminary analysis formed and judgements reached, and jointly develop recommendations to inform ongoing or future work.