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## Acronyms and abbreviations

AAT Administrative Appeals Tribunal

ART Administrative Review Tribunal

AHRC Australian Human Rights Commission

ART Administrative Review Tribunal

CLC Community Legal Centres

CLE Community Legal Education

CT Communications Team

DA Data Analyst

DHA Department of Home Affairs

DoJ Department of Justice

ELT Executive Leadership Team

FCFCOA Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia

MP Member of Parliament

PM Program Manager

PDS Project Delivery Staff

PL Principal Lawyer

PV Protection Visa

SL Senior Lawyer

SCALES Southern Communities Advocacy Legal and Education Service Inc.

SROI Social Return on Investment

## Project background

### Program context

*What is the broader context of your program, and what issue/s does it aim to address? Answer questions such as what is the problem? Where are we now? Where are we going? How will we get there?*

The protection visa system in Australia plays a significant role in ensuring safety and support to individuals fearing persecution. A well-functioning system ensures that all individuals seeking protection have access to fair and timely decision-making processes.

The protection visa system in Australia has extensive backlogs, resulting in significant delays in processing and reviewing onshore Protection Visa (PV) applications. These delays are compounded by backlogs at both the merits and judicial review stages, hindering the timely entry of migrants seeking protection (Law Council of Australia; 2023). The Administrative Review Tribunal (ART) has an active migration workload of over 50,000 cases, with a backlog of about four years (Law Council of Australia; 2023). According to the Refugee Council of Australia, onshore protection visa applicants wait an average of 2.4 years for a main decision from the Department of Home Affairs, 3.6 years for a merit-based review from the ART, and 5.1 years for court appeals. This means some applicants may wait up to 11 years for a final decision (Refugee Council of Australia). If no targeted intervention occurs, this situation is likely to lead to more inefficiencies, heightening the vulnerability, poverty, and exploitation of those seeking protection. This will also impede Australia's ability to effectively and efficiently manage its migration system (Media Release: Restoring Integrity to Our Protection System; Refugee Council of Australia). (Law Council of Australia; 2023; [Refugee Council of Australia](https://www.refugeecouncil.org.au/refugee-council-welcomes-investment-in-protection-visa-reform/), 2023). In response, the Australian Government has allocated $48 million to strengthen essential legal assistance services, providing critical support throughout the PV process (Law Council of Australia; 2023). These investments are expected to reduce decision wait times and improve the overall efficiency of Australia’s onshore protection system (Refugee Council of Australia). Nevertheless, substantial reform will require time to tackle the backlogs (Law Council of Australia; 2023; Giles, 2023). Addressing the backlog is crucial not only for the wellbeing of applicants, but also for the broader interests of Australian society.

Circle Green Community Legal is the only legal service in Western Australia with specialist humanitarian and protection expertise that has received funding (over 2024-25) to boost legal assistance and support applications throughout the PV journey, including merits review and judicial review stages. As the only community legal centre in WA with expertise in refugee status determination, Circle Green engages with a cohort of protection visa applicants experiencing significant disadvantage by, offering legal advice and assistance to people who are unable to access private lawyers. Many clients in this group experience additional barriers including financial, literacy, language and other factors such as family violence or disability, making it even more challenging for them to self-represent protection claims.

Circle Green brings expertise in delivering holistic, trauma-informed, client-centred legal services that address both legal and non-legal needs. With over two decades of experience in client-centred legal service delivery, Circle Green is uniquely positioned to address the growing demand for legal assistance in the protection visa process and is well-placed to contribute significantly to reduce the legal system’s backlog and provide much-needed support to people navigating Australia’s complex legal framework.

Circle Green will use the funding to design and deliver a holistic, trauma-informed, innovative, and sustainable model of service to help reduce the backlog in protection visa caseloads at initial and appeals stages. By expanding access to legal representation for protection visa clients, this service will contribute to improving case management efficiency at the Administrative Review Tribunal (ART) and Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (FCFCOA), as well as ensuring a fairer decision-making process.

### Goals and objectives

*What specific goals and objectives will your project work towards?*

The goals and objectives of the PV Project are to:

1. Contribute to reduced protection visa case backlogs and improve long-term efficiency and fairness in the Protection Visa system.
2. Secure long-term funding for a sustainable, efficient and effective PV and Appeals legal service.
3. Establish a scalable, sustainably structured PV and Appeals legal service that is client-centred and trauma-informed. Demonstrate financial and social benefits to the justice system through avoided costs, supported by data-driven decision-making. This includes monitoring efficiency and effectiveness, achieving positive Social Return on Investment (SROI), and advocating for evidence-based improvement to the PV system.
4. Provide all clients with comprehensive, best-practice legal advice, and eligible clients with full representation, throughout all stages of the PV process. Enable clients to actively participate, understand their rights, and explore all available options.
5. Strengthen coordination and efficiency in PV and Appeals service delivery by strengthening partnerships with government agencies, legal service providers, and community organisations. Build legal capacity and skills in protection and humanitarian immigration law across WA’s legal assistance sector.
6. Develop and share clear, accessible educational materials to improve understanding of the PV decision-making process and empower individuals to navigate it effectively.
7. Advocate for systemic change and policy reform to address the root causes of inefficiency and unfairness in the onshore protection visa framework and decision-making process.

**Circle Green will actively promote a culture of collaboration and knowledge sharing within the legal assistance sector to enhance the capacity for providing high-quality legal services to individuals seeking protection.**

**Clients will be empowered by legal education and information, allowing them to actively  engage in the process while also understanding their rights and options. The organisation will actively advocate for systemic change and policy reform to address the root causes of inefficiencies and unfairness within the protection visa system.**

## Purpose and approach

### Evaluation purpose

*What the purpose of the framework, why is the evaluation being conducted, and what are its key focus areas? (Useful resource:* [*Better Evaluation*](https://www.betterevaluation.org/frameworks-guides/rainbow-framework/frame/decide-purposes)*)*

The evaluation is intended to provide accountability to the State Government of WA, Department of Justice (and Federal Department of Home Affairs), contribute to a broader protection visa evidence base, while also inform decision making to support learning and continuous improvement at Circle Green (formative), and advocacy. Over the course of the project, the evaluation will focus on the following areas:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * 1. Process evaluation | * assessing program fidelity\* and implementation design. |
| * 1. Outcome (impact) evaluation | * measuring intended intermediate and long-term outcomes. |
| * 1. Social Return on Investment (SROI) | * analysing the measurable avoided costs and positive SROI. |

\* Program fidelity = an assessment of planned vs. actual activities

### Evaluation approach

*What approach will you use to conduct the evaluation? (Useful Resource:* [*Clear Horizon Academy*](https://learn.clearhorizon.com.au/course/choosing-evaluation-methods)*)*

The evaluation will adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining program data, questionnaires, project meetings, focus groups, workshops and case studies to provide a comprehensive understanding of the program’s performance. It will prioritise alignment with the projects core goals objectives and key evaluation questions, ensuring findings are relevant, actionable, and representative of diverse perspectives. The evaluation will draw on several evaluation approaches (stakeholder, pragmatic, learning, systems, and social return on investment).

## Key stakeholders

*Can you identify the key stakeholders, their roles and interests in the project?*

### Project team and roles (internal)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Team Member(s)** | **Strategic**  **oversight** | **Endorse framework** | **Develop framework** | **Support data collection** | **Reporting & Comms** |
| **Executive Leadership** | Celia Dufall |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Principal Lawyer** | Katy Welch |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Manager** | Rohini Thomas |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Social Impact Advisor** | Jess Moniodis |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SROI Consultation** | Larissa Andrews (external) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Data Analyst** | Casey Chang |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Delivery Staff** | Senior Lawyers​  Lawyers​  Paralegals  Social Worker​  Intake Officer​s |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Marketing and Communications team** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Stakeholder capacity building needs (internal)

*What are the capacity building needs of your internal stakeholders?*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stage** | **Required areas of knowledge and understanding** |
| Initial orientation | Project Manager |
| Developing the framework | Project Manager, Data Analyst, Leadership Team |
| Implementing the framework | PV Project Team |
| Managing findings and reporting | TBD |

### Project stakeholders’ involvement in evaluation

*Who will participate in the evaluation and what roles will they play? (Resource:* [*CSI Roadmap to Social Impact*](chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https:/assets.csi.edu.au/assets/research/Roadmap-to-Social-Impact.pdf)*)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Stakeholder** |
| **Core-team**  (decision-making) | * Executive Leadership * Program Manager and Principal Lawyer * Senior Lawyers and Specialist Leads * Social Impact Advisor |
| **Collaborate and co-design**  (partner to design and implement and interpret results) | * Lawyers/Paralegals * Data analyst * Social worker * Marketing and Communications team * Department of Justice |
| **Consult**  (advise on key decisions about the evaluation) | * ART/FCFCOA * DHA * Private Lawyers/Barristers * SCALES * Legal Aid WA * Legal assistance providers * Consultants * Community organisations |
| **Keep informed**  (keep track of the evaluation’s progress and findings) | | * Clients * Members of Parliament * Attorney Generals Department * Australian Law Reform Commission * Australian Human Rights Commission |

## Key Evaluation Questions

* What key questions will focus and frame your evaluation? (Useful Resource:* [*OECD six evaluation criteria*](https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/sub-issues/development-co-operation-evaluation-and-effectiveness/evaluation-criteria.html)*). Start with one or two evaluation questions and build from there.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DOMAIN** | **Key Evaluation Questions** |
| **IMPACT**  *Positive or negative changes, intended or not, resulting from the intervention* | 1. To what extent has the project reduced the protection visa backlog, improved fairness and efficiency in the PV system, and advocated for policy reform to address systemic inefficiencies and unfairness? *(Goals 1 & 7)* |
| 1. What measurable avoided costs and positive Social Return on Investment (SROI) can be attributed to the PV legal service model? (Goal 3) |
| **EFFECTIVENESS**  *The extent to which objectives have been achieved* | 1. To what extent is the service delivery model sustainable and scalable? (Goals 2 & 3) |
| 1. To what extent did clients improve their understanding of their legal rights and responsibilities, and how effectively did the program address their non-legal needs? (Goals 4 & 6) |
| 1. To what extent has the project strengthened legal sector capacity, and strengthened partnerships in the PV framework? (Goal 5) |
| 1. To what extent has information sharing, coordination, and collaboration improved across government, legal, and community networks? (Goal 5) |
| **EFFICIENCY**  *Qualitative and quantitative outputs in relation to inputs* | 1. To what extent was the program delivered efficiently and cost-effectively, with an accurate understanding of the cost of service? (Goals 1 & 3) |

## Theory of Change (TOC) and Program logic

*What is the evidence-based pathway that explains how your program’s activities will lead to your intended outcomes? (Useful Resource:* [*Better Evaluation*](https://www.betterevaluation.org/frameworks-guides/rainbow-framework/define/develop-programme-theory-theory-change)*)*



### Problem, causes and effects

*What are the root causes of your problem and the effects that your program seeks to address? (Resource:* [*CSI Roadmap to Social Impact*](chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https:/assets.csi.edu.au/assets/research/Roadmap-to-Social-Impact.pdf)*)*
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Figure 2. Problem analysis of backlog and inefficiencies within the protection visa framework.

### Problem Statement

*Optional as this is a summarised version of 1.1. Clarify the context and critical issues that your program intends to address (Useful Planning Resource:* [*Community Impact Planner*](https://communityimpacthub.wa.gov.au/plan-your-project/community-impact-planner/)*)*



The **protection visa system in Australia** faces significant **processing delays and backlogs**, leaving individuals seeking protection in a **prolonged uncertainty**. It is estimated that onshore protection visa applicants wait an average of **2.4 years** for an initial decision, **3.6 years** for a merits review, and up to **11 years** for a final decision (Refugee Council of Australia). These delays **increase vulnerability, poverty, and exploitation**, making it harder for Australia to effectively manage its migration system.

This backlog is driven by systemic inefficiencies at both the merits and judicial review stages, where the Administrative Review Tribunal (ART) has an active migration caseload of over 50,000 cases. Without targeted intervention, legal assistance gaps and procedural delays will continue to compromise fairness, efficiency, and access to justice.

### **Need for a Solution**

*Optional as this is a summarised version of 1.1. What solution is needed to address the identified problem, and why is it important? (Useful Planning Resource:* [*Community Impact Planner*](https://communityimpacthub.wa.gov.au/plan-your-project/community-impact-planner/)*)*



Strengthening legal assistance services and policy reform is important to improving decision wait times, reducing backlog pressure, and ensuring a fair and effective onshore protection visa system. The Australian Government’s $48 million investment in legal services is a critical first step, but sustained efforts are needed to enhance efficiency in long-term case management, protect vulnerable applicants, and uphold the integrity of Australia’s migration system.

### Program logic

*A visual or diagram that maps your program’s inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes, and shows the causal links (the relationship between intervention and outcome), based on evidence of what works (Useful Planning Resource:* [*Community Impact Planner*](https://communityimpacthub.wa.gov.au/plan-your-project/community-impact-planner/)*)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inputs**  *What resources are needed to conduct your activities?* | **Activities**  *What tasks will you deliver to address the problem and achieve your outcome?* | **Outputs**  *What are the tangible results you will produce through your activities?* | **Intermediate outcomes**  *What are the short to intermediate changes expected of your intervention(s)? Usually at the learning/action level e.g., awareness" behaviour or practice change.* | **Long-term outcomes**  *What is the long-term impact you hope to achieve? E.g., social* |
| **Funding**   * DHA * DoJ   **Stakeholders**   * Clients * Department of Justice * Law Access * Law Council of WA * Private lawyers * Barristers * Legal Aid WA * SCALES * ART * FCFCOA * Community organisations * Consultants   **Human Resources**   * Experienced legal team & specialist legal practice * CG Humanitarian stream * Principal lawyer * Project manager * PV and Appeals legal team * Social worker * Data analyst * Social Impact Advisor   **Procedures & protocols**   * RMF, Legal Practice Management Guidelines   **Systems**   * Microsoft SharePoint * Actionstep * PowerBI * Data analysis tools | **Design & Develop Model of Service**   * Holistic, trauma-informed model * Processes * Data-driven * Time recording * Referral pathways * Alternative service models (overflow, outreach) * Monitoring & evaluation   **Deliver Legal Services**   * Intake, Legal advice, Urgent advice * Merits assessments, Representation * Resources * Referrals, Outreach * Client surveys   **Build sector capacity**   * Targeted professional development * Self-help resources for clients * Legal & educational resources to sector * Training & educational initiatives * Community Legal Education (CLE program)   **Facilitate collaboration & advocacy**   * Partnerships (legal & nonlegal) * Cross-sector coordination & data sharing * Network groups * Position papers for law reform advocacy (SCALES) | **Service Model**   * Service model concept map * Process documents * Data reports   time  quality control   * Impact framework * Impact reports   **Legal Service**   * Client demographic data   # clients advised, represented  # & type of referrals  # & type of legal services   * Client survey results * Waiting time   **Training**   * Professional development activities * Resources developed * Education & training sessions * CLE delivered * Client feedback surveys   **Stakeholder & Resources**   * Stakeholder list * Sector engagement * Networking groups, events   Position papers for law reform | **Circle Green**   * 1. Improved understanding of costs & resources needed for a sustainable PV legal service (including avoided costs)   2. Improved processes & data systems to support an efficient & effective service model   3. Increased data-driven decision-making to support continuous learning & improvement   4. Enhanced knowledge, skills & capacity in immigration law & case management   5. Strengthened engagement & collaboration across sector   **Client**   * 1. Increased access to timely, trauma-informed PV legal assistance   2. Understanding of legal issues, rights & responsibilities to support informed decision-making.   3. Access to resources to navigate legal issues.   4. Increased support to address non-legal needs.   5. Increased confidence & knowledge to make informed decisions.   **Justice System**   * 1. Improved fairness & efficiency in case management   2. (1.1) Improved understanding of costs & resources needed for a sustainable PV legal service   3. Improved quality of evidence submitted to decision-makers.   4. Decision-makers are more informed through increased information sharing.   5. Enhanced knowledge, skills & capacity across the WA legal sector & service providers.   6. Established & strengthened partnerships & relationships across the legal & non legal sector | **Circle Green**   1. Sustainable, scalable, holistic & responsive PV legal service model 2. Circle Green is recognised as a leader in protection visa legal service delivery   **Client**   1. Access to timely, best-practice PV legal services 2. Clients are equipped with knowledge, skills & resources to self-advocate, make informed decisions, & seek legal (& non-legal) support independently   **Justice System**   1. Reduced backlog in PV system, & a fairer, more efficient PV system, informed by evidence. 2. PV legal service is sustainably resourced through long-term funding. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risks and assumptions**  *What are the beliefs about your program, the people involved and how it will work?* | * The target community will be aware of and willing to access the services. * Skilled staff will be recruited & retained. * Accurate and comprehensive data will be available to monitor and evaluate impact. * Partner organisations will actively participate in collaborative efforts. * Legal & policy environment will be receptive to evidence provided. * The backlog can be reduced with the funding provided. * Advocacy efforts will influence policy changes or funding allocations. |
| **External factors/Risks**  *What are the factors the program doesn’t control, and which might put it at risk of achieving outcomes?* | * Significant political changes. * Cessation of funding/resources/continuity of funding- changes to funding priorities * Policy changes. * Delays or changes in the judicial process could impact case resolution timelines. * Security conditions (war/conflict/humanitarian crises/conflict zones could increase the number of applicants seeking protection). * Media/culture/public perceptions. * International relations. |

## Outcomes and indicators

* *What outcomes do you expect your project to achieve, and what indicators can you use to measure progress toward them? (Useful Planning Resource:* [*Community Services Outcome Tree*](https://communityservicesoutcomestree.com/outcomes-tree/)*)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DOMAIN** | **Key Evaluation Questions** | **Data focus** | **Data type** | **Data source** |
| **IMPACT**  Positive or negative changes, intended or not, resulting from the intervention | 1. To what extent has the project reduced the protection visa backlog, improved fairness and efficiency in the PV system, and advocated for policy reform to address systemic inefficiencies and unfairness? *(Goals 1 & 7, Outcomes 5.1, 5)* | *Changes in backlog* | *TBA (qualitative or quantitative)* | *ART/DHA* |
| *Fairness, efficiency advocacy/unfairness* | *Qualitative* | *GC Legal team* |
| *Efficiency (dates, outcomes, time recording)* | *Quantitative* | *Action step* |
| 1. What measurable avoided costs and positive Social Return on Investment (SROI) can be attributed to the PV legal service model? *(Goal 3, Outcomes 1.1, 5.2)* | *Measurable avoided costs* | *Quantitative and Qualitative* | *ART*  *DHA*  *CG Legal team* |
| **EFFECTIVENESS**  *The extent to which objectives have been achieved* | 1. To what extent is the service delivery model sustainable and scalable? *(Goals 2 & 3, Outcomes 1, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2, 2.1, 2.2, 5, 6)* | *Sustainable service model* | *Qualitative* | *CG Legal team*  *DHA/AGD* |
| *Scalable/sustainable: cost of service, time metrics,* | *Quantitative* | *Action step* |
| *Client and justice system impacts (intended/unintended)* | *Quantitative*  *Qualitative* | *Action step*  *Client surveys*  *ART/DHA surveys* |
| 1. To what extent did clients improve their understanding of their legal rights and responsibilities, and how effectively did the program address their non-legal needs? *(Goals 4 & 6, Outcomes 3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2)* | *Client understanding* | *Quantitative (some qualitative)* | *Client surveys* |
| *Non-legal needs* | *Qualitative* | *Social worker* |
| *Quantitative* | *Action step* |
| 1. To what extent has the project strengthened legal sector capacity, and strengthened partnerships in the PV framework? *(Goal 5, Outcomes 2, 2.1., 2.2., 6.2)* | *Legal sector capacity* | *Quantitative (some qualitative)* | *Stakeholder surveys* |
| *Partnerships* | *Qualitative* | *CG Legal team* |
| 1. To what extent has information sharing, coordination, and collaboration improved across government, legal, and community networks? *(Goal 5, Outcomes 5, 6.1, 6.3,)* | *Information sharing* | *Quantitative* | *Reports* |
| *Qualitative* | *DHA/AGD/ART* |
| *Coordination and collaboration* | *Qualitative* | *CG Legal team* |
| **EFFICIENCY**  *Qualitative and quantitative outputs in relation to inputs* | 1. To what extent was the program delivered efficiently and cost-effectively, with an accurate understanding of the cost of service? *(Goals 1 & 3, Outcomes 5,6.2., 6.3.)* | *Cost of service* | *Quantitative* | *Action step* |
| *Efficiently and cost-effectively* | *Qualitative* | *CG Legal team* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | | **Indicator(s) (In development)** |
| 1. | Sustainable, scalable, holistic & responsive PV legal service model | * Clear documentation of service model elements * Demonstrated improvements in service efficiency (e.g., reduced processing time-merits assessments, statements) * Documented process and data system improvements and benefits * Structured feedback from legal team (surveys, team meetings, workshops) * Cost of service analysis * SROI completed |
| (5.2.) | Improved understanding of costs & resources needed for a sustainable PV legal service (including avoided costs) | * Accurate cost/resource mapping * Cost of service * SROI |
| 1.2. | Improved processes & data systems to support an efficient & effective service model | * Evidence of process and data system improvements * Associated benefits. |
| 1.3. | Increased data-driven decision-making to support continuous learning & improvement | * Documented decisions influenced by data * Adjustments to service model based on evidence * Other adjustments/improvements |
| 2. | Circle Green is recognised as a leader in protection visa legal service delivery | * Recognition (external) – formal/informal * Circle Green’s services or contribution to policy/submissions. |
| 2.1. | Enhanced knowledge, skills & capacity in immigration law & case management | * Participants report increased knowledge following professional development/training * Evidence of a strengthened learning and reflective culture (project meetings, team meetings) |
| 2.2. | Strengthened engagement & collaboration across sector | * Documented collaborations with key stakeholders and results from interactions |
| 3. | Access to timely, best-practice PV legal services | * Funding stability (adequate funding to meet legal need) * Client surveys and feedback on experience * Time case resolutions/waiting times (in days) |
| 3.1. | Increased access to timely, trauma-informed PV legal assistance | * Legal service access/legal need * Time case resolutions/waiting times (in days) * Trauma-informed-training of staff * Client surveys and feedback on experience |
| 3.2. | Understanding of legal issues, rights & responsibilities to support informed decision-making. | * Client understanding of legal issues. * Client outcomes. |
| 3.3. | Access to resources to navigate legal issues. | * Awareness of resources available. * Access to resources and support. |
| 4. | Clients are equipped with knowledge, skills & resources to self-advocate, make informed decisions, & seek legal (& non-legal) support independently | * Client feedback: self-reported knowledge and confidence in seeking help, qualitative feedback * Support accessed |
| 4.1. | Increased support to address non-legal needs. | * Evidence of referrals and uptake of non-legal services (Social Worker) |
| 4.2. | Increased confidence & knowledge to make informed decisions. | * Client feedback survey on level of confidence * Use of available resources/materials |
| 5. | Reduced backlog in PV system, & a fairer, more efficient PV system, informed by evidence. | * Reduction in backlog numbers (before/after) * Unmet legal need * Feedback from DHA, ART, DoJ, AGD on results * Policy or law reform informed by project evidence * Casework examples/Case studies |
| 5.1. | Improved fairness & efficiency in case management | * Examples of project contribution to fairness and efficiency. * Stakeholder feedback on case management efficiency. * Policy and law reform briefs * Casework examples/Case studies/success stories of contribution to fairness/integrity in protection outcomes |
| 5.2. (1.1.) | Improved understanding of costs & resources needed for a sustainable PV legal service (including avoided costs) | * Accurate cost/resource mapping * Cost of service * SROI |
| 5.3. | Improved quality of evidence submitted to decision-makers. | * Decision-maker feedback on application quality |
| 6. | PV legal service is sustainably resourced through long-term funding. | * Ongoing (adequate) funding secured to maintain service |
| 6.1. | Decision-makers are more informed through increased information sharing. | * Evidence of engagement with decision-makers * Success stories of engagement * Shared data strategy |
| 6.2. | Enhanced knowledge, skills & capacity across the WA legal sector & service providers. | * Cross-sector training or partnerships and evidence of improved service delivery |
| 6.3 | Established & strengthened partnerships & relationships across the legal & non legal sector | * Examples of improved collaboration and shared resources |

## Data collection, management and analysis

*Use this table as a guide to identify outcome data, drawing on existing systems where possible to avoid placing additional strain on resources.*



### Data sources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data source** | **Information** |
| **Action step** | * Administrative and client data * Service metrics, activities, and outcomes * Client survey results * Quality control reports |
| **Surveys** | * Internal staff surveys for feedback and input into:   + - * Professional development opportunities/skill development       * Process and workplace improvements       * Work culture and wellbeing * External stakeholder surveys to gather:   + - * Insights into data collection practices/Circle Green’s service delivery model       * Feedback on training delivered by Circle Green |
| **Case studies** | * Case examples from legal team collected at reporting stages to illustrate key activities, client journeys, outcomes in fairness/integrity/efficiency * Stories of change from legal team/social worker (addressing non-legal client needs) |
| **Legal Team meetings (informal)** | * Discuss data collected and contextualise results * Support data collection practices and evaluation literacy * Discuss insights to inform ongoing reflection, practice and continuous improvement |
| **Project meetings (informal)** | * Project leaders: insights into program implementation, data-informed decision making, resources, progress, intended and unintended outcomes * Social worker: understanding client needs, support needs, activities, and results |
| **Focus groups/workshops/reflective practice** | * Workplace culture, processes, workflow improvements, sustainability planning (workplace, service model) |
| **Other** | * Radio interview-Senior Lawyer * Financial inputs (SROI) * Formal/informal feedback from stakeholders |
| **Public documentation** | * DHA/ART on backlog numbers, lodgements. |

### Building capacity for data collection

*Optional: What actions, if any, will you take to strengthen capacity for high-quality, consistent data collection across the project?*



A data-strengthening phase may be implemented to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of data collected across the project. This will involve reviewing current practices and working collaboratively with program leaders and managers to:

* enhance data collection processes and systems
* help build staff capability and foster a team culture that values data-driven service delivery
* embed good data practices across the team

This phase aims to establish a strong foundation for robust, reliable data to support accurate analysis and inform project monitoring, evaluation, and continuous improvement.

### Data collection timeline

*Use this table as a guide to map out how you will collect and analyse data, and when will each activity occur?*



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data source** | **Who** | **Purpose** | **2024** | **2025** | | | |  |  | **2026** |
| **Nov-Dec** | **Jan-Feb** | **Mar-Apr** | **May-Jun** | **Jul-Aug** | **Sep-Oct** | **Nov-Dec** | **Jan-Mar** |
| **Data collection plan** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Surveys | Legal sector | * Knowledge, skills and capacity in immigration law |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal team | * Helpfulness of training for professional development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ART/DHA  Circle Green | * Backlog, SROI, service model * Engagement, partnerships |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal team | * SROI * Outcomes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lawyers | * Merits assessment, processes, sustainable workforce |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team meetings | Legal team | * Project outcomes * Continuous learning, reflection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workshop/focus group | Legal team | * Workplace culture and wellbeing * Processes/project results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project meetings | PM  Leadership | * Project outcomes, data-driven decisions, learning, improvement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Case studies | Lawyers  Social worker | * Client stories * Client/justice system outcomes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Case notes | Social worker | * Client perspectives by proxy * Project outcomes (client-focused) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Analysis and reporting** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Literature review | Social Impact Advisor | * Context, interpretation of findings, gap, future focus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SROI analysis | SROI consultant | * Avoided costs and social return on investment/cost-benefit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service Snapshots | Social Impact Advisor, Leadership and Legal team | * Regular updates on service model and results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reporting (funders) | * Funding accountability requirements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Final snapshot | * Summarised version of full report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full report | * Comprehensive report of findings, recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Project Deliverables

*Optional: use this table to map out what key deliverables will be produced at each stage of the evaluation, and when will they be completed?*



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation stage** | **Activities** | **Timing** |
| **Planning the evaluation framework** | | |
| **Social Impact (SI) Framework planning documents** | * Problem analysis * Clarify vision, goals & objectives * Stakeholder mapping * Program logic (and TOC) * Evaluation questions * Evaluation approach * Outcomes framework * Data collection and management plan * Presentations and resources for: evaluation planning | Sep-Dec 24 |
| **SI Framework** | * Endorsed Social Impact Framework (as a working document) | Jan-25 |
| **SROI Project Plan** | * SROI project and implementation plan | Apr-25 |
| **Data collection, monitoring and evaluation** | | |
| **Routine data collection** | * Quality control reports: monitor data, strengthen data collection practices | Aug 24-  Dec 25 |
| **Develop data collection tools** | * Survey instruments (Microsoft Forms, QuestionPro): external training, internal feedback, ART/DHA * Qualitative feedback guides: focus groups, workshops, team meetings | Jan 25-  Nov 25 |
| **Data analysis and evaluation** | * PowerBI Dashboard for regular reporting * Evaluation infrastructure documents: introductory letters, informed consent forms, informed consent procedures, ethics statement * Analysis of surveys, Action step data, qualitative feedback * Cost of service calculation | Jan 25-  Dec 25 |
| **Communication and Reporting** | | |
| **Reporting and Communication** | * Service Snapshots | Bimonthly |
| * Funder reporting | 6 monthly |
| * Contribution to social media posts | As needed |
| * Presentations as requested, e.g., conferences | As needed |
| * Full report | Nov-Dec 25 |
| **Capacity building, learning & improvement** | | |
| **Capacity building** | * Presentations and resources for: evaluative capacity building * Workshop materials (PowerPoints, planning documents, supplementary material) | Aug-Nov 25 |
| **Reflection & improvement** | * Process to incorporate feedback (TBD) | Sep-Dec 25 |

### Approach to data synthesis

*Drawing on your evaluation questions and the tables below as a guide, consider how you will bring together and interpret data to answer your key questions. This approach can evolve as stronger indicators emerge, or better methods are identified. Start with one or two key evaluation questions. For each question, identify the potential indicators that best reflect progress, the data sources you can draw on (preferably using existing systems and processes), and the methods you will use to analyse and interpret the findings.*



The Data collection Table 5 below identifies the key evaluation questions and data that will be prioritised for analyses and reporting **during the project lifecycle, up until** **December 2025.**

This table contains priority focus areas selected from the Program Logic and Outcomes Framework (that includes broader Circle Green, Client and Justice Outcomes to be monitored over a longer 3–4-year period).

##### Key evaluation question 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Question | Performance Indicators | Monitoring Data | Evaluation |
| To what extent has the project reduced the protection visa backlog, improved fairness and efficiency in the PV system, and advocated for policy reform to address systemic inefficiencies and unfairness? *(Goals 1 & 7)* | * Reduction in backlog * Breakdown of total services provided & clients assisted * Evidence of contributions to fairness and efficiency * Feedback from DHA, ART, DoJ * Policy and law reform briefs * Casework examples | Applications   * + Total # of Initial, AAT, JR (FCFCOA) – disaggregate to country of origin and PV claim   + Total # services delivered, disaggregate by service type   + Total # assisted and total # of family groups   + Number of people assisted in the priority client groups outlined in the statement of service.   + Total # of urgent, paired with client feedback   + Total # of complex matters   + Complex matters case studies (n=2)   + Total # of statements, submissions and post-hearing statements and submissions (paired to average time of hearings)   + Interviews: Total #; Average time of interviews   + Hearings: Total #; Average time of hearings   + Turn-aways (information + alternative service model)   Merits assessment   * + Total # Merits Assessments   + % of no merit advice provided   + Average days from first entering service   + Average hours taken for merits assessment   + Examination of % who lodged with no merit and why   Client survey on no merit + DHA, ART and FCFCOA data   * + Total # no merit advices that proceeded to lodge at ART, FCFCOA   + DHA data on number of lodgements – paired to number of merits advices provided   Qual Survey for ART, DHA and FCFCOA   * + Survey feedback from DHA, ART, FCFCOA, regarding impact   Policy and law reform briefs  # and type of brief (activities only no data) | Applications   * + 1. Descriptive statistics   Merits assessments   * + 1. Trends in time taken * Applications * Merits assessments * Service outputs   Research tracker for Malaysian claims  Case studies   * + Examples of complex matters/fairness/integrity   Interviews   * + Examples of improved fairness/efficiency   Survey Feedback   * + Survey feedback from DHA, ART, FCFCOA, DoJ regarding impact, priorities, collaboration/information sharing |

##### Key evaluation question 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Question | Performance Indicators | Monitoring Data | Evaluation |
| What measurable avoided costs and positive Social Return on Investment (SROI) can be attributed to the PV legal service model? (Goal 3) | * TBD * Avoided cost for decision makers (DHA/Courts/ART) * Cost-benefit analysis | TBD   * + Consultant, Larissa Andrews, Impact Solutions   + SROI outcome and measurement plan | * + If funding is not continued, what key costs (economic and social) will be incurred across the justice system?   + Independent report from SROI consultant |

##### Key evaluation question 3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Question | Performance Indicators | Monitoring Data | Evaluation |
| To what extent is the service delivery model sustainable and scalable? Goals 2 & 3) | * Cost of service * SROI (cost/benefit analysis) * Service gap * Benefits/outcomes | Cost of service (quarterly)   * + Legal time   + Non legal time   + Legal supervision   + Interpreter costs   + Merits assessment average time   + Case processing capacity (e.g., see (Barbour, 2023)   Service gap   * + # overflow service referrals   + Total time spent on overflow service matters   Collaborative partnerships   * + Case studies/success storiesA diagram of a service      AI-generated content may be incorrect. | Cost of service   * + Funding allocation (true costs)   + Time spent   + Cost-efficiency (SROI)   + Cost of service calculation formula based on total time recorded, disaggregate to a professional commercial rate (Refer to Appendix, Figure S1):   + Cost of client journey from entry to lodgement   + Cost of client journey from entry to finalised outcome (consider trends in cost for complex matters)   + Cost (per hour) for specific service types     - * Merits assessment (range, average, complex cases).       * Average cost per merits assessment (including upper and lower scale of costs/time       * Urgent advice service       * Statements (range, average, complex cases)       * Submissions (#, hrs)       * Overflow service (#, total hrs)   + Actual hours per description (pie graph) |

##### Key evaluation question 4

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Question | Performance Indicators | Monitoring Data | Evaluation |
| To what extent did clients improve their understanding of their legal rights and responsibilities, and how effectively did the program address their non-legal needs? (Goals 4 & 6) | * Client feedback * Internal reports * Social worker feedback | Client surveys   * + Client feedback, questions 1 (urgent advice), questions 3 and 4 (first appointment), question 5 (no merit advice), questions 9-12 (file closure)   Internal reports (social worker)   * + # accessing social worker support service   + Case notes / client wellbeing outcomes or   + External (community)   + Referrals: # and details of non-legal services | Client surveys   * % of clients who report information was clear and understandable |

##### Key evaluation question 5

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Question | Performance Indicators | Monitoring Data | Evaluation |
| To what extent has the project strengthened legal sector capacity, and strengthened partnerships in the PV framework? (Goal 5) | * Internal capacity * External capacity * Relationships * Resources and education | Internal capacity (evidence of strengthened capacity)   * + # of professional development plans   + # of training delivered and participation rates   + % of staff who report:     1. greater knowledge in immigration law and case management, and that     2. CG provides strong opportunities to increase relevant skills and expertise.   External capacity (evidence of strengthened capacity)   * + # and details of training delivered to the sector (topic, total attendees, stakeholder group)   + Feedback from participants on:     1. Satisfaction rating     2. Helpfulness of training     3. % Request for additional training (demand)     4. % who report training made a positive contribution to skill/capacity   Relationships   * + # of active partnerships and joint initiatives   + # and participation details stakeholder activities/events/collaborations/network meetings   + Success stories on collaborative projects | * Case studies, interviews * Survey feedback |

##### Key evaluation question 6

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Question | Performance Indicators | Monitoring Data | Evaluation |
| To what extent has information sharing, coordination, and collaboration improved across government, legal, and community networks? (Goal 5) | * Partnerships * Evidence of collaborative efforts/improvements in service delivery structure | Collaboration   * + Frequency of meetings and shared reports/information exchanges (e.g., newsletters)   + # of factsheets/resources developed and shared   + Evidence of improvements in service delivery infrastructure | * Case studies, interviews * Surveys to stakeholders (e.g., SCALES, Legal Aid) |

##### Key evaluation question 7

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Question | Performance Indicators | Monitoring Data | Evaluation |
| To what extent was the program delivered efficiently and cost-effectively, with an accurate understanding of the cost of service? (Goals 1 & 3) | * Cost of service | Implementation fidelity   * + Actual vs. planned activities | * Case studies, interviews * What went well, challenges and barriers |

## Communications and Reporting

*What is your strategy for communicating evaluation findings and progress to stakeholders? Use this table to plan and track how key evaluation findings will be reported, who they will reach, and the formats and channels you will use for communication. This may change over the project life cycle.*



A strategy is being developed in collaboration with the in-house marketing and communications team, who are helping guide the reporting and communication of key results. Fortnightly meetings have been scheduled to coordinate key messages and guide implementation.

### Reporting and dissemination plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report Type** | **Due** | **Audience & their Interests** | **Overall Focus** | **Contents/Format** | **Dissemination** |
| **Formal Reports/External Communication** | | | | | |
| * 6 months Progress Report * 6 months Funder Report | 31 Jan 25 | Department of Justice   * + - * Backlog progress reports | Reporting Requirements | Report template | SmartyGrants |
| * 12 months Progress Report * 12 months Funder Report | 31 Jul 25 |
| * Final Report | 31 Aug 25 |
| * Compliance Statement | 31 Oct 25 |
| * 6 months Progress Report | 31 Mar 25 | Department of Home Affairs   * + - * Initial applications | Reporting Requirement | Report template | Online |
| **Marketing and communications strategy** | | | | | |
| * Website publications, reports, education materials, etc. | Ongoing | Clients, Government, funders, legal and non-legal sector. | Education, Project awareness | Various | Website |
| * Regular posts on Social Media platforms, project updates, casework, data, interviews with staff | Ongoing (weekly if possible) | Government, funders, legal and non-legal sector. | Education, Project awareness | Responsive | Social media, e.g., LinkedIn |
| * Social impact snapshot | 1. 6-month snapshot 2. 8-month snapshot 3. 10-month snapshot 4. Final snapshot | Government, funders (DHA, DoJ), MP’s, Attorney Generals Department  Legal sector  Non-legal sector  MPs |  |  | Website, social media, email |
| * Service feature (training), Lawyer profile features | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| * Social Impact Full Report | December 2025 | Government, funders (DHA, DoJ), MP’s, Attorney Generals Department  Legal sector  Non-legal sector  MPs | Outcomes, impact, recommendations |  |  |
| * SROI Report | December 2025 | Impact, including avoided costs |  |  |
| **Ad Hoc and Event Reports** | | | | | |
| * Training, Conferences |  |  |  |  |  |

## Learning strategy

*How will you capture and use lessons learned from the evaluation to improve future practice?*



The learning strategy will use evaluation findings to generate actionable recommendations and lessons that inform ongoing improvement. Key conclusions will be drawn from the evidence, paired with recommendations and lessons that can be embedded across programs, policies, and practice.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **What can we conclude from the evaluation** | **Recommendations** | **Lessons** |
| [Insert key finding/conclusion] | [What should be done differently or improved based on this finding?] | [What principle or insight can be applied to future practice?] |

## Risks and controls

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risk | Results | Likelihood | Consequence | Rating | Control |
| Insufficient resources to measure all outcomes | Fewer outcomes measured compared to the original program logic | Possible | Minimal | Minor | Dedicated SIA to meet regularly with PM to manage risks and ensure coverage of priority outcomes |
| Inadequate data to support analysis/low data quality | Inadequate evidence to support findings; low quality evaluation report; stakeholder dissatisfaction | Unlikely | Minimal | Minor | Agreed data collection plan outlining indicators, methodology, responsibilities, and timeframes, updated regularly. |
| Evaluation findings not applied to improve service delivery | Missed opportunities for learning; resources not used effectively or efficiently. | Unlikely | Minimal | Minor | Embed formative evaluation and integrate regular data use into service improvement cycles. |
| Lack of stakeholder engagement in evaluation process | Reduced buy-in and ownership; reduced usefulness of findings on a broader scale; lower likelihood of recommendations being implemented | Possible | Moderate | Moderate | Early engagement, regular updates and information sharing, implement feedback loops, and where possible, co-design of evaluation tools to ensure relevance. |

Risk ratings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Likelihood rating | Consequence rating | | | | |
| Insignificant | Minimal | Moderate | Substantial | Severe |
| **Almost certain** | Minor | Medium | High | Very high | Very high |
| **Likely** | Minor | Medium | Medium | High | Very High |
| **Possible** | Low | Minor | Medium | High | Very High |
| **Unlikely** | Low | Minor | Minor | Medium | High |
| **Rare** | Low | Low | Minor | Medium | High |