

Are you an individual or making a submission on behalf of an organisation?

Organisation

Organisation name

Life Education Queensland

Is your organisation....?

- A provider currently funded under one or more of the 5 programs in scope for this consultation

What type of service or support do you mostly provide?

- Prevention or early intervention services

What state or territory does your organisation deliver services and supports in?

- Queensland

Where does your organisation deliver most of their services and supports?

Regional area

1. Does the new vision reflect what we all want for children and families?

The proposed vision recognises the vital role of parents and caregivers, but it does not fully reflect the broader community supports that are essential for children's development. Evidence shows that children's wellbeing is shaped not only by family environments but also by early learning settings, schools, and wider community networks. A strong vision must acknowledge this collective responsibility.

The vision also omits the role of children themselves. Children need opportunities to build skills, confidence and agency, core components of prevention-focused practice and key contributors to long-term resilience. Positioning children as active participants aligns with Outcome 2 and reflects best practice in early intervention.

Life Ed Queensland supports children directly to develop the knowledge and capabilities needed to live safe, healthy lives, while strengthening the capacity of their support network; parents and caregivers, teachers, early childhood educators and community members. Not all young people have strong families with the skills

to nurture them, making community-based and school-based supports critical.

We recommend expanding the vision to recognise the combined role of families, educators and communities in providing wrap-around support, and to more clearly reference children's own skills and self-determination.

2. Are the two main outcomes what we should be working towards for children and families? Why/Why not? - Outcome 1: Parents and caregivers are empowered to raise healthy, resilient children - Outcome 2: Children are supported to grow into healthy, resilient adults.

Yes. The outcomes provide a strong foundation by supporting both parents/caregivers and children to develop the skills required for resilience and long-term wellbeing. This dual focus aligns with early intervention evidence and reflects the reality that children thrive when the adults around them are supported and they themselves build age-appropriate capabilities.

However, both outcomes would benefit from greater clarity and measurable indicators. Including measures such as parental confidence, child wellbeing, engagement, and access to support would strengthen evaluation and better demonstrate progress.

The outcomes should also acknowledge the broader ecosystem influencing development; schools, early learning settings, community organisations and place-based supports. Many children rely on these networks, particularly those who may not have strong family environments. Explicitly recognising these influences ensures the outcomes reflect the collective responsibility needed to support children and families.

3. Will a single national program provide more flexibility for your organisation?

Our experience shows that community needs vary significantly, and effective prevention requires the ability to respond quickly to local risks, school capacity and demographic changes. Maintaining mechanisms for local coordination, currently supported through Facilitating Partners, is essential. Without clarity on how coordination will operate under a single program, there is a risk that local needs will be harder to identify and address.

Flexibility, community engagement and place-based responsiveness are critical to achieving strong outcomes for children and families.

4. Does the service or activity you deliver fit within one of the three funding streams? Do these streams reflect what children and families in your community need now – and what they might need in the future?

Yes. Life Ed Queensland's school and early learning programs align closely with Stream 2: Prevention and Early Intervention.

Teacher feedback strongly supports this alignment. In our 2025 survey, 99% of teachers state they would rebook Life Ed, and 62% identified Triple P as a program that would further strengthen support for their school community. This demonstrates clear demand for evidence-informed prevention programs that support both children and parents.

Our partnership with Triple P enables delivery of evidence-based parenting support alongside children's health and wellbeing education. These services address growing national concerns about wellbeing, resilience and early risk behaviours.

Without continued CFC funding, over 15,000 children in Queensland will miss out on proven early intervention programs delivered by Life Ed Qld. Up to 16 FTE positions that directly work on these projects could be at risk. Sustained funding is essential to ensure children, families and educators continue to benefit from these vital supports.

We encourage the Department to ensure that the three funding streams are designed and implemented to operate in a complementary, rather than competitive, manner, noting that each stream plays a critical role in supporting children and families across Australia. Without explicit policy safeguards, there remains a significant risk that early intervention will be inadvertently deprioritised.

5. Are there other changes we could make to the program to help your organisation or community overcome current challenges?

The uncertainty beyond June 2026 presents major risks to service continuity. While Facilitating Partners are funded to January 2027, it remains unclear whether community partners, who deliver frontline services, will be funded in this period. This uncertainty disrupts planning, affects workforce stability and jeopardises program commitments to schools, many of which schedule visits 12 months ahead.

Sustainable, longer-term funding is essential to ensure organisations can continue delivering early intervention programs and avoid service disruptions impacting communities in most need.

Both evidence-based practice requirements and DEX reporting burden (as outlined in Q16–17) impose additional resourcing demands that can reduce funding available for direct service delivery. Current DEX requirements significantly increase workload. Project budgets must reflect the full cost of service delivery, including administrative requirements such as DEX reporting and evaluation measures to inform evidence base.

A clear and shared understanding of what constitutes evidence-informed projects is essential and must be established early to enable potential partners to appropriately scope and prepare future submissions. Ongoing clarity regarding evidence-based programs, including alignment with the AIFS evidence hierarchy, will be required moving forward.

Finally, clear guidance on how to demonstrate local partnerships and community-led models, especially if the Facilitating Partner model changes, is needed to maintain strong coordination, collaboration and community engagement.

6. Do you agree that the four priorities listed on Page 4 are right areas for investment to improve outcomes for children and families?

Yes, the four priorities are appropriate. However, Priority 2; connected, co-located and integrated services requires greater clarity. Without the Facilitating Partner model, it is unclear how service coordination, referral pathways and local collaboration will be supported.

Strong investment should continue in community-led, place-based approaches that reflect local priorities, strengthen community capacity and build on existing networks. Programs developed with community voice are more likely to be effective, sustainable and evidence-informed.

Greater clarity is also needed on the role of evidence-based programs in future funding decisions. Ongoing investment in evidence-informed practice requires dedicated evaluation funding, particularly for prevention and early intervention.

7. Are there any other priorities or issues you think the department should be focusing on?

One key priority is ensuring that both children and parents receive appropriate support to foster healthy development and wellbeing. To achieve this, the Department should focus on strategies that strengthen family engagement, build

parental confidence, and provide practical tools to support children's social and emotional wellbeing. Local schools and early learning centres play an essential role as community hubs, connecting families with information, education and services. A key priority is supporting both children and parents, ensuring they receive coordinated, accessible and practical supports that strengthen wellbeing. These hubs act as bridges between children, parents, educators, and broader community supports, enabling coordinated interventions and fostering collaboration.

Place-based initiatives should integrate child education, parent support and professional development for educators. Collaboration with community health centres, ACCCHOs and family support services ensures community informed, culturally safe, locally responsive and holistic approaches.

These elements strengthen prevention, build capability across the community, and support consistent, coordinated interventions.

10. What are other effective ways, beyond co-location, that you've seen work well to connect and coordinate services for families?

The Facilitated Partner model has proven effective in supporting coordinated service delivery across specific regions. By fostering communication between services, encouraging active referrals, and promoting shared learning, this model strengthens collaboration and maximises impact. Consideration should be given to how this level of coordination and integration can be maintained should the Facilitated Partner model no longer be in place.

At each site where Life Ed delivers programs, local partnerships are actively demonstrated and reinforced. Engagement with community stakeholders occurs through regular meetings and the development of a community of practice. Life Ed's delivery model ensures that prevention education is targeted to all relevant members of the community. This includes offering parent workshops prior to program delivery, providing the evidence-based Triple P program to partner schools and early learning centres, and delivering professional development opportunities for teachers. By offering a suite of complementary programs, Life Ed embeds prevention and wellbeing initiatives directly within the school environment, enhancing both reach and effectiveness.

Furthermore, Life Ed collaborates with local organisations to ensure services are complementary, avoiding duplication and strengthening the local service ecosystem. This partnership approach supports coordinated, community-

informed service delivery across the lifespan, ensuring children, families, and educators receive integrated, evidence-based support tailored to local needs.

11. What would you highlight in a grant application to demonstrate a service is connected to the community it serves? What should applicants be assessed on?

Applicants should be assessed on several criteria:

- **Demonstrated impact:** Clear links between activities and positive outcomes for children, families, and the community.
- **Program reach:** Demonstrated through the delivery numbers and supporting communities in most need.
- **Partnerships and collaboration:** Evidence of sustained relationships with local schools, services, and community groups – or the service the program serves.
- **Cultural inclusivity:** Consideration of diverse community groups, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, culturally and linguistically diverse families, and children with additional needs.
- **Integration and sustainability:** Programs embedded in the local ecosystem, enhancing capacity and avoiding service duplication.

By prioritising these factors, applicants can show that their service is not only present in the community but actively contributing to its wellbeing, cohesion, and long-term resilience.

12. Beyond locational disadvantage, what other factors should the department consider to make sure funding reflects the needs of communities?

Incorporating multiple perspectives is essential. Data collection, alongside student and teacher voice, provides insight into local priorities, program effectiveness, and areas of emerging need. Listening to those directly involved in children's learning and development helps identify issues that may not be evident through traditional metrics, ensuring interventions are timely, relevant, and responsive.

It is also important to recognise community diversity, including cultural and linguistic backgrounds, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, and families experiencing multiple layers of disadvantage. These factors influence children's development and the type of support required to achieve positive outcomes.

Finally, flexibility in program delivery is critical. Communities face dynamic challenges, and funding models should allow programs to respond to emerging risks, local priorities, and contextual factors beyond geographic location. By

considering social, economic, cultural, and community insights alongside data and stakeholder feedback, the Department can ensure funding is targeted, equitable, and capable of supporting sustainable outcomes for children and families.

13. What's the best way for organisations to show in grant applications, that their service is genuinely meeting the needs of the community?

Demonstrated evidence of program impact, participant outcomes, qualitative and quantitative data, and community connection. The strongest evidence includes:

- Quantitative data demonstrating reach and outcomes
- Qualitative data such as case studies and children's voice
- Teacher and parent feedback
- Evidence of community partnerships and referrals
- Improving outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and families

16. What types of data would help your organisation better understand its impact and continuously improve its services?

To effectively understand impact and support continuous improvement, Life Ed Qld requires data collection approaches that are appropriate for the client groups being evaluated. SCORE tools, including numeric Likert-scale responses, are often unsuitable for young children; attempting to capture such data from early childhood cohorts can be misaligned with the best interests of the child and may not accurately reflect program outcomes. It is recommended that proposed changes adopt community-level SCORE approaches rather than individual child-level data for all program participants.

Data collection also presents practical challenges for service providers and the communities served. Vulnerable populations may be reluctant to provide sensitive demographic information, and collecting this data can impose administrative burdens that divert time and funding away from direct service delivery. Reducing overall data collection requirements under the DEX Partnership Approach would maintain program evidence while alleviating these burdens. Specifically, lowering the percentage of clients required to provide demographic information or complete SCORE assessments would allow educators to focus more on program delivery. Program budgets should reflect the administrative time required for data collection.

Evaluation tools must be developmentally appropriate. SCORE tools are not suitable for young children and may not reflect meaningful outcomes. We

recommend allowing community-level SCORE approaches for children and reducing demographic and SCORE data requirements to ease the administrative burden.

Alternative evaluation methods that are developmentally appropriate are recommended, including observational data, qualitative feedback, and case studies, which provide richer insights into children's learning and engagement. Incorporating student voice through satisfaction ratings and other measures is also encouraged.

Finally, educator feedback remains essential. Teachers and early learning staff are well-positioned to observe children's responses, engagement, and the skills and knowledge developed through programs. Their insights offer a robust understanding of outcomes, support continuous improvement, and inform program adaptation and innovation without reliance on rigid scoring frameworks alone.

Budgets must reflect administrative time required for data entry and reporting.

17. What kinds of data or information would be most valuable for you to share, to show how your service is positively impacting children and families?

A multi-layered evidence approach is essential to demonstrate the impact of Life Ed programs across diverse communities. Combining developmentally appropriate child assessment methods with systematic teacher feedback provides the most reliable and meaningful data. This approach enables continuous refinement of program design and delivery while ensuring evaluation remains child-centred and relevant.

Key data types include satisfaction ratings from participants, qualitative insights such as case studies, and feedback that captures children's voices. Teacher surveys and assessments are also critical, providing information on the skills and knowledge children gain as a result of participating in Life Ed programs.

Collectively, these measures offer a comprehensive view of program effectiveness, illustrating both tangible outcomes and the broader benefits to children, families, and the wider school community.

18. If your organisation currently reports in the Data Exchange (DEX), what SCORE Circumstances domain is most relevant to the service you deliver?

- Education and skills training
- Consider how we can better demonstrate outcomes other than SCORE when working with young children leaning on best practice evaluation methodology for children.

19. What kinds of templates or guidance would help you prepare strong case studies that show the impact of your service?

- Template that can be adapted for multiple users
- Broad questions and observational stories
- Not overly time or resource intensive to ensure it doesn't take time away from direct service delivery
- Not required for every reporting period.