Brotherhood
of St Laurence
Working for an Australia free of poverty

Measuring what matters

BSL response to Australian Treasury discussion paper

Brotherhood of St. Laurence

January 2023

Brotherhood of St. Laurence
67 Brunswick Street
Fitzroy Vic. 3065

ABN 24 603 467 024
ARBN 100 042 822

Ph. (03) 9483 1183

www.bsl.org.au

For further information or to discuss this submission, please contact:

Mischa Barr
Senior Manager, Policy
Social Policy and Research Centre
Brotherhood of St. Laurence
Email: mischa.barr@bsl.org.au

Summary

The Brotherhood of St. Laurence (BSL) supports the development of a more holistic measure or set of measures by which Australia can measure its social, economic and environmental progress, including consideration of a wellbeing framework.

BSL's submission focuses on the importance of measuring and optimising **people's capabilities – that is, their real opportunities to be and do what they value**. This means that, in addition to measuring resources (such as income and assets) and outcomes (such as employment, educational attainment, safety, leisure), it is also essential that an Australian wellbeing framework measure people's **agency** (choice, voice, control and empowerment) and the extent to which they are **enabled to exercise agency by systems, structures, norms and processes**.

The submission also highlights the importance of **integrating wellbeing measures into policy design, program design and practice**, and briefly outlines the ways this can be achieved. Further information about implementing a wellbeing approach can be provided on request.

Summary of recommendations

BSL recommends that the Australian Treasury:

1. Adopt the Capabilities Approach as the conceptual framework for Australia's approach to wellbeing.

2. Utilise a more inclusive participatory process to identify the 'mission' or 'missions' to guide the Government's approach to wellbeing and the selection of domains and indicators.

3. Adopt an approach to measuring and advancing wellbeing that evaluates policy, budgeting and other government decision-making according to their impact on both people's capabilities and their functionings.

4. Consider measuring people's real opportunities (capabilities) using a combination of proxy measures, including functionings, resources, conversion factors and agency.

5. Engage with local and international experts investigating development of specific/direct capability measures.

6. Include at least one indicator of individual agency within the wellbeing framework, and consider including indicators in each domain representing the degree to which agency is able to be exercised in that domain.

7. Include process and practice indicators or principles in all domains in the wellbeing framework to measure *how* government services and supports are delivered, in addition to what services are delivered and the outcomes achieved.

8. Implement a wellbeing approach through vertical alignment of policy, programs and practice in each domain, including appropriate governance arrangements, tools and resources to guide practice, and monitoring and evaluation approaches.

1 Introduction

The Brotherhood of St. Laurence (BSL) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Australian Treasury's consultation on 'Measuring what matters'. BSL strongly supports the development of a holistic measure or set of measures by which Australia can measure its social, economic and environmental progress, including consideration of a wellbeing framework.

BSL is a social justice organisation working to prevent and alleviate poverty across Australia. Our mission is to pursue lasting change, to create a more compassionate and just society where everyone can thrive. Our approach is informed directly by the people experiencing disadvantage and uses evidence drawn from our research, together with insights from our programs and services, to develop practical solutions that work.

BSL has been engaging with wellbeing approaches and frameworks for nearly two decades, including engaging with previous work led by Treasury under Dr Ken Henry. BSL's work spans design (including domains and indicators), implementation, measurement and evaluation of wellbeing approaches, particularly in relation to children and young people. For example:

- BSL has been working for several years with the Australian National Development Index (ANDI), the campaign for an alternative national measure of progress based on social wellbeing, and in 2022 signed an MOU signalling our intent to be a major partner of ANDI.

- BSL's Impact Framework is informed by an extensive review of the literature on measuring wellbeing, and applies the Capabilities Approach to identify both participant and systemic outcomes that together allow BSL to assess whether we are expanding participants' capabilities to pursue valued opportunities, as well as whether participants have realised specific aspirations.

- Wellbeing has been the guiding principle for BSL's work designing and implementing system level change within the homelessness, youth and family services systems in Tasmania, aligning effort across domains to maximise wellbeing for children and young people.

We have also worked on related projects, such as the Social Exclusion Monitor – which developed a model for measuring social exclusion as a score aggregating indicators from multiple domains, and monitored trends over time.

2 Conceptualising wellbeing

The Capabilities Approach provides a useful anchor for wellbeing

It will be important to articulate the conceptual framework underpinning Australia's approach to measuring – and hopefully optimising – wellbeing, as this has implications for the selection, prioritisation and weighting of indicators in decision-making.

The Capabilities Approach provides a useful framework with which to identify what matters to Australians. First developed around 40 years ago by Amartya Sen and later elaborated by Martha Nussbaum, the Capabilities Approach posits that wellbeing should be understood and measured in terms of people's 'capabilities' and 'functionings', rather than solely relying on the resources

(such as income) that people can mobilise to pursue their wellbeing or their subjective feelings of wellbeing. Robeyns and Byskov summarise these concepts as follows:

> **Capabilities** are the doings and beings that people can achieve if they so choose — their opportunity to do or be such things as being well-nourished, getting married, being educated, and travelling; **functionings** are capabilities that have been realized.
>
> Whether someone can convert a set of means – resources and public goods – into a functioning (i.e. whether she has a particular capability) crucially depends on certain personal, sociopolitical, and environmental conditions, which, in the capability literature, are called 'conversion factors'.
>
> **Capabilities have also been referred to as real or substantive freedoms as they denote the freedoms that have been cleared of any potential obstacles**, in contrast to mere formal rights and freedoms.[1] [emphasis added]

Simply put, capabilities refer to an individual's ability to pursue and realise the goals (functionings) they value – including wellbeing. **The role of social policy within a Capabilities Approach is to enable people to choose what for them constitutes a flourishing life by expanding the real opportunities they have to be and do what they value.** This means social policy should both enable **agency** and provide **real opportunities** to effectively exercise agency to pursue valued outcomes.

The Capabilities Approach has influenced and informed the design of many wellbeing frameworks around the world, including the previous Australian Treasury framework developed under Ken Henry, the Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress commissioned by former French President Nicolas Sarkozy, and the OECD Better Life Initiative, as well as the United Nations Development Program's Human Development Index.

Core aspects of a capabilities-led approach to wellbeing

Many alternative frameworks for measuring social, economic and environmental progress focus on measuring resources (e.g. income, assets, healthcare provision) and/or functionings (e.g. health, employment, educational attainment). A capabilities-led approach to wellbeing, on the other hand, **focuses on measuring (and optimising) people's choice and freedom – what people can do and be**. At its core, it requires:

- going **beyond 'equality of opportunity'** to consider not only the amount of resources people have, but also what they can do and be with those resources, recognising the **diversity** of human needs and personal and contextual circumstances and their impact on opportunity. Sen gives the example of a person with a disability who needs a wheelchair requiring more financial resources to achieve the same level of mobility as someone who does not, as well as having less disposable income to pursue other goals they value.[2]

---

[1] Robeyns, I & Byskov, MF 2020, 'The Capability Approach', in EN Zalta (ed.) 2021, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2021 edition.

[2] Sen, A (1979) cited in Robeyns, I & Byskov, MF 2020, 'The Capability Approach', in EN Zalta (ed.) 2021, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2021 edition.

- an emphasis on the intrinsic value of individual **agency**, asking us to consider whether outcomes are the result of the real choices a person has made or their lack of them. This means we must incorporate a **focus on process indicators as well as outcome indicators** (explored further in Section 3).

- attention to how **systems, structures, norms and processes** enable or constrain people's agency and their capability to convert resources into functionings. For example, BSL's financial wellbeing framework highlights the importance of addressing systems and structures that constrain people's capability to save money and avoid debt, including financial systems (e.g. lending practices), the labour market (e.g. availability of secure work for fair pay), adequacy of social security, and access to essential social infrastructure, such as affordable health care, education, transport and housing.

- a fundamental concern with **equity,** enabling people to have fair access now and in the future to the social, economic and environmental resources needed to achieve wellbeing. For example, the OECD framework measures progress in each wellbeing domain using not just averages, but also inequalities between groups, inequalities between top and bottom performers, and deprivations.

Box 2.1 Applying the Capabilities Approach to employment services

The Capabilities Approach requires that the adequacy of policy and programs be judged by the measure of whether they offer individuals real freedom of choice about the lives they want to live.

A concrete example is the extent to which employment support for low-income parents expands their real opportunities to pursue lives they value. The current program response – ParentsNext – pits different capability sets (the freedom/opportunity to earn an adequate income and to do meaningful work and the freedom/opportunity to look after one's children) against each other. Participants report that the program design makes it impossible to achieve these functionings simultaneously.[3]

An employment support program for low-income parents informed by the Capabilities Approach, on the other hand, would be voluntary and support parents to build the foundations for long-term employability, career development and economic security, while enabling them to balance their care responsibilities, for example by offering flexible hours and subsidised childcare.

The implications for measurement are that individual capabilities or facets of wellbeing cannot be considered in isolation. The metrics we use to prioritise and evaluate social policy should enable investigation of the multiple dimensions of wellbeing and where policy decisions might involve trade-offs.

Which capabilities should be advanced (and measured)?

In theory, the Capabilities Approach is values-neutral in terms of which capabilities should be advanced and measured. A capability is simply the freedom that people have to do or be certain things. For the purposes of measuring, comparing and advancing the 'wellbeing' of the Australian

---

[3] See, for example, Bowman, D & Wickramasinghe, S 2020, *Trampolines not traps: enabling economic security for single mothers and their children*, Brotherhood of St. Laurence, Fitzroy, Vic.

population, however, it may be necessary to take a normative approach – identifying an overarching policy direction or goal and specifying criteria by which capabilities will be selected.

For Sen, the centrality of agency (itself a normative judgment) within the Capabilities Approach demands a **participatory process** to develop and prioritise capabilities/ indicators. BSL agrees with the preference for community-generated indicators, as well as involvement of ordinary citizens in wellbeing governance. This process aligns with our emphasis on agency, our growing focus on embedding **lived experience** in policy and program design, and our understanding of the importance of **place**.

While Treasury is currently consulting on wellbeing indicators, BSL suggests a more inclusive 'community conversation' is needed about what matters to Australians akin to the 'listening tour' conducted by the Victorian Council of Social Service across Victoria in 2022. Using Marianna Mazzucato's terminology, this process could assist in **identifying a 'mission' or 'missions' to guide the Government's approach to wellbeing** (its 'grand challenge') and the selection of domains and indicators.[4]

Recommendations

1. Adopt the Capabilities Approach as the conceptual framework for Australia's approach to wellbeing, as outlined above.

2. Utilise a more inclusive participatory process to identify the 'mission' or 'missions' to guide the government's approach to wellbeing and the selection of domains and indicators.

3 Measuring wellbeing

As noted above, many frameworks that adopt holistic measures of social, economic and environmental progress tend to focus on measuring **resources** (e.g. income, assets, healthcare provision) and **functionings** (e.g. health, employment, educational attainment).

BSL recommends an approach to measuring and advancing wellbeing that evaluates policy, budgeting and other government decision-making according to their **impact on both people's capabilities (i.e. the extent to which people are able to pursue valued opportunities) and their functionings (i.e. the extent to which they realise specific aspirations)**.

Measurement of capabilities can be broken down into two types of freedoms, both of which are fundamental to wellbeing:

- **opportunity freedoms**, assessed in terms of capabilities, and importantly requiring consideration of **conversion factors** that enable people to convert resources into valued functionings; and

- **process freedoms**, understood as **individual agency** and **system** freedoms.

---

4 In New Zealand, for example, improving child wellbeing was identified as a specific priority for its 2019 Wellbeing Budget, drawing on analysis of the indicators from the Living Standards Framework Dashboard, alongside other wellbeing evidence: https://www.treasury.govt.nz/information-and-services/nz-economy/higher-living-standards/measuring-wellbeing-lsf-dashboard.

Opportunity freedoms: Measuring capabilities

Measuring capabilities is essential for at least three reasons:

- Resources (such as income, assets, public goods, entitlements) are often understood as proxies for wellbeing, that is, as the material goods that enable wellbeing. However, people with similar sets of resources may be able to achieve **different outcomes** (functionings) depending on their circumstances. Personal, social and environmental factors shape people's ability to convert available resources into valued outcomes. Therefore, measurement of the resources available to an individual can only provide a partial picture of their wellbeing. Indeed, empirical research demonstrates that measures based on resource deprivation do not neatly correlate with measures of capability deprivation; rather the two measures lead to the identification of different individuals experiencing hardship.[5]

  For example, for an individual to have the capability to do decent work aligned with their aspirations and values, they may need not only financial resources and assets (e.g. a car, money to buy suitable clothes) and personal conversion factors (e.g. skills) but also access to certain services (e.g. child care, transport), as well as certain political freedoms, social norms and structures (e.g. protection from discrimination, inclusive and flexible work environment).

- By focusing on capabilities, no particular notion of what makes a 'good life' is privileged. Rather, the aim of public policy is to **expand the valued ways of life from which each person can choose** – once again **reflecting the centrality of agency**.

- Measuring capabilities overcomes some of the weaknesses of **subjective measures of wellbeing**, which can be affected by personality, adaptation to experience, and social and cultural norms.[6] Sen notes that while happiness and life satisfaction are valued capabilities, they are not the only ones social policy should seek to expand.[7]

Measuring capabilities is difficult because it involves measuring what people are *potentially* able to be and do, not want they are actually being or doing. Although BSL is not aware of any government or institution that has (yet) developed a comprehensive set of indicators to measure capability (real opportunity) directly, it is possible to develop indicators and measures that represent key aspects of capability. The Multidimensional Inequality Framework developed by the London School of Economics and the UK Measurement Framework for Equality and Human Rights represent two attempts to apply the Capabilities Approach to measurement of (in)equality that are worthy of further exploration by the Australian Treasury. Neither framework has successfully

---

[5] Alkire, S et al. 2015, *Multidimensional poverty measurement and analysis*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

[6] McKnight, A et al. 2019, Multidimensional Inequality Framework, International Inequalities Institute, London School of Economics, pp. 7–8. A counterpoint to common criticisms of subjective wellbeing measures is provided by RA Cummins and KC Land (2018), 'Capabilities, subjective wellbeing and public policy: a response to Austin (2016)', *Social Indicators Research* no. 140, pp. 157–173. BSL supports inclusion of subjective measures as part of a comprehensive approach to measuring wellbeing.

[7] Sen, A (2009) cited in Alkire, S et al. 2015, *Multidimensional poverty measurement and analysis*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

identified specific capability measures; rather both attempt to measure capabilities by developing a set of proxies for real opportunities, including:

- outcomes (**functionings**)

- personal and public **resources** in the form of service access and quality, and formal entitlements and rights

- notes on how different types of policies in each domain can enable people to convert resources into valued functionings (**conversion factors**).

BSL takes a similar approach in our Impact Framework. We break down the Capabilities Approach into its component concepts, which together signal real opportunity to achieve valued outcomes in a domain of interest. These components are measured both at the level of the individual and at system level.

- At the individual level, this includes **participation** in a valued domain, *connections* to people and services and **knowledge and skills** enabling conversion of resources and opportunities into outcomes, and a person's **agency and voice** to identify and pursue valued outcomes. These roughly coincide with functionings (participation), conversion factors (connections; knowledge and skills) and agency respectively, though some social and personal conversion factors (such as skills and social connections) could also be understood as intrinsically valuable outcomes (functionings).

- At the system level, the framework considers the social conversion factors acting on people's ability to access and convert resources and opportunities into valued outcomes, including social norms and mental models, policies, power structures and relations, and practices. Personal and environmental conversion factors are incorporated through the framework's consideration of people's diverse life circumstances and the places they live.

Box 3.1 Integrating consideration of resources, conversion factors and functionings to assess financial wellbeing

BSL's approach to financial wellbeing is designed to make visible both the **structural and individual factors** (conversion factors) that influence financial wellbeing. As a concept, financial wellbeing has tended to focus on individual objective measures and self-assessments of ability to meet expenses. This has resulted in financial literacy programs and policies that have focused on building individual financial 'literacy' (knowledge and skills, i.e. personal conversion factors) but neglected the systemic and structural drivers of financial distress, such as inequitable financial systems, lack of decent work, and inadequacy of social security. Drawing on the Capabilities Approach, BSL's financial wellbeing framework centres on economic dignity and reveals how structures of inequality and systemic barriers can constrain people's choices and undermine efforts to achieve financial wellbeing.[8]

---

[8] Brown, JT & Bowman, D 2020, Economic security and dignity: a financial wellbeing framework, Brotherhood of St Laurence, Fitzroy, Vic., p. 6.

BSL recommends that Treasury **engage with local and international experts** who are investigating direct measurement of capability, given its centrality to wellbeing.[9]

Process freedoms: Measuring agency

In addition to opportunity freedoms, process freedoms – that is, ensuring systems enable people's agency to identify and pursue valued outcomes – are central to a Capabilities Approach to wellbeing. From a capabilities perspective, ***how* government services and supports are delivered** can be as important as – if not more important than – what services are delivered and what outcomes are achieved.

Theoretical and empirical research shows that **agency** (which can include **choice, voice, control, empowerment)** is fundamental to people's sense of wellbeing and can vary independently from people's access to resources.[10] Deprivation of agency experienced as **powerlessness** is also central to the experience of poverty. This means it will not be sufficient from a wellbeing perspective for an individual or group to achieve an outcome – for example, in employment – if the process and practice through which this is achieved does not support individual agency, giving people real choices over their employment pathway(s).

Kotan describes the elements of agency as the ability to:

- exert **power** so as to **influence** the state of the world,

- do so in a **purposeful** way [i.e. intentionally], and

- in line with **self-established objectives**.[11]

A national wellbeing framework therefore must include indicators of agency. While the OECD framework already includes some measures of political agency, including 'having a say in government' and 'voter turnout', it lacks measures of individual agency, which reflect a person's everyday experience of control over their lives. BSL recommends that the Australian wellbeing framework include at least one **indicator of individual agency**.[12] BSL recommends Treasury also consider incorporating indicators **in all domains** within the Australian wellbeing framework

---

[9] These could include Sabina Alkire and James Foster from the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative; Hareth Al-Janabi and fellow researchers developing the ICECAP capabilities measures at the University of Birmingham; Professor Rob Carter, Foundation Chair in Disability Economics at the Melbourne Disability Institute; and Mike Salvaris at the University of Melbourne for work on the Australian National Development Index.

[10] See Ibrahim, S & Alkire, S 2007, *Agency and empowerment: a proposal for internationally comparable indicators*, Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative, Working paper no. 4, Oxford Department of International Development, pp. 4–5; Hojman, D & Miranda, A 2018, 'Agency, human dignity and subjective well-being', *World Development*, vol. 101, pp. 1–15.

[11] Kotan, M 2010, 'Freedom or happiness? Agency and subjective well-being in the capability approach', *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, vol. 39, pp. 369–370.

[12] See Ibrahim, S & Alkire, S 2007, *Agency and empowerment: a proposal for internationally comparable indicators*, Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative, Working paper no. 4, Oxford Department of International Development; Samman, E & Santos, ME 2009, *Agency and empowerment: a review of concepts, indicators and empirical evidence*, Working paper, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative.

representing the degree to which agency is able to be exercised in each domain. These agency measures could be domain-agnostic (applying the same criteria to all domains, thus providing a unifying framework for measuring wellbeing across different domains, populations and places); or alternatively domain-specific measures of agency could be developed.[13]

Agency as an outcome can be measured both **objectively and subjectively**, capturing people's effective use of their agency to achieve valued outcomes or their belief in their agency respectively. Objective measures could capture functionings and their alignment with individual goals and aspirations, but subjective measures are most common. A person's subjective assessment of their agency can be considered a mixture of their objective agency, the information available to them, and features of their personality, such as their level of optimism. While all subjective measures must contend with this mixture of inputs, increasingly techniques are being developed to control for personality.[14]

In addition to indicators of individual agency as an outcome, BSL recommends that process and practice indicators or principles be included in the wellbeing framework to capture system freedoms enabling agency. These process and practice indicators might sit at a level below the headline indicators, as part of a comprehensive wellbeing measurement framework. These could take the form of implementation principles, as in the He Ara Āwhina (Pathways to Support) framework developed in New Zealand to monitor the features of an ideal mental health and addiction system supporting wellbeing.[15]

The expansion of Australia's wellbeing framework to incorporate capabilities-based process and practice measures also has implications for how the framework is implemented, including governance, program design and practice (see Section 4).

Recommendations

3. Adopt an approach to measuring and advancing wellbeing that evaluates policy, budgeting and other government decision-making according to their impact on both people's capabilities and their functionings.

4. Consider measuring people's real opportunities (capabilities) using a combination of proxy measures, including functionings, resources, conversion factors and agency.

5. Engage with local and international experts investigating development of specific/direct capability measures.

---

[13] Ibrahim, S & Alkire, S 2007, *Agency and empowerment: a proposal for internationally comparable indicators*, Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative, Working paper no. 4, Oxford Department of International Development, p. 5.

[14] See Hojman, D & Miranda, A 2018, 'Agency, human dignity and subjective well-being', *World Development*, vol. 101, pp. 1–15, for application of a method using subjective wellbeing measures developed in Van Praag, BM & Ferrer-i Carbonell, A 2008, *Happiness quantified: a satisfaction calculus approach*, Oxford University Press.

[15] See the He Ara Oranga wellbeing outcomes framework developed by the Te Hiringa Mahara Mental Health and Wellbeing Commission.

6. Include at least one indicator of individual agency (e.g. experience of control over one's life) within the wellbeing framework, and consider including indicators in each domain representing the degree to which agency is able to be exercised in that domain (either domain-agnostic or domain-specific).

7. Include process and practice indicators or principles in all domains in the wellbeing framework to measure *how* government services and supports are delivered, in addition to what services are delivered and the outcomes achieved.

4 Implementing wellbeing

BSL agrees with the Centre for Policy Development that a wellbeing framework is only truly meaningful if wellbeing measures are **integrated into decision-making**[16], yet it seems few have grappled with the challenges of implementing a wellbeing approach in policy, programs and practice – in communities, among key populations and at life transition points.

BSL has experience using wellbeing as a guiding design principle to **vertically align effort** at **policy, program and practice** levels across domains to optimise outcomes for children and young people. This includes consideration of governance arrangements, monitoring and evaluation approaches, and tools and resources to guide practice.

Using a wellbeing framework for policy design

A BSL review of the literature on the governance of youth policy internationally and in Australia, with a focus on child and youth wellbeing frameworks and strategies, suggests the following features are required to drive meaningful improvements in wellbeing:

*   effective **top-down leadership** – that is, a political commitment combined with high-level authorisation to drive whole-of-government collaboration

*   well-designed mechanisms to enable **effective cross-departmental collaboration** on policy problems that require a joined-up system response, including a central implementation unit, ideally complemented by mechanisms to enable service system integration

*   robust mechanisms to **hold agencies to account** for the implementation of policy commitments, backed up by consistent data collection practices and reporting requirements

*   **real opportunities for those affected to contribute** to the governance of the framework, not just engagement or consultation in the development of the framework, but ongoing participation in implementation and monitoring progress.[17]

These findings are consistent with the conclusions drawn by CPD regarding mechanisms for translating wellbeing measures into policy in their review of international approaches to wellbeing, and BSL supports their recommendations regarding provision of guidance for decision-

---

[16] Gaukroger, C, Ampofo, A, Kitt, F, Phillips, T & Smith, W 2022, *Redefining progress: a review of global approaches to wellbeing*, Centre for Policy Development, p. 4.

[17] Thornton, D 2022 (unpub.), BSL proposal for a Commonwealth youth transition strategy: Background paper.

making to support capability-building and cultural change, and embedding wellbeing across government through strong governance and accountability mechanisms.[18]

As an example, the Youth Transitions Framework developed by BSL for the Tasmanian Department of Communities embeds engagement in education and employment within the Tasmanian government's broader wellbeing framework, which is based on the outcome domains in the ARACY Nest agenda, to deliver systemic change. The Tasmanian wellbeing framework picks up the essential elements identified in the policy review above and provides guidance for governance arrangements and accountabilities for each sector based on their expertise – aligning effort vertically at the policy, program and practice levels – as well as for development of outcome measures, data collection and practice approaches.

Operationalising wellbeing approaches at the program design level

BSL has used a wellbeing approach to inform program design, for example, in the development of the Education First Youth Foyer model, the review of Quality of Life measures (which include measures of subjective wellbeing and capability) to inform aged care service design, and as the basis of our delivery model for NDIS Local Area Coordination and Aged Care. BSL can provide further information about this work on request.

Place is an important factor to consider in implementing a wellbeing approach. As CPD argues:

> the broad principles of what makes a good life may be almost universal but the specifics vary by location and demographic. This represents a challenge to governments because the best way to achieve their aims may be to devolve power to those who are operating at the appropriate scale.[19]

Operationalising wellbeing approaches at the practice level

The Capabilities Approach also provides a framework for thinking about how practice enables wellbeing. As highlighted above, from a capabilities perspective, *how* programs and services are delivered (process and practice) can be as important to wellbeing as the outcomes achieved.

As an example, six 'service offers' have been developed for the **Education First Youth Foyers** that bring the ARACY wellbeing domains together with insights from positive psychology to create practical approaches and resources for working with young people. Each service offer outlines the practice model, the operational approaches and some of the tools and measures that can be used to implement it, and is designed for use by Foyer practitioners, educators and those developing and delivering youth services, as well as other stakeholders.

BSL would be pleased to provide further advice on development of an implementation model for Treasury's wellbeing framework drawing on the Capabilities Approach, including how this can

---

[18] Gaukroger, C, Ampofo, A, Kitt, F, Phillips, T & Smith, W 2022, *Redefining progress: a review of global approaches to wellbeing*, Centre for Policy Development.

[19] Gaukroger, C, Ampofo, A, Kitt, F, Phillips, T & Smith, W 2022, *Redefining progress: a review of global approaches to wellbeing*, Centre for Policy Development, p. 8.

be operationalised **in place and/or with specific cohorts**, and how the interplay between **structural and individual factors** that influence wellbeing can be addressed.

Recommendations

8. Implement a wellbeing approach through vertical alignment of policy, programs and practice in each domain, including appropriate governance arrangements, tools and resources to guide practice, and monitoring and evaluation approaches.