Consultancy Services for Outcome Evaluation for Services of Urban Renewal Social Service Teams

Commissioned by Urban Renewal Fund

Final Report

Submitted by
Prof. WONG Hung & Prof. WONG Yu Cheung

Department of Social Work
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

November 2016

Research Team Members

Name	Position	Role
Dr. WONG Hung	Associate Professor	Co-Principal investigator
Dr. WONG Yu Cheung	Associate Professor	Co-Principal investigator
Ms. LU Shiyu	Ph.D student	Co-investigator
Mr. Justin Ho	Research Assistant	Research Assistant

Acknowledgement

Special Note by the URF:

This report was prepared by the Consultants' team independently. The opinions and recommendations presented in the report do not necessarily reflect the views of the URF.

Executive Summary

1. This is the final report submitted to the Urban Renewal Fund by Prof. Wong Hung and Prof. Wong Yu Cheung of the Department of Social Work at The Chinese University of Hong Kong for the Consultancy Study "Consultancy to Conduct Outcome Evaluation for Services of Urban Renewal Social Service Teams (SSTs)".

2. The objectives of this Consultancy are to conduct the outcome evaluation for the services of the current Social Service Teams (SSTs) to enhance service assessment and service planning, and to articulate any impact of the change in the funder of the SST services from the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) to the Urban Renewal Fund (URF) including the independence of the SSTs and their working relationship with stakeholders.

3. The study period lasted from September 2015 to June 2016. After the policy documents and literature review, the consultancy team conducted individual interviews with senior managers of URA and URF, supervisors and workers of SSTs. Focus group discussions were organized for SST social workers and users of the SST services. On-site observations regarding the SST services were also carried out.

4. The expected outcome of the setting up of URF, recommended by the Urban Renewal Strategy Review, was to enable the SSTs to become more independent from the URA. The new funding arrangement under URF allows the SSTs to obtain additional manpower for supervision and clerical supports, which enables social workers in the SSTs to focus on frontline service. The extension of the second contract term from one year to two years also allows programme and manpower planning over a longer time span.

5. Different stakeholders, undoubtedly, have different expectations. URA expected that the work of the SSTs could provide assistance and advice to residents affected by URA-implemented redevelopment projects to facilitate the carrying out of urban renewal on a "people first" approach in accordance

with the Urban Renewal Strategy. URF expected that they could serve as a facilitator between SSTs and URA. While the SSTs hoped that they could perform a helping and assisting role to understand and alleviate users' difficulties and problems. Some users expected that SSTs could liaise and organize residents to build up their solidarity.

6. After the new funding arrangement, URA found that the communication with SSTs was not as smooth as before. The URF identified their role as a facilitator between URA and SSTs, which helped to clarify misunderstanding between the two parties. The SSTs viewed that they could successfully deliver the essential outcomes for giving advice, providing emotional support, enhancing linkage and facilitating self-help and mutual help atmosphere. The users agreed with the outcomes reported by the SSTs and appreciated the forming of platform among users to share information and to provide mutual help.

7. There are some common understanding about the division of work and communications between the three parties. The communication of the day-to-day details at the case level can be directly carried out by URA and SSTs without involvement of URF. URF will be involve in the macro management about planning and administration of the SSTs service outcomes and performances. URF will also service as a mediator between URA and SSTs, when needs arise.

8. All stakeholders agreed that the independence of SST has increased after the change of source of funding from URA to URF. However, URA commented that there existed communication issues between URA and SSTs. URF perceived that SSTs' operation has been smoother. The workers of SSTs commented that clearer administration and responsibilities between URA and SSTs has been achieved. They also expressed that they have gained more respect the staff of RA than before.

9. URA found that changes in the communication pattern have created barriers for completing certain tasks. For URF, the major difficulty was that the service boundary of SSTs was limited by the project framework. For the workers of

SSTs, the difficulties encountered were mainly related to the short duration of project, changing working areas and sites and limited manpower resources.

10. SSTs suggested that a district-based planning and implementation of the SST services is a better approach than just the existing project-based ones. They expressed their wish that agencies could serve specific districts for a longer duration, such as three to four years. Both workers and users recommended that the SST service could be started before the announcement of redevelopment sites by URA, and the follow-up period could be extended to 12 months and beyond. SSTs suggested the inclusion of other stakeholders as their service targets. Users suggested that SSTs could provide more updated and accurate policy and procedure of redevelopment and could engage residents to participate in relevant policy areas of URA/URF. Both users and workers recommended more manpower resources in each SST. For the tendering procedure, SSTs hoped that the tender/ service agreement could be flexibly designed to reflect the specific conditions of each district.

11. The Consultancy Team makes the following major recommendations:

- Being important partners of URA, URF and SSTs should collaborate with URA to plan, implement and achieve the 4Rs.

- Coordination and synergy among the three main functions of the URF is to be achieved. For instance, SSTs are to involve in social impact assessments and planning studies as well as to encourage start-up projects in the community for heritage preservation and district revitalization projects. A more proactive coordination among the respective roles and functions of URF, SSTs and URA will be more effective and efficient to achieve the Urban Renewal Strategy.

- The major policy about setting up of SSTs should follow the original framework, which stipulates that "The UR Fund Limited shall fund the Team in designated districts for providing assistance and counseling services to the owners and residents affected by the redevelopment projects implemented by the Urban Renewal Authority."

- An extension of the service scope and depth of the service provided by SSTs would lead to the improvements mentioned above. Other than providing assistance and counseling services to owners and residents affected by URA redevelopment projects, SSTs may extend their service scope to encourage and organize residents and/or resident groups to participate in the 3Rs other than "re-development".

- SSTs should continue to provide assistance and counseling services to owners and residents affected by the re-development project, which is still the core business of individual SSTs. Whereas, in some stages of the re-development project, when spare manpower resources are available, they could be allocated to the following extended services:

  i) Building rapport with residents before the re-development phase and following up residents after the re-development phase; and

  ii) Facilitating and enabling residents, residents' group and community organizations to take part in building rehabilitation, as well as revitalisation and heritage preservation projects.

- A three-level communication framework to address the communication issue between SST and URA.

  i) First level – Overall project platform (Involvement of all three parties: URA, SST & URF)
     - It is a platform to communicate and clarify about the compensation and relocation policy and the major and potential issues regarding each project as well as other issues concerning the 4Rs within the district of the project. The involvement of URF in the process is recommended. Such meeting could be held in the beginning stage of each project and at the completion of the project to review the working experience.

  ii) Second level – Case conference (URA and SST)
     - Regular case conferences, probably on quarterly basis throughout the redevelopment and follow-up period to discuss

cases related to social services needs of the disadvantaged groups. Prior consent from clients could be sought before the meeting to facilitate discussion. Minutes of the meeting should be sent to the URF. Ad-hoc discussion regarding urgent cases could always be arranged.

iii) <u>Third level – Direct negotiation (URA and affected stakeholders)</u>

- Given the differences in the roles played by URA and SSTs regarding redevelopment process, it is better for URA to negotiate directly with the affected stakeholders over compensation and relocation arrangement. Nevertheless, SSTs should have sufficient and accurate knowledge regarding such policies and arrangements so that SSTs could provide reasonable and rational advices to the stakeholders during the process. In such connection, briefing sessions could be arranged by URA to provide updates of the arrangements to SSTs whenever needed.

- Service Area: In each District Council District with redevelopment projects of URA, normally one NGO will be responsible for providing the SST service. In exceptional case when there are rising needs in one District Council District that exceed the capacity of one NGO, other NGO(s) may be invited to bid the service tender. In each District Council District, the number of SSTs will be based on the normative service outcome and service needs of each district.

- The duration of contract for NGOs in serving one area is recommended to be increased to two years plus two years. NGOs, currently operating SSTs, will still be eligible for bidding the service tender and compete with other NGOs under the same set of criteria after four years' service.

- Rapport building with residents should be started before the announcement of redevelopment by URA. Activities such as community education programmes like street exhibitions, talks and forums could be provided. For some exceptional needs and vulnerable clients, the follow-up period can exceed six months for providing longer term support services after redevelopment have taken place.

- Other stakeholders especially those vulnerable groups in the district, like hawkers, homeless people, or residents living nearby, who are affected by the redevelopment process, are recommended to be included as potential targets of service. This arrangement is to be mutually agreed by SSTs and URF

- SSTs will continue their existing casework, group work and organizing work on redevelopment. Clients should be well-informed of policy and procedure of redevelopment before the start of redevelopment.

- SSTs should also engage residents to participate in relevant policy areas of URA/ URF, such as Urban Renewal Heritage Preservation and District Revitalisation by organizing district forums, participatory design workshops, project design competitions at district level if they have extra manpower after handling the re-development cases.

- To address the manpower issue of different districts, a notional approach suggested by the HKU 2012 team should be adopted. If the case number falls below 1,000 in an area, SST concerned will be required by URF to deliver community education projects.

- There will be one to three SST(s) in an area according to the expected outcomes (number of cases and number of persons engaging in projects) set by URF as stipulated in the tender document.

- URF could adopt a standardized template of key performance indicators. The NGOs are required to provide key performance indicators of the project according to the needs and characteristics in the redevelopment sites in their tender documents during the bidding process.

Contents

1. Background

The Urban Renewal Fund commissioned Prof. WONG Hung and Prof. WONG Yu Cheung of the Department of Social Work at The Chinese University of Hong Kong to perform "Consultancy to Conduct Outcome Evaluation for Services of Urban Renewal Social Service Teams (SSTs)" on 14 September 2015. The study period lasted from September 2015 to June 2016. This is the final progress report, which reviews the research process, states the results of the study, and articulates the changes on the social service teams due to the change in funder of the SST services from the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) to the Urban Renewal Fund (URF). Based on the comments and feedback of SSTs, the consultancy team also make some specific recommendations to improve the future planning and implementation of SSTs.

According to the tender and proposal of the study, the objectives of this Consultancy are as follows:

1. To conduct the outcome evaluation for the services of the current Social Service Teams (SSTs) to enhance service assessment and service planning.
2. To articulate any impact of the change in the funder of the SST services from the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) to the Urban Renewal Fund (URF) including the independence of the SSTs and their working relationship with stakeholders.

1.1 Outcome evaluation for the services of the current SSTs

In order to define and evaluate the potential outcomes, the research team identified three aspects to be studied. Firstly, we investigated the tender documents, evaluation forms and other relevant documents of URF and SSTs to investigate the outcomes defined by URF. Secondly, the aims and objectives of each SST operating organization were studied. Thirdly, major stakeholders, including owner occupiers, tenants, and shop operators (owners and tenants) were interviewed while their expectation of services outcome were identified and evaluated.

1.2 Articulation of the impact of the change in the funder of the SST services

The examination on the impact of the change in the funder of the SST services from URA to URF was a two-step process. Firstly, previous reviews and studies about the SST services before the change in funder in 2011 were examined. Based on the documentation review, a rating on various factors, including but not limited to SSTs' independence and its working relationship with stakeholders, was derived. Secondly, same factors were evaluated again with the new data collected in this study. A new rating, which was then compared with the old rating so as to assess the impact of the change in the funder, was derived.

The areas of comparison include:

i) *General*

- Composition of SSTs and amount of funds available

- Service team location and geographic coverage of SSTs

- Reporting and monitoring mechanism (to funding body

ii) *Engagement of service users and interventions*

- Self-introduction and rapport building with service users

- Perception of service users towards the independence of the service teams

- Nature and amount of service output/outcome

iii) *Communications with URA and local community leaders*

- Nature and frequency of communications

- Availability of information and support

- Nature of cooperation

2. Data collection methods

2.1 Documentation review

- URA completed two reviews of the SST services in April 2008 and October 2009. Relevant documentation of the reviews, provided by URA, was examined.

- URF completed another study on the operation of SSTs in August 2012 (Our research team member, Prof. WONG Yu Cheung took part in the study). The relevant documentation was reviewed again.

- Relevant materials on SSTs of the Urban Renewal Strategy Review conducted in 2008-2011 were reviewed.

2.2 Interviews

- Senior managers of URA who monitored the performance of SSTs under the previous URA system.

- Senior managers of URA who worked closely with SSTs in URA redevelopment projects.

- Senior managers of URF who monitor the work of the existing SSTs.

- Supervisors of the existing SSTs funded by URF.

- A total of 8 in-depth / focus group interviews were conducted with the workers of SSTs.

2.3 Focus group interviews

- Major stakeholders, including affected owners, tenants, shop operators (owners and tenants).

- Frontline social workers of the existing SSTs.

- A total of three focus group interviews of users were conducted. Participants were selected to include respondents from different demographic background, such as age and gender, and specifically, we included new arrivals, older persons, ethnic minorities, and so forth.

2.4 Onsite observations

- Three onsite observations were conducted to Christian Family Service Centre (26/1/2016), The Salvation Army (11/3/2016) and St. James

Settlement (1/4/2016) to observe the working environment at the office, the atmosphere and activities at these centres.

3. Tasks Completed

3.1 Document reviewed

Review Date	Document
Sept 2015	Invitation to Tender for the Running of Urban Renewal Social Service Team for Services in Hong Kong Island (August 2012)
Sept 2015	SST Quarterly/Annual Report Form (December 2014)
Sept 2015	Performance Evaluation Form of SST (June 2013)
Oct 2015	Legislative Council Panel on Planning, Lands and Works, Work Plans of The Urban Renewal Authority, CB(1) 825/01-02(01) (Jan 2002)
Oct 2015	Meeting of the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works on 23.11.2004 -- Government/URA's Response to Concerns Raised by Organizations/Deputations at the Meeting, CB(1)1202/04-05(02) (Mar 2005)
Oct 2015	Legislative Council Brief -- People First: A District-Based And Public Participatory Approach To Urban Renewal Urban Renewal Strategy Review, CB(1)1157/09-10(03) (Oct 2010)
Oct 2015	Urban Renewal Strategy -- People First: A District-Based And Public Participatory Approach To Urban Renewal Urban Renewal (Feb 2011)
Nov 2015	The Study on The Future Directions of Providing Social Work Services within the New Urban Renewal Strategy to be Formulated by HKU team (July 2010)
Nov 2015	Consultancy Study to Review the Appointment of Urban Renewal Social Service Teams for Services to Residents Affected by URA-implemented Redevelopment Projects by HKU team (Aug 2012)
April 2016	Documentation Review of current contract and report forms of SSTs

3.2 In-depth and focus group interviews

Date	Interview / Focus Group	Target	Participants
15 Oct 2015	URF	Manager	2
16 Oct 2015	URA	Managers	4
16 Oct 2015	URA	Managers	2
4 Nov 2015	St. James Settlement	Service in Charge, Team Leader	2
11 Nov 2015	The Salvation Army	Supervisor	1
11 Nov 2015	Christian Family Service Centre	Supervisor	2
17 Nov 2015	The Salvation Army	Team Leader, Social Worker	11
18 Nov 2015	Christian Family Service Centre	Team Leader, Social Worker	4
26 Jan 2016	Christian Family Service Centre	Clients & on-site visit	5
11 Mar 2016	The Salvation Army	Clients & on-site visit	9
1 Apr 2016	St. James Settlement	Clients & on-site visit	4
May 2016	Telephone and mail invitation were sent to District Council Members and Legislative Councilors, asking if they would like to participate in focus group about the work of SSTs, but response was negative.		-

In conclusion, 95% of the tasks were completed by June 2016. The only incomplete task was organizing focus group interviews with the Members of District Council and Legislative Council.

4. Findings and Analyses

4.1 Comparison between the different arrangements of SSTs under the funding from URA and URF

	Funded by URA	**Funded by URF**	**Impacts**
General			
Policy requirement	• Under Section 33 of the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS) (2001), "the URA should set up an urban renewal social service team in each of the nine target areas to provide assistance and advice to residents affected by URA's redevelopment projects. Such a team should operate independently and should preferably be in place before the first redevelopment project has actually commenced in a target area." • The new URS (February, 2011) stated that the SSTs will be funded by the URF which is set up with endowment from the URA (Article 39). The SSTs will directly report to the Board of Trust Fund. The aim of this construction to make the SSTs more independent from the URA, at least, to be seen as more independent.	• The UR Fund Limited is incorporated to act as the trustee of the Urban Renewal Trust Fund as provided in the URS promulgated by the Development Bureau in February 2011. • The UR Fund Limited shall fund the Team in designated districts for providing assistance and counseling services to the owners and residents affected by the redevelopment projects implemented by the URA.	• SSTs express a stronger sense of professional autonomy and were seen to be more independent by service users in the redevelopment sites

Composition of SSTs and amount of funds available	• In April 2008, under the funding of URA, the required composition of a SST was: 1 Team Leader (social work (SW) degree + 3 years working experience); and 2 Team members (social work diploma holders (or equivalent) + 2 years working experience).	• Since 2015, under the funding of URF, the composition of each SST was: 1/5 Team Supervisor (5 years' experience preferably in Community Work); 1 Team Leader (SW Degree + 3 years relevant working experience & above); 2 Team Members (SW Diploma/ Associate Degree + 2 years relevant working experience); and 1 clerical assistant	• Additional manpower for supervision and clerical support enables social workers in the SST to concentrate their work on frontline service with users. • Supervisors take up major responsibility to liaise with URF and URA.
	• In 2002, when URA first funded SSTs, the annual funding for operating each SST included a fixed lump sum fee of HKD 600,000 and a ceiling cost of HKD 100,000 for programme-related expenses. • In 2008, URA started to provide a total staff cost of HKD 2,250,000 for a 2-year SST contract, with an increase of HKD 1,050,000 or 87.5% of existing contract sum.	• Around HKD 750,000 fixed lump-sum fee, annual MPS adjustment, and 10% out of pocket reimbursement (including programme cost + 5% administration cost + 1% staff development cost)	• More secure funding on programme and administration enables better planning and administration of the NGOs in running SSTs.
	• 2–year contract + 1-year follow up services (at most 2 times)	• 2–year + 2–year contract (subject to satisfactory performance of the SST in the first two years)	• Longer contract period allows longer term programme and manpower planning of the SSTs.

Service team location and geographic coverage of SSTs	• In 2002, three NGOs run three teams in Wanchai, Tai Kok Tsui and Sham Shui Po. • In 2010, URA engaged three NGOs to provide SST services to seven of the nine target areas, except for Yau Tong and Tsuen Wan. • In 2012 review, the HKU team recommended the location and geographical coverage of SST as follows: 1. Hong Kong Island; 2. Sham Shui Po and Yau Tsim Mong [possibly including the New Territories West]; 3. Kowloon City, Wong Tai Sin, and Kwun Tong (except Kwun Tong Town Centre) [possibly include the New Territories East]	• In 2016, three NGOs run three teams in Central and Western District, Kwun Tong and Kowloon City, as well as Yau Tsim Mong and Sham Shui Po.	• The location and the boundaries of the SSTs under the URF have been changing in recent years, owing to the launch of new projects, which are smaller in scale. • Salvation Army is running more projects than the other two NGOs.
Reporting and monitoring mechanism (to funding body)	• SSTs needed to submit the Performance Evaluation Forms in six-month periods and Quarterly Reports on case progress and statistics to URA. • Regular work meetings between the URA and the SSTs were held to ensure that both sides knew the current stage of project development and the work plans of their partners for facilitating SSTs to make better plans for their work and provide better services to the affected residents.	• NGOs running SSTs are required to submit reports to URF regarding the following items: 1. annual work plans and annual reports; 2. quarterly reports within 30 days on completion of each quarter within the Service Period; and 3. quarterly service reports in the format provided by URFL.	• The requirement of reporting procedure and format under the URF is systematic and structured. Accordingly, the SSTs reported that they need to have some work plans than before.

In summary, the setup and arrangement of URF was to allow SSTs to become more independent from URA. This was the expected outcome of the policy and the Urban Renewal Strategy. The funding arrangement under URF enabled SSTs to have additional manpower for supervision and clerical supports, which allowed social workers in the SSTs to concentrate their work on frontline service. The inclusion of programme cost and staff development cost in the fixed lump sum fee enables better planning and administration of SSTs. The extension of second contract term from one year to two years allows programme and manpower planning to be conducted a longer time span.

4.2 Interviews with different stakeholders

Expected Roles/Function/Outcomes

	Expected Roles/Function/Outcomes
URA	• URA expected that the work of the SSTs could make the clearance of the site more smoothly; could enable clients to understand procedures and matters on clearance. The social workers, who act as a third party, could establish better relationship with the clients through different activities. • In order to better assist the affected residents in URA's redevelopment projects, relevant staff of URA expressed that they needed to know the progress of individual cases being handled by SSTs with a view to resolving the problems being faced by the residents together with SSTs, not the details about SSTs' activities.
URF	• URF should be independent from URA. • URF, URA and SSTs should jointly participate in the decision making process.
SSTs	• SSTs should explore difficulties faced by residents and try to help them. • SSTs should not have the responsibility to act on behalf of the URA to urge the residents to move away and to acquire the flats.

Users	• Most users appreciated the emotional support, information and advice giving services of the SSTs, no matter during period of the URA and URF. • Some users commented that the URA used tactics to divide residents into different groups while the SSTs tended to limit their organizing role. They wished that SSTs could liaise and organize residents to build up their solidarity.

Different stakeholders carried different expectation regarding the roles and function of the SSTs as well as the outcomes of the SST services. URA expected the work of SSTs to provide assistance and advice to residents affected by URA-implemented redevelopment projects to facilitate the carrying out of urban renewal on a "people first" approach in accordance with the Urban Renewal Strategy. URF expected themselves to serve as a facilitator between SSTs and URA in order to enhance independence of SSTs. On the other hand, SSTs expected that they could perform a helping and assisting role to understand and alleviate users' difficulties and problems. The users appreciated the emotional support and advice giving services of SSTs, they expected that SSTs could liaise and organize residents to build up their solidarity.

Achieved Outcomes

	Achieved Outcomes
URA	• URA does not directly monitor the work over SSTs, URA can only require SSTs to handle cases when needed.
URF	• Serves as a facilitator of SSTs at two levels: project-based and case-based. • Helps clarify misunderstandings between URA and SSTs.
SSTs	• Give information and advices to individual cases during different phases of redevelopment. • Provide essential emotional support and empathy to handle disrupted emotion of the residents.

	• Organize activities, groups and meetings to increase interaction and linkage among residents. • Facilitate a self-help and mutual help atmosphere among residents by asking experienced residents to share their own experiences and information.
Users	• Appreciated SST workers' assistance in releasing their stress and pressure in facing the difficult situations during redevelopment. • Acknowledged that SST workers provide necessary information and advice about what to do and that they really help them in handling their situations. • Acknowledged that SST workers organize residents with similar backgrounds and problems through forming a platform to share information and mutual support. • Recognized that SST workers provide successful cases and examples from other districts, which empower the residents.

After the new funding arrangement under URF, URA found that it could not directly monitor the work over SSTs, so that the communication was not so smooth as before. URF reviewed that they can serve as a facilitator between URA and SSTs, which helped to clarify misunderstanding between the two parties. The SSTs viewed that they could successfully deliver the essential outcomes as stated in the tenders for giving advice, providing emotional support, enhancing linkage and facilitating self-help and mutual help atmosphere. The users agreed with the outcomes reported by the SSTs and appreciated the forming of platform among users to share information and to provide mutual help.

**Perceived Impacts due to Change in the Source of Funding from
URA to URF**

	Perceived Impacts due to Change in the Source of Funding from URA to URF
URA	• Increasing independence of SSTs is achieved. • Setting up independent offices of the SSTs demonstrates that SSTs are not directly linked to URA; this helps reduce the "less independent image" of SSTs. • Longer time is needed or time-lag exists for communication between URA and SSTs. • Communication between URA and SSTs has changed from direct communication to indirect communication, in which URF serves as a mediator. • Under URF, regular meetings among URA, SSTs and URF are being held. • URF replaces URA to supervise administration and finance matters of SSTs and as a result, URA does not know the details of services provided by SSTs as in the past. • URA understands that owing to social work ethics, social workers are not allowed to disclose clients' information and progress without clients' consent. However, URA would like to have a balance between protection of privacy and information sharing to facilitate better handling of cases. • SSTs made frequent reports about case progress to URA, but after the change, URA does not receive similar data and reports. • Being unable to secure immediate support from the Social Welfare Department, the URA wishes SSTs to do the support work in case of emergency. However, it is difficult to require the staff of SSTs to present themselves during the clearance operation of URA to provide emergency support to distressed residents.
URF	• SSTs are more open to discuss opinions and problems. • Operation of SSTs is smooth. URF focuses on macro-management

	rather than micro-management.
SSTs	• Clearer administration and responsibilities between URA and SSTs have been made. • SSTs gain more respect from the staff of URA than before during their communication. • Making direct report to URF and using standardized form simplify the administration.
Users	• URA period: social workers helped the residents up to a certain extent but then stopped. • URA period: some barriers existed between social workers and residents, so the relationship was not stable. • URA period: residents dared not talk with SST workers during office hours of URA, so they would wait for the closing of URA office in order to talk with SST workers. • URA period: SSTs got limited power and capability. • URA period: some residents did not want to contact SSTs as they perceived that SSTs would collect information for URA. • URF period: SSTs do not share office premises with URA, so they enjoy a more independent image. • Some residents with longer and positive experiences with the SSTs claimed that SSTs have not changed much on their attitudes to tenants before and after receiving funding from URF. It does not affect the trust between residents and SSTs.

All stakeholders agreed that the independence of SST has increased after the change of source of funding from URA to URF. However, URA commented that communication between URA and SSTs has changed from direct to indirect, which took longer time or that time-lag existed. URA would also like to have a balance between the protection of privacy and information sharing with the social workers so that better and smoother handling of the cases can be achieved.

URF perceived that SSTs' operation is smoother. Furthermore, URF reviewed that they focused on macro-management rather than micro-management of the SSTs. The workers of SSTs commented that clearer administration and responsibilities

between URA and SSTs has been achieved after the change of source of funding. They also found that they have gained more respect from the staff of the URA than before.

Difficulties and Challenges

	Difficulties and Challenges
URA	• URA staff members understand the changes of attitudes and communication pattern of SSTs, but they find that these changes create barrier for completing certain tasks.
URF	• Service boundary of SSTs is limited by the project framework. • Short-term notice of projects is limited by the policy framework of a 24-hour notification period of announcement of projects. • Learning and knowledge transfer among the SSTs is limited.
SSTs	• The mediating role of URF may not be necessary as direct communication on case discussion between URA and SSTs is more efficient. • Drafting of tenders should be based on professional knowledge and allows SSTs to exercise with more autonomy. • Short duration of project. • Changing working area and sites. • Limited manpower resources. • Short follow-up period after moving out. • Standardized Funding and Service Agreement (like other mainstream social services) may not be appropriate for SSTs as different projects have great deviation of number of clients, area of redevelopment and length of services.
Users	• Manpower of the SSTs is not enough. • Residents are not familiar with the procedures of urban redevelopment. SSTs should educate residents about these steps.

While URA understood the changes of attitudes and communication pattern of SSTs after the change of source of funding, they found that these changes have created barriers for completing certain task. For URF, the major difficulty was that the service boundary of SSTs was limited by the project framework. Moreover, short-term notice of projects was limited by the policy requirement of 24-hour notification period of announcement. The major obstacles faced by the workers of the SSTs included the short duration of project, changing working areas and sites and limited manpower resources. The workers considered that the standardized Funding and Service Agreement might not be appropriate for SSTs as different projects had great variations. There are some common grounds for the division of work among the SSTs, URA and URF. As URF consider their role as a facilitator and involve in macro rather than micro management, and both URA and SSTs agree that direct communication about the cases between URA and SSTs is more efficient. The communication of the day-to-day details at the case level can be directly carried out by URA and SSTs without involvement of URF. The SSTs still need to report back the progress and situation of the cases by aggregate data to URF and URF will be involve in the macro management about planning and administration of the SSTs service outcomes and performances. Furthermore, URF will service as a mediator between URA and SSTs, when needs arise.

4.3 Possible directions of improvement suggested by stakeholders

Proposed Service Delivery Model	
Boundary / Level	• Plan and implement SST services on a district-based rather than project-based approach. • Select agencies to serve specific districts for a longer duration, say three to four years, to allow the selected agency have a longer period for service and manpower planning.
Duration	• Start the SST service in redevelopment projects before the announcement of redevelopment by URA for

	community engagement and rapport building with potential clients. • Extend the 6-month follow-up period to 12 months or more to provide longer support services for vulnerable clients.
Target /Scope of Service	• Other than owners, tenants and non-domestic owners/ operators /tenant-operators who are directly affected by the redevelopment, other stakeholders especially those vulnerable groups in the district, like hawkers, homeless peoples, or residents living nearby who are affected by the redevelopment process, are proposed to be included as target.
Depth of Service	• Deliver more update and accurate policy and procedure of redevelopment to residents especially for tenants. • SSTs attempt to engage residents in participating relevant policy areas of URA/URF e.g. Urban Heritage Renewal and Management, District Revitalization. Public hearings, participatory design workshops, project design competitions are to be organized at district level.
Manpower	• Provide more manpower resources in each SST
Planning & Administration	
Tender Procedure	• Arrange flexible tender / service agreement terms • Implement structured procedure and open selection criteria • Include minimum provision standard of office spaces and manpower resources for each SST

SSTs suggested that a district-based planning and implementation of SST services rather than just the existing project-based approach could be more appropriate. They expressed their wish that agencies could serve specific districts for a longer duration, such as three to four years, to enable better service and manpower planning. Both workers and users recommended that the SST service could be started before the announcement of redevelopment by the URA, and the follow-up period

could be extended to 12 months or beyond for some vulnerable clients in need. The workers of the SSTs suggested the inclusion of other stakeholders like hawkers, homeless peoples, or residents living nearby who were affected by the redevelopment as service target. Users suggested SSTs could deliver more updated and accurate policy and procedure of redevelopment, Moreover, SSTs could engage residents to participate in relevant policy areas of URA/URF. Both users and workers recommended more manpower resources in each SST. For the tender procedure, SSTs hoped that the tender/ service agreement could be flexible designed to reflect the specific conditions of each district. The workers expected that the procedure should be structured and the selection criteria should be opened to the public and SSTs. In the service contract, minimum provision standard of office spaces and manpower resources should be included for each SST.

5.   Recommendations by the Consultancy Team

There are some limitations of this study. First, it is difficult to contact clients who receive service from the SSTs long enough so that they can compare the differences of the Service provided by the SSTS between period under funding from URA to funding from URF. This problem is also valid for the frontline social workers of the SSTs, who may not have experience in working with URA. Second, it is difficult to contact other community leaders who have knowledge about the SSTs and ready to comment on their performance. Given such limitations, and while taking into consideration the policy context as well as practice situations and problems of the SSTs, and after reviewing major suggestions from different stakeholders, the Consultancy Team would like to make the following recommendations :

5.1 Roles and functions of URF, SSTs and URA

- The Urban Renewal Strategy (2011) states that urban renewal is not a "slash and burn" process. "A comprehensive and holistic approach should be adopted to rejuvenate older urban areas by way of redevelopment, rehabilitation, revitalisation and heritage preservation (the 4R business strategy). Implementation of URS should be undertaken by the URA, as well as all the other stakeholders/ participants so as to achieve a better balance and coordination among the 4Rs".

- The Consultancy Team considers that being important partners of URA, URF and SSTs should collaborate with URA to plan, implement and achieve the 4Rs.

- The three main functions of the URF are to provide an independent funding source to support the operation of SSTs, to support social impact assessments and other related planning studies to be proposed by the District Urban Renewal Forum, and to support heritage preservation and district revitalisation projects. We recommend that coordination and synergy among the three main functions of the URF is to be achieved. For instance, SSTs are to involve in social impact assessments and planning studies as well as to encourage start-up projects in the community for heritage preservation and district revitalization projects.

- According to the findings of this study, most stakeholders agreed that the SSTs have achieved a more "independent" practice and image, when compared to the period when SSTs received direct funding from the URA.

- The major policy about setting up of SSTs should follow the original framework, which stipulates that "The UR Fund Limited shall fund the Team in designated districts for providing assistance and counseling services to the owners and residents affected by the redevelopment projects implemented by the Urban Renewal Authority." It is envisaged that a more proactive coordination among the respective roles and functions of URF, SSTs and URA will be more effective and efficient to achieve the Urban Renewal Strategy.

- Accordingly, an extension of the service scope and depth of the service provided by the SSTs would lead to the improvements mentioned above. Other than providing assistance and counseling services to owners and residents affected by URA redevelopment projects, SSTs may extend their service scope to encourage and organize residents and/or resident groups to participate in the 3Rs other than "re-development".

- Yet, the major function of the SSTs is providing assistance and counseling services to owners and residents affected by the re-development project, which is still the core business of individual SSTs. Whereas, in some stages of the re-development project, when spare manpower resources are available, they could be allocated to the following extended services:

    i) Building rapport with residents before the re-development phase and following up residents after the re-development phase; and

    ii) Facilitating and enabling residents, residents' group and community organizations to take part in building rehabilitation, as well as revitalisation and heritage preservation projects.

5.2 Communication framework

- During our interviews, issues about communication between URA and SST regarding households/ cases in the redevelopment process were brought up by both parties. The experience of such communications varied. Regular communications between the two parties did take place. However,

there were circumstances under which the expectations regarding the roles of SSTs were different. There have been some issues related to the accessibility of SST members, and the roles they played during emergency situations. Apparently, the accessibility problem was addressed to some extent through the use of mobile phones on and after office hours. However, the role expectation issues still need to be addressed.

- During our interviews, we found out that cases regarding social service needs, such as care for the older people, concerns of the ethnic minorities, and other disadvantaged groups could be handled and communicated smoothly. There was no major problem over regular communications about their social service needs. Also, getting consents from these clients to communicate their needs to other public service providers, including URA, would be considered favorably by clients involved in general.

- However, cases regarding compensation and relocation arrangement could be more complex. These issues arise mainly from the different expectations about the roles of SST and the URA acquisition team. Social workers of SST, by their professional training, would see their roles more as organizers and facilitators to empower clients (under the context of redevelopment, the affected residents and shop operators/ owners) to respond to the challenges they face so that their rights and interests could be protected, and their well-beings enhanced. The URA acquisition team would expect more from the SST to help solve the problems of and remove the barriers for the residents, which hinder them from accepting the statutory compensations and relocation arrangement and moving away to new homes.

- Upon redevelopment, affected residents and shop owners/ operators, might engage in an extended negotiation process with URA. Under such circumstances, the roles of the social workers, by their professional training, require them to work closely with the residents and other affected stakeholders and examine rationally and reasonably about their rights and interests, and work out with them the best course of actions in the negotiation process. During this process, trust between the social workers

and clients are very important, and it is extremely difficult to ask for the consent of the clients to release their information to URA.

- The consultancy team would see this difference in expectations of the roles regarding compensation and relocation as natural given the professional background of the SST and is very common in the redevelopment process and it is where the issue of insufficient communication might have arisen. A new approach and understanding is needed to address such differences.

  i)   The Consultancy Team recommends a three-level communication framework to address the communication issue between SST and URA. First level – Overall project platform (Involvement of all three parties: URA, SST & URF)

      ● It is a platform to communicate and clarify about the compensation and relocation policy and the major and potential issues regarding each project as well as other issues concerning the 4Rs within the district of the project. The involvement of URF in the process is recommended. Such meeting could be held in the beginning stage of each project and at the completion of the project to review the working experience.

  ii) Second level – Case conference (URA and SST)

      ● Regular case conferences, probably on quarterly basis throughout the redevelopment and follow-up period to discuss cases related to social services needs of the disadvantaged groups. Prior consent from clients could be sought before the meeting to facilitate discussion. Minutes of the meeting should be sent to the URF. Ad-hoc discussion regarding urgent cases could always be arranged.

  iii) Third level – Direct negotiation (URA and affected stakeholders)

      ● Given the differences in the roles played by URA and the SST regarding redevelopment process, it is better for URA to negotiate directly with the affected stakeholders over compensation and relocation arrangement. Nevertheless, the SST should have sufficient and accurate knowledge regarding such policies and

arrangements so that SSTs could provide reasonable and rational advices to the stakeholders during the process. In such connection, briefing sessions could be arranged by URA to provide updates of the arrangements to SSTs whenever needed.

5.3 Service delivery model of SSTs

- Other than owners, tenants and non-domestic owners/ operators /tenant-operators who are directly affected by the redevelopment, other stakeholders especially those vulnerable groups in the district, like hawkers, homeless people, or residents living nearby, who are affected by the redevelopment process, are recommended to be included as potential targets of service. This arrangement is to be mutually agreed by SSTs and the URF

- The SSTs will continue their existing casework, group work and organizing work on redevelopment. Viewing the needs expressed by the clients, the Consultancy Team agrees that the clients should be well-informed of policy and procedure of redevelopment before the start of redevelopment. This should be one of the major tasks of the SSTs.

- It is also recommended that SSTs should also engage residents to participate in relevant policy areas of URA/ URF, e.g. Urban Heritage Renewal and Management, District Revitalisation by organizing district forums, participatory design workshops, project design competitions at district level if they have extra manpower after handling the re-development cases.

- For manpower issue of different districts, a notional approach suggested by the HKU 2012 team should be adopted:

Case number*	Number of Notional Standard SST
Below 400	1/2
400-799	2/3
800-999	1
1,000-1,499	1.5
1,500-1,999	2

* Case number refers to the number of households (residential) and number of operators (commercial).

- If the case number falls below 1,000 in an area, the SST concerned will be required by the URF to deliver community education projects as stated before. Community education project(s), on reaching the target of 5,000 residents, can be considered as having equivalent workload of 200 cases.

- There will be one to three SST(s) in an area according to the expected outcomes (number of cases and number of persons engaging in projects) set by URF as stipulated in the tender document.

- The notional manpower provision and office space should be proportional to the outcomes planned in each area. However SST, URF and URA should consult residents in framing and planning the expected outcomes in each area in the three-year period according to the unique needs and strengths of each area.

5.4 Template of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) of SSTs

- As there are diverse needs and characteristics in different districts, URF has not set up a set of standardize performance indicators for all SSTs. We understand the difficulty in setting up a universal set of performance indicators for all projects. However, to balance the need of flexibility of and the quality assurance and effectiveness of different projects, the Consultancy Team recommends the URF to adopt a standardized template of key performance indicators. The NGOs are required to provide key performance indicators of the project according to the needs and characteristics in the redevelopment sites in their tender documents during the bidding process.

- An example of template of the Key Performance Indicators are summarized in Appendix 2.

24

Appendix 1: Details of Case interview, Focus Groups and Site Visits

Date	*Interview / Focus Group*	Target	Parti-cipants	Tools of data collection
15 Oct 2015	*URF*	Managers	2	Semi-structural Interview
16 Oct 2015	*URA*	Managers	4	Semi-structural Interview
16 Oct 2015	*URA*	Managers	2	Semi-structural Interview
4 Nov 2015	*St. James Settlement*	Service in Charge, Team Leader 伍斯安 (Service in Charge) 王偉彥 Tony (Team Leader)	2	Semi-structural Interview
11 Nov 2015	*The Salvation Army*	Service supervisor Mr Tom Ma	1	Semi-structural Interview
11 Nov 2015	*Christian Family Service Centre*	Supervisor Mr. Charles Ng (Programme Director) Ms. Joyce Tse (Senior Service Manager)	2	Semi-structural Interview
17 Nov 2015	*The Salvation Army*	Team Leader Ms. Jessica Lam Social Workers	11	Semi-structural Interview
18 Nov 2015	*Christian Family Service Centre*	Team Leader - Ms. Lee Yin-han Social Workers	4	Semi-structural Interview
26 Jan 2016	*Christian Family Service*	Clients	5 (2 join in URA	Focus group interviews & on-

	Centre		period and 3 join in URF period)	site visit
11 Mar 2016	*The Salvation Army*	Clients	9 (3 join in URA period and 6 join in URF period)	Focus group interviews & on-site visit
1 Apr 2016	*St. James Settlement*	Clients	4 (2 join in URA period and 2 join in URF period)	Focus group interviews & on-site visit
May 2016	*Telephone and mail invitation were sent to District Council Members and Legislative Councilors, asking if they would like to participate in focus group about the work of SSTs, but response was negative.*			

Appendix 2 Example of Template of Key Performance Indicators

Key Performance Indicators	Owners/ Owner-occupiers	Tenants	Non-domestic
Initial Phase (Month 1-3 after the official announcement of re-development) ✓ Information Giving ✓ Emotional Support ✓ Community Education on redevelopment policy and procedures			
Intervention Phase (Month 4 - Moving out of the majority of residents/ business) ✓ Rapport building ✓ Case work: counselling & advice ✓ Group work: emotional support & mutual help ✓ Community education ✓ Project evaluation and clients satisfaction survey			
Late Redevelopment Phase: (6-months period after the moving out of the majority of residents/ businesses) ✓ Case management and referrals ✓ Adaption and reorientation in new area			