

## COMMUNITY SECTOR ROUNDTABLE

### MINUTES OF MEETING

Tuesday 14 May 2013

Large Executive Conference Room, Level 2  
Department for Child Protection  
189 Royal Street, East Perth

Meeting commenced at 9:30am

#### 1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed members to the Community Sector Roundtable meeting.

##### Present

Mr Basil Hanna	Parkerville Children and Youth Care Inc
Ms Kay Benham	Department for Child Protection
Mr Ian Carter	AnglicareWA
Ms Irina Cattalini	WACOSS
Mr Mick Geaney	MercyCare
Mr Neil Hamilton	AccordWest
Ms Tricia Murray	Wanslea Family Services Inc
Mr Tony Pietropiccolo	Centrecare Inc
Mr Ashley Reid	Ngala

##### In attendance

Ms Sandra Flanagan	Department for Child Protection
--------------------	---------------------------------

##### Apologies

Ms Cheryl Barnett	Department for Child Protection
Mr Steve Glew	Department for Child Protection
Ms Melissa Perry	Mission Australia
Ms Anne Moore	Women's Council for Domestic & Family Violence Services (WA)

#### 2. Minutes of meeting held 9 April 2013

The minutes from the Community Sector Roundtable meeting held on 9 April 2013 were confirmed as an accurate record of the proceedings, with the following addition to the discussion on outcomes.

Clarification was sought regarding the differentiation between outcomes that are the goals of the Department and the work we are trying to achieve together amongst the service providers and notions of what are appropriate accountability measures when it comes to contract outcomes. These are not necessarily the same thing so the work that was being done through the contracting reform in terms of outcomes measurement needs to be thought of in terms of what is reasonable accountability for that service as opposed to outcomes work of the Department more broadly. This needs to be considered in the paper being prepared by the Department.

Some members requested clarification of the Development Fund mentioned in discussion about the NPAH transitional agreement to be provided out of session.

**Action:** Ms Flanagan to provide clarification on the Development Fund to members out of session.

### **3. Actions Arising**

#### **3.1 Leadership and Partnership Forum 2013**

The Chair asked members for input regarding the theme for the forum and nominees to participate on the working group to progress the development of the forum. Discussion was opened on ideas for the theme:

- Big society agendas – pre-empting the directions that will occur with a change of Federal Government. The items that will affect Federal and State agendas.
- What is the role of the sector versus the role of the government, in the context of debates around service design, policy making and service delivery. Including both State and National contexts.
- Thinking through the future changes to COAG arrangements. The possibility that contracts which have, in the past, been exclusively undertaken by the non-government sector being opened up to the private sector. The impact this would have/is having on the sector and the need for lobbying and advocating.
- Closer look at the current initiatives of client centred/self-directed models. Is this the sort of model we want into the future?
- Relationship between not for profits and governments - bedding down the principles of these relationships. What is the relationship with consumers – for both the government and non-government sectors. What kind of funding and service models should be in place, and how should this work? Who represents the clients and how?
- Opportunity to discuss issues that are not covered by other forums.
- How is leadership being shown? Where/who are the leaders?
- National standards in child protection – how will this play out. FaHCSIA is in discussions with collective bodies at the National level about the possible structural changes to keep children out of care. It was suggested that FaHCSIA attend the forum and discuss plans for the future.

Members suggested that the theme be around the role of civil society and values. It was agreed that Ian Carter, Irina Cattalini, Tricia Murray and Steve Glew would be on the working group to progress the agenda for the Leadership and Partnership Forum. The target audience also needs to be determined by the working group.

**Action:** Working group members to meet to progress the membership, theme and agenda for the Leadership and Partnership Forum.

#### **3.2 Mechanisms for supporting the sector.**

The Chair suggested that this item needs to be discussed in more detail, perhaps at a future CSR meeting. Ms Cattalini advised her understanding was that members identify what needs to be done to support the sector in each of the four key areas. What is the capacity of CSR and the Department to provide that support? What is the role of peaks such as WACOSS in terms of capacity building support (which they are already providing)? What is the Department already providing? What are the gaps and how can additional resources be gained to fill the gaps where needed? Is there a role for CSR in having this discussion and identifying the gaps?

Members expressed concern that it is difficult for organisations to stay in the loop with the different conversations occurring throughout the sector, especially for the smaller organisations. CSR is currently providing a summary of each meeting on the

Departments website. WACOSS is able to provide a link to this in relevant newsletters or similar.

CSR must be careful not to become too broad and move beyond what it is able to control. Members need to ensure the discussion that takes place at CSR meetings is communicated to the sector. More people can be connected to the communique via key peak agencies providing the link a couple of times each year, for example a WACOSS and other peak bodies e-bulletins.

Members reiterated that a one page communiqué be placed on the website each month – with the minutes and membership list. It was suggested that each communiqué include a brief description of CSR. It was also suggested that the working group reports be circulated to the sectors once they are completed.

**Action:** Monthly communiques to be continued. Working Group papers to be included on the website as completed.

### **3.3 CSR EOI process**

The Chair advised that the applications close this Friday. There are currently eight applications. Ms Les Evans has resigned from her position as CEO of Ngnowar Aerwah Aboriginal Corporation and the CSR. The rules state that it is the CEO of the organisation that is the member of CSR, not the individual, thus the new CEO of Ngnowar Aerwah Aboriginal Corporation will be offered membership of CSR for the remainder of the existing term. The Chair suggested that he would contact the organisation with the proposal that if a new CEO will be in place in the very near future, that person will be given the opportunity to take over the CSR membership on behalf of the organisation. If there will be a significant time delay in a new CEO being appointed, the membership will be filled through the current EOI process and Ngnowar Aerwah Aboriginal Corporation will be offered membership next year.

Members discussed the position of WACOSS on the CSR. It was suggested that it be considered that WACOSS be a permanent member of CSR and not go through the re-election process. Members discussed the need to give other peak bodies similar opportunity for membership on CSR. It was agreed that this be discussed in the future, and that WACOSS should go through the EOI process on this occasion.

The Chair asked Ms Benham to discuss the presence of the Director General at CSR meetings with the Director General.

#### **Actions:**

- EOI process to be completed.
- The Chair to contact Ms Les Evans regarding CEO membership of Ngnowar Aerwah Aboriginal Corporation on the CSR.
- Ms Benham to speak to Mr Murphy regarding attending CSR meetings.

### **3.4 Department's position paper on outcomes**

Deferred to next meeting. Members discussed the importance of this paper and the need for members to receive the paper for review well in advance of a future meeting set for discussion.

## AGENDA ITEMS

### 4.1 Expansion and development of the Secondary Family Support Hubs

The Chair advised that this working group has not met since the last meeting. This item will be discussed in more detail at the June meeting.

It was reiterated that the key elements of the Family Support Networks were discussed at the previous meeting and members had indicated agreement on those key elements and guiding principles. The funding strategy is an important element of this. The evaluation of the AFSN will be critical to the funding strategy and will be used to put forward a bid to the Department of Treasury at the first opportunity. The Murchison Family Support Network (lead agency is Parkerville), is operating in line with the model, although the funding is different, the Department is providing the Child Protection worker and the support. The Mirrabooka initiative is planning to operate in line with the model. If the Mirrabooka alliance of agencies have chosen a leader and this is included in the proposal, presumably there will not be any other applications. However, there will need to be a procurement process.

It was queried what the mechanisms would be if a family support network fails to adhere to the key elements and guiding principles. The strength of the model is the model itself. While the Department is not able to be prescriptive, the key elements can be incorporated into the contracts and would therefore have consequences for non-compliance.

<b>Action:</b> For discussion at the June meeting.
--

### 4.2 Macro issues impacting the out of home care system

Mr Geaney reported that the challenge of this topic is quite significant. The group is pursuing information around the national framework and engaging in discussion around complexity in terms of children coming into care, why they are coming into care and complexity in terms of the needs children have as a consequence of being in care. Both of these types of complexity are key issues that need to be addressed. A literature review is being undertaken on this topic by MercyCare. A number of agendas are being pursued and as a result it will take longer than initially thought. The group will explore the range of issues and come back to CSR with a considered in-depth view.

The Chair suggested the group connect with Dr Robyn Mildon, Director of Knowledge Exchange and Implementation at the Parenting Research Centre, to share information in this space. Dr Mildon is coming to Perth for monthly meetings, Ms Murray agreed to organise a meeting with this Working Group.

Ms Murray suggested applying for funding through the Child Aware funding process (FaHCSIA). She agreed to pursue this.

Mr Hamilton queried the ethical, legal and moral obligation for children who are already traumatised being further traumatised by children in group homes who are not the 'right fit' for that home. That is, exposing children to situations that exacerbate their trauma. Are we failing to protect these children in care? What will be the consequences into the future for these cases? Mr Geaney suggested that these circumstances need to go back to the Tier 1 Committee for discussion with agencies. The Tier 1 Committee meets monthly would be able to consider/develop processes to deal with this issue. It was suggested that someone from the residential care area be invited to attend the Macro Issues Impacting the Out of Home Care System Working Group meetings.

The Chair reiterated that concerns about the practice with these hard end kids was the catalyst for developing this Macro Issues Impacting the Out of Home Care System Working Group and the intention is that the work of this group will stimulate action to change the practice where needed. The Department responds to these complex issues and is also working hard to ensure positive change is actioned as required.

**Actions:**

- Ms Murray to organise a meeting with Dr Robyn Mildon and this Working Group.
- Ms Murray to determine possibility of applying for funding through the Child Aware funding process (FaHCSIA).
- Mr Geaney to invite a representative from the residential care unit to attend the Macro Issues Impacting the Out of Home Care System Working Group meetings.
- Mr Geaney to explore the availability of the Tier 1 report to CSR.

### **4.3 Self-directed service design**

The Chair advised that this working group will meet prior to the next CSR meeting and report at the June meeting.

The whole of government Self Directed Services Practitioners Group, set up by the Partnership Forum, has now been established. Ms Cattalini said she would ensure CSR received a copy of the report by this group once completed. Each government agency and community organisation on the Partnership Forum have nominated a member for the Practitioners Group. Ms Cattalini expressed concern regarding how this group will operate and how effective it will be in providing critique in assessing service models regarding child protection. The group meets quarterly with a rotating chairperson and no resources. Mr Geaney is concerned that self-directed services are seen as the 'way to go' with very little critical review of the model. Ms Cattalini advised that the Practitioner Group is about giving the model a go and to learning from others experiences with the model, rather than a critical review. As such, it is important to keep this on the agenda at the Partnership Forum. The CSR Self-Directed Service Design Working Group will be critically reviewing the model. The group will examine all the semantics regarding this model, and bring information back to CSR for discussion.

Mr Reid noted that there is still need for clarity and consistency regarding the language used in this space. Mr Geaney suggested that CSR formally advise DPC that the CSR Working Group is undertaking this review and they can feed this review into their decision making processes. Mr Pietropiccolo expressed concern regarding the implications of the introduction of a self-directed service design model for the not for profit sector in a broad sense, especially if it is introduced against the advice and best interests of the sector.

Ms Cattalini asked members if their views are still the same as when the the DPC paper on Self-Directed Service Design was released? Members agreed they require more information before they can make an informed decision on this matter. The paper highlighted the different interpretations of that terminology within the paper. The implications are vast and need careful consideration. CSR needs to ensure the right evidence is being fed through to the DPC to support CSR arguments.

### **4.4 Integration of Youth Services**

Ms Benham advised that the Working Group met on Friday and the WACOSS paper *Youth Justice Think Tank* was tabled. The Group has begun working through the issues and direction they need to take. Members have agreed to gather more information before the next meeting, including a scoping paper by YACWA, due in August,

identifying what is currently happening in the sector. The EERC also published a paper last year on what is currently happening with funding around youth. The At Risk Youth Strategy will also be reviewed to gain a better overall picture. Anecdotally, these reports have highlighted that there is a vast range of small amounts of funding being accessed throughout the sector. The Working Group will establish if there is capacity for CSR to influence better integration of these services/funding. The Forum on 31 May for Regional Managers and CSR members will be focussing on youth.

Mr Pietropiccolo queried if, in the discussions around integration, broader issues such as the concern that government is moving towards greater integration of services while at the same time continuing competitive tendering processes. Mr Pietropiccolo asked if it was reasonable to expect agencies to integrate in a competitive environment. Members discussed the issues with this and agreed there is no easy answer. It was queried if, within a civil society, this is something we want as part of our culture? Is it recognised and rewarded that even in a competitive environment, services are mission driven, giving time, effort and working collaboratively to achieve the best outcomes for clients. Recognition of effort may be a partial answer to this issue.

The Chair noted that these issues are so complex, CSR needs to ensure it keeps its work focussed on what it can control. While the context is important, many of the issues above are not within CSR's control.

Mr Geaney discussed the social inclusion aspects of tenders and suggested that social development capital criteria be included in tenders for youth services. This prevents bigger organisations from coming into a community and out-bidding smaller local agencies who are able to demonstrate the social development criteria, which may be seen as critical to the service being tendered.

Ms Benham noted that these discussions are valuable and assist related decision making processes.

#### **4.5 Quarterly Statistical Report**

Ms Benham briefly discussed the *Quarterly Statistical Report* that had been provided to members prior to the meeting.

Mr Carter thanked Ms Benham for the report and asked if it was possible to have the mandatory report broken down by region. The mandatory reports are based on sexual abuse only and therefore it is only a small percentage. Ms Benham agreed that the safety and wellbeing assessments can be broken down by region.

Mr Hamilton queried the District Boundaries, Ms Benham agreed to provide them to Mr Hamilton.

<b>Action:</b> Ms Benham will include the safety and wellbeing assessments broken down by region in the next Quarterly Statistical Report.
--

#### **5. Other Business**

Nil

#### **6. Next Meeting**

The Chair thanked members for their attendance and the meeting was declared closed at 11:30am. The next CSR meeting will be held on Tuesday 11 June 2013.