

Contents

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Positive and negative aspects of DHSP**
 - § Positives
 - § Negatives
 - ú No framework, no vision
 - ú Impacts on small organisations
 - ú Limited housing focus
 - § Other
 - ú Actions in the Plan
 - ú Driving the Plan
 - ú Community ownership
 - ú Plan not static
 - ú Integrated assessment, referral and case management/coordination
 - ú Co-location
 - ú Reforms
 - ú Links to Council's social and other plans
- 3. General Aspects of Reform Process**
 - § The service system
 - § Model for youth services
- 4. Specific features of the service reform model**
 - § Drivers
 - § Objectives
 - § Benefits to clients
 - § Issues
 - § Strategies
 - § Governance
 - § Youth Services Model
- 5. Aboriginal needs, services and issues**
 - § General comments
 - § Individual priorities
 - § Information sharing
 - § Underlying causes of disadvantage
- 6. Private sector involvement (the Citizenship Prospectus, and the Trust)**
- 7. Community participation**
- 8. Implementation**
- 9. Monitoring, evaluation and review**

Critique of Draft Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan (DHSP)

This critique was written by Elizabeth Rice, who is not a resident of Redfern-Waterloo, but works on a voluntary basis with several groups in the area. The analysis is based on her knowledge of the human services system as a whole. However, this analysis also needs to be informed by the knowledge of local people and service providers. Local knowledge is expert knowledge that is as critical in identifying how to improve outcomes in the area as that of external experts and decision makers.

1. Introduction

This document:

- § summarises some of the positive and negative aspects of the Draft Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan (DHSP)
- § provides a critique of:
 - ü general aspects of the proposed reform process for human services in Redfern-Waterloo
 - ü the specific features of the service reform model identified in the Plan
 - ü themes in the Plan including:
 - Aboriginal needs, services and issues
 - community participation
 - implementation
 - monitoring, evaluation and review
 - private sector involvement (the Citizenship Prospectus, and the Trust).

Although the critique contains material that could readily be transformed into recommendations, this document does not do so. This is because the positions outlined in the critique need confirming or amending in collaboration with local people and service providers.

The time allowed by the RWA for responses to the DHSP has not, unfortunately, been sufficient to allow this to occur.

2. Positive and negative aspects of DHSP

Positives

As far as this writer knows, this is the first time in NSW that there has been a plan of this kind for a whole area:

- § covering employment, crime prevention (and, to a degree, the corrections system) and community development, as well as the usual human services
- § including the three levels of government **and** the non-government sector
- § aiming to focus all service providers, government and non-government, on outcomes to be provided through specific actions.

There also appears to be potential for:

- § joint specifications and benchmarks between the government and non-government sectors
- § additional funding, mainly through state wide programs that have not yet been commenced in Redfern-Waterloo (although there are also scattered references throughout the text to additional funding/resources that do not seem to come from these sources).

It also appears that not all the actions relating to agencies working together better are derived from existing programs (from elsewhere in NSW or already in Redfern-Waterloo).

Together all these offer the potential to fill the gaps between formal programs.

Negatives

No framework, no vision

The DHSP does not sit within a strategic framework that includes:

- § a vision of what the community wants life in Redfern-Waterloo to be like
- § indicators and measures that will allow the community to tell whether the DHSP is helping to make that vision a reality
- § a statement of how the Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan will link to other components of the Redfern-Waterloo Plan to make the vision a reality
- § scope for an advocacy strategy on those matters which:
 - ú are underlying causes of the high levels of disadvantage in Redfern-Waterloo
 - ú are significant factors in creating the local demand for human services
 - ú cannot be addressed by the human services system alone, even as part of an integrated plan for the area
 - ú are beyond the control of the RWA.

One very recent document that explicitly acknowledges the need for outcomes and indicators that are linked to a vision within a framework is the Productivity Commission's report, *Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage: Key Indicators 2005*. (This report was prepared by the Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, on behalf of the Council of Australian Governments (COAG).) This report states (p ii):

A key function of this Report, which distinguishes it from other compilations, is **to document outcomes** for Indigenous people **within a framework that has both a vision of what life should be** for Indigenous people **and a strategic focus on areas that need to be targeted if that longer-term vision is to be realised** [emphasis added]. It can therefore provide governments with information needed to assess whether their policy interventions are having the intended impacts.

The RWA could consider adopting the approach underlying this report to develop a strategic framework for the DHSP and how it addresses disadvantage in Redfern-Waterloo.

Small organisations

Small organisations may feel under threat unless:

- § the details of what the reform process means is spelled out clearly and in one place
- § the support to be made available to small organisations is also clearly spelled out.

Limited housing focus

The plan needs a stronger housing focus. This is clearly an issue that cuts across human services, development/infrastructure and jobs.

Other

This section deals with a range of issues, some of which could be positive or negative, depending on how they are dealt with or implemented.

Actions in the Plan

Many of the actions in the Plan adopt approaches that are needed in any place where people with multiple and/or complex needs live or use services. The fact that they are only now being proposed is an indictment of the effectiveness of the human

services system – as a system – in Redfern Waterloo, and/or the level of resources allocated to it.

This raises the following questions:

- § are the resource allocation models used by government agencies effective in identifying "needs 'hot spots'" within regions?
- § if so, are the findings from the models well enough integrated into policy making, planning and service delivery at all relevant levels?
- § if not, how can they be improved so that:
 - ı they do identify these 'hot spots'?
 - ı these findings are integrated into decision making (as per previous point)?

(None of the comments in this section should be interpreted as criticism of individual organisations and staff who, despite the failings of the system, often work extremely hard in difficult circumstances in the interests of better outcomes for their clients.)

Driving the Plan

The RWA is taking a "central agency" role and driving the implementation of the Plan (as well as its development). This could be positive. However, the lead role will need to be managed sensitively if all agencies are to own the process.

(The RWA is also taking the lead on specific actions, but usually on issues for which no one department has responsibility. The role for DAA in relation to actions seems similar.)

Community ownership

The RWA states (DHSP, p i) that the Plan:

... is closely based on key outcomes identified by people and organisations in Redfern and Waterloo through a series of community workshops, service cluster group meetings and discussion by the Human Services Advisory Committee.

However, there has been criticism that the consultation process has been inadequate, and that the DHSP does not correspond to either the cluster groups' proposals or those of the Human Services Advisory Committee. If this is the case, the RWA needs to explain to the community why the DHSP is a limited match with these bodies' proposals, and why its proposals are better.

Plan not static

The Plan is not intended to be static (DHSP, p i). Whether this is a positive or negative factor depends on how the Plan is implemented and reviewed. Review of the Plan from time to time will necessarily include an analysis of whether any changes are needed and if so, what they should be. However, all stakeholders need to be able to participate in the review process. (See Section 9 below.)

Integrated assessment, referral and case management/coordination

These processes are part of many of the actions in the Plan. They can provide benefits to clients, but may also be of concern to some, particularly Aboriginal people, whose lives were controlled by the "system" for two centuries.

There needs to be a clear statement that nothing that happens in Redfern-Waterloo in relation to these processes will fall outside the state wide framework for the Better Service Delivery Program (including ReferralLink) and its privacy protections/client consent provisions, or any similar state wide frameworks.

(Information about the Better Service Delivery Program is available from <http://bsdp.hsnet.nsw.gov.au/#Home> ; information about Families First and the Aboriginal Child, Youth and Family Strategy is available from http://www.familiesfirst.nsw.gov.au/public/s26_homepage/default.aspx ; and information about the Early Intervention Program is available from http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/html/child_protect/early_intervention.htm .)

It should also be made clear that any sharing of “back office” functions will **not** include the sharing of client information.

Co-location

Co-location of services can also bring benefits to clients, through better coordination or integration of services, or by providing a one-stop-shop. However, it is not a single answer to all client needs. Some people may be deterred from accessing services, if it is obvious that they cannot do so without being observed. The outreach proposals may overcome this problem by providing an alternative for people who prefer to maintain their privacy about the sort of service they are accessing, but more detail is needed before a judgement can be made about this.

Reforms

Comments about the elements of the reform process are made throughout the Plan. There needs to be a clear consolidated statement about the reform process and its consequences for client outcomes and for agencies. (See also Section 4 of this document.)

Links to Council's social and other plans

As the RWA and the City of Sydney share responsibility for the governance of Redfern-Waterloo, consideration needs to be given to how the Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan will link with the Council's Social Plan, Cultural Plan and developer contribution plans (see s 94 of *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act*). The solution needs to respect the legitimate areas of responsibility and control of each body, while developing collaborative arrangements, at least in relation to staging of implementation.

3. General Aspects of Reform Process

The proposed reform process for human services in Redfern Waterloo has two main components:

- § the introduction into Redfern-Waterloo of strategies, programs and projects designed to address weaknesses or failures in the human services system across the state
- § the introduction into Redfern-Waterloo of a specific service model for youth services, which “could also provide a template for future consolidation of services for other client groups” (DHSP, Appendix One, p 1).

The service system

Strategies, programs and projects in the first category include:

- § service delivery strategies or programs that have already been introduced (or are currently being introduced) elsewhere in the state (eg Families First; Aboriginal Child, Youth and Family Strategy; Early Intervention Program)
- § processes and tools to support collaborative and integrated service provision under the Better Service Delivery Project (BSDP) which will operate across the human services system in NSW (including non-government services who wish to participate)

- § approaches that are part of the state wide efforts by the NSW government to build community capacity (eg promoting the sharing among small agencies of “back office” functions).

The first two initiatives immediately above were intended to improve the capacity of the human services system **across the state** to respond to clients with multiple or complex needs. The third initiative acknowledges the resource constraints of small organisations everywhere in the state. The fact that these reforms are now being introduced into Redfern-Waterloo is an acknowledgement that there is a high level of unmet need for people with multiple and/or complex needs which local agencies have been struggling, without adequate system support, to meet.

In other words, service delivery in Redfern-Waterloo is difficult because:

- § the needs of the area are more complex than in most other areas of NSW
- § at least until recently, system supports have been inadequate.

This conclusion is supported by:

- § the DHSP’s comment (p 11) that:
 - Over a number of years, the human services system in Redfern-Waterloo has evolved into a mainly reactive model. Put simply, the focus has been on providing services which respond to an immediate crisis, rather than on prevention.
- § the fact that, despite constant assertions previously that the area is well resourced, some of the proposals do involve additional resources.

Model for youth services

The DHSP proposes a **service hubs** model for youth services, and states that:

Creating service hubs or “precincts” is currently considered to be the optimal way to provide quality, integrated, services to clients. (Appendix One, p 2)

There is no evidence given in the Plan to support this statement. However, it is understood that the RWA believes that its proposal is supported by the paper *Coordinated and Integrated Human Service Delivery Models*, which was prepared for the NSW Cabinet Office by the UNSW’s Social Policy Research Centre.

(The paper, although published in 2005, relates to work completed in 2000. The NSW case studies (of which this writer prepared four) were completed in 1999.)

In this paper, the service hub model is only one of ten models discussed, and the paper’s conclusions do **not** promote any one model. As the paper states on p 41:

It is unlikely that any of the approaches outlined can provide all the answers and options for the State government. The most advisable approach would be not to attempt to copy all the details of any of the particular models outlined, but to draw elements from a number of different approaches to develop solutions which are tailor made to the actual problems and difficulties being tackled.

(That there is still no one “optimal way” in this area is evident from the fact that the NSW Division of the Institute of Public Administration Australia (IPAA) sponsors a Special Interest Group on Integrated Services, which is currently (September-November 2005) holding a series of three “round tables” exploring the management, planning and delivery of integrated services.)

Additional points made by the SPRC paper are:

- § first, check whether the needs/circumstances require coordinated or integrated approaches at all
- § if they do, it is then a question of “horses for courses” (ie which model best fits the needs/circumstances)
- § be aware that “[s]ometimes, one-off services need to have such a different approach that attempting to integrate them could lose their value” (SPRC, p 6)
- § some of the general lessons learned so far are the need for trust, time and involvement of all stakeholders.

On this basis, what is needed in Redfern-Waterloo at this stage is **not** the establishment of a model for which no evidence has yet been provided, but consultation with all relevant stakeholders on **what, under all the circumstances, the best model is.**

4. Specific features of the service reform model

This section collates the main statements made about service reform in the DHSP. *Where this writer is commenting on these statements, the text is italicised.*

Drivers

These are stated to be "government direction, community input and deliverable timeframes" (DHSP, p 2).

Objectives

The “overall objective” is stated, in two different ways, as:

- § to focus all service providers, government and non-government, on outcomes for clients (DHSP, p iii)
- § [t]o provide a framework for joint activity by government, non-government services and other stakeholders (DHSP, p 2).

Benefits to clients

These are stated as:

Clients should then be able to access services more easily and the need to negotiate an unnecessarily complex service system should be reduced. This will be achieved through improved service coordination and standards. (DHSP, p 2)

All clients should be able to access services with ease and in a timely manner, without having to negotiate an unnecessarily complex service system. (DHSP, p 28)

Issues

The issues are stated (DHSP, p iii) to be:

- § the need for administrative efficiencies
- § poor governance
- § service duplication.

Despite this statement of the issues, the reform proposals appear to place a great deal of emphasis on assisting services to fill existing gaps, particularly through greater integration of government services, rather than simply removing duplication.

Strategies

The DHSP states (p iii) that it includes “strategies to strengthen the governance and day-to-day management of non-government service providers” and that:

- Steps to achieve this include:
- joint service planning;
 - sharing of administrative resources;

- common reporting, monitoring and evaluation arrangements;
- physical and virtual co-location of services using modern communication technologies and out-sourcing arrangements;
- training and professional development of staff; and
- improving facilities.

Governance

Overall, the implementation of the Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan will be driven by the RWA, as chair of an Implementation Senior Officers' Group (ISOG) (DHSP, p 26). The ISOG will:

- § develop "indicators and evaluation methodologies" (DHSP, p 27), and "evaluation measures" and "an evaluation framework" (DHSP, p 28), for the Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan
- § assess and report on progress against the Plan's priorities (DHSP, p 29)
- § assess improvements in the cultural appropriateness of services (DHSP, p 29).

(There is no reference to community participation in these processes.)

The ISOG will also establish service groups of relevant government agencies and non-government service providers in the areas of youth services, services for Aboriginal people, family services and health services. These will provide advice on:

- § service specifications for organisations within that service provider group (DHSP, p 27)
- § service quality benchmarks and value for money (DHSP, p 28)
- § client outcomes (DHSP, p 28)
- § coordination of joint training (DHSP, p 28).

Youth Services Model

This model applies to youth services only at this stage. However: "It could also provide a template for future consolidation of services for other client groups." (DHSP, Appendix One, p 1)

This model includes:

- § co-location in specialised precincts in which each service also provides some of its services in the other precinct (DHSP, Appendix One, p 2)
- § coordinated activity calendars (DHSP, p 15)
- § coordination of prevention and early intervention programs for young people (DHSP, p 17)
- § creation of a coordinated access point to therapeutic, general and mental health services for young people (DHSP, p 15)
- § assertive outreach programs (DHSP, p 15)
- § multiple access points for programs (DHSP, p 15)
- § improved integration of government-funded employment, education, training and youth services through formal agreements with the Australian Government and the City of Sydney (DHSP, p 16)
- § a range of integrated and/or streamlined planning, service delivery and administrative processes which will apply generally in Redfern-Waterloo (DHSP, p 28).

It appears that the RWA does not intend to negotiate about the nature of the model, but only to hold discussions - through the Youth Precincts Taskforce - on the details of implementation. (This depends on what the RWA means by its reference in Appendix One, p 5 to "an agreed youth precincts model".)

The implications of these statements for existing funded services seem to be that future funding will depend on:

- § *(for all services) agreement to undertake the actions specified for NGOs under each of the Plan's priorities*
- § *(for youth services) adoption of:*
 - ü *the prescribed model*
 - ü *integrated processes associated with participation in any of the new programs or approaches to be introduced into the area*
- § *(for other services – at this stage) adoption of the integrated processes associated with participation in any of the new programs or approaches to be introduced into the area*
- § *(for all services) satisfactory performance (on the basis of evaluation criteria not yet developed) in carrying out the specified actions using the prescribed model and/or prescribed processes.*

5. Aboriginal needs, services and issues

This section:

- § makes some general comments about the Plan's approach to the needs of Aboriginal people and how to meet them
- § makes some specific comments about aspects of individual priorities in the Plan
- § issues a warning about the care that needs to be taken in relation to sharing information about Aboriginal clients.

However, please note that this writer is not Aboriginal, so if there is a difference between her views and those of the Aboriginal community, the latter should prevail.

General comments

The needs of Aboriginal people are one of the focuses of Stage One of the Plan (DHSP, pp 2-3).

The Plan states that it requires "NSW government agencies and non-government organisations ... to provide services in a culturally appropriate manner and in ways which are relevant to the needs of the Aboriginal community" (p 2).

While it is important to re-state these requirements, as reminders to all service providers, the delivery of relevant services in a culturally appropriate way is already NSW Government policy through the Strategic Management Framework managed by Premier's Department (see the Whole-of-Government Policies and Frameworks page at

<http://www.premiers.nsw.gov.au/WorkAndBusiness/WorkingForGovernment/StrategicManagementFramework/StrategicDirections/WholeOfGovernment.htm>). If these have not been observed in Redfern-Waterloo, there needs to be a clear analysis of why not, and how adherence to these policies can be ensured in the future.

A second issue is the reference to the way the "plan also creates opportunities for the Aboriginal community to find ways forward" (DHSP, p 2). This language is patronising, as the local Aboriginal community has been finding ways forward for decades. As the Plan acknowledges on p 1, Redfern is the birthplace of significant Aboriginal organisations, some of which have been "used as models for the development of similar organisations elsewhere in Australia". The Aboriginal community is not short of ideas for the way forward and can identify its own "opportunities". What is needed is the removal of barriers, and the cooperation of other decision makers, so that the opportunities the Aboriginal community has identified can be translated into reality.

Finally, the RWA states that the actions in the Plan “will be linked to *Two Ways Together*, the NSW Government’s Aboriginal Affairs Plan 2003-2012” (DHSP, p 2). That is essential, and actions also need to take heed of the findings in the recent evaluation of the outcomes from this plan so far in the *Two Ways Together Report* (DAA, 2005).

Individual priorities

This section draws attention to two items in the Priorities that need rewording. They are:

Priority 4, Actions, second dot point (HSDP, P 11)

This dot point refers to “Stolen Generation”. This, and the parallel reference on p 7 of the Action Implementation Schedule: Phase One, need to be changed to the plural - “Stolen Generations”.

There was not just one stolen generation, but many, and in NSW the process continued over at least eighty-odd years (as is documented in *Learning from the Past* (Gungil Jindibah Center, 1994) and *The Stolen Generations: The Removal of Aboriginal People in NSW 1883 to 1969* (Read, 1998)).

The intergenerational effects of the forced separation of Aboriginal children from their families, especially when successive generations were separated, has had significant adverse effects - direct and indirect - on Aboriginal well being. The continuing impacts of these separations is noted by the NSW Department of Community Services (DoCS) in its *Aboriginal Policy Directions* (p 6) where it states:

The Royal Commission Into Aboriginal Deaths In Custody showed us the underlying factors contributing to disadvantage are historical and are linked to indigenous people being removed from their land and taken from their families:

- § high mortality - an average lifespan of 20 years less than a person from the wider community;
- § unemployment - approximately three times the national average;
- § low education - 11 per cent of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population aged 15 years and over have never attended school; and
- § high incarceration - young Indigenous people are 18 times more likely to be held in detention than other Australian youths.

The accurate use of the term “stolen generations” (plural) remains important:

- § to show respect for the suffering endured by many generations of Aboriginal people
- § to avoid the risk of underestimating the continuing impact of the removals on Aboriginal individuals, families and communities (and on culture, including the relationship to land).

Priority 10, Actions, fourth dash point under first dot point (DHSP, p 24)

This dash point refers to “a publication recording the history of the area from pre-settlement, ...”.

A different term needs to be used for “pre-settlement”, as this term defines Aboriginal history against European history, instead of in its own right.

Information sharing

There are many references in the DHSP to collaborative and/or integrated processes such as family conferencing (p 10), joint operations (p 10), early intervention (p 11), transfer of information (p 12), case coordination (p 12), as well as ReferralLink (part of the NSW Better Service Delivery Program) (p 28).

While these processes can provide benefits to clients, it would not be surprising if there were considerable concern in the Aboriginal community about collaborative and/or integrated service delivery involving agencies such as DoCS, Police and Education, given that:

- § these agencies or their predecessors were involved in the system of forced removals (see entry earlier in this section)
- § Aboriginal children are still removed from their families at a far greater rate than other children.

(DoCS has already acknowledged this as an issue for its service provision in its *Aboriginal Policy Directions* (p 5), where it refers to “a mistrust of the Department and welfare institutions due to past policies and procedures”.)

This is one reason why it is particularly important for the RWA and the Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan to make a clear statement (as indicated in Section 2 above) that:

- § nothing that happens in Redfern-Waterloo in relation to these processes will fall outside the state wide framework for the Better Service Delivery Program (including ReferralLink) and its privacy protections/client consent provisions, or any similar state wide frameworks
- § any sharing of “back office” functions will **not** include the sharing of client information.

The RWA should **seek advice from the Aboriginal community** before it makes this statement.

Underlying causes of disadvantage

In relation to underlying causes of disadvantage in Redfern-Waterloo (see comments in Section 2 above under: *No framework, no vision*), there needs to be recognition that, in relation to Aboriginal people, these causes include unresolved rights and justice issues.

6. Private sector involvement (the Citizenship Prospectus, and the Trust)

The DHSP (p 30) states that: “A key role for the RWA in the implementation of the Human Services Plan will be to broker partnerships with the private sector ...”.

Private sector involvement in public sector projects carries risks. One of these is that private sector contributions, when sizeable, can drive different priorities from those the government or the community wants. To overcome this problem, the Plan has established a draft Citizenship Prospectus to identify activities where private sector contributions would help to meet the government’s identified priorities for Redfern-Waterloo, not work against them (DHSP, p 30).

However, there are other issues that must also be addressed. These include:

- § the potential for private sector resources to replace public ones so that there is no net benefit to the area
- § the potential impact on services which already rely on private sector donations
- § the potential conflict of interest for a public sector body which, as is the case with the RWA, also has the power to make recommendations on the development of state significant sites in the area (and which may even have consent power delegated to it for these sites under s 28 (3) of the *Redfern-Waterloo Authority Act*)
- § the potential conflict of interest when, as is the case in Redfern-Waterloo, the relevant Minister can be both:

- ü the maker of the Redfern Waterloo Plan (s 27 (1)) including its human services components (s 27 (2)); and
- ü the consent authority for state significant sites in the area, if that power is so delegated under s 28 (2).

In relation to the potential conflicts of interest, particular attention needs to be given to the possible interaction between the voluntary planning agreements now incorporated into the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act* (s 93) and the operation of the Citizenship Prospectus.

There is a view that the potential problems in relation to the proposed Citizenship Prospectus, and associated Trust, are so great that these mechanisms are not feasible for Redfern-Waterloo.

A decision on this matter should be deferred to allow for:

- § exploration of these issues, including the obtaining of advice from relevant bodies (including the Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Auditor-General)
- § a public participation process to facilitate community discussion of the issues.

7. Community participation

Community participation remains an issue in the area. There are still frequent complaints of inadequate consultation, in terms of substance, process and time allowed.

The Plan refers to issues on which there will be information, feedback and consultation in future. These references tend to gloss over the differences between facilitating the community's participation in decision making, and informing the community of views received or decisions already made.

There is readily available material that could assist the RWA to consult better. Just two examples are:

- § the Community Consultation Principles in REDWatch's May 2005 *Submission to the RWA* (available at <http://www.redwatch.org.au/redwatch/statements/050531Plan/principles>)
- § the award winning guidelines the NSW Government has adopted for the NSW planning system, which can be readily adapted to consultation on the Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan (available at <http://www.iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement/index.jsp> and <http://203.147.162.100/pia/engagement/>).

The REDWatch Submission also outlines suggested ground rules for establishing Objectives and Priority Outcomes for Redfern-Waterloo. These could be used by the RWA as the foundation of its consultation for the next stage of the Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan.

8. Implementation

Community participation is also needed in decisions about implementation.

The REDWatch submission to the RWA (referred to in Section 7 above) provides a suggested ground rule for how this should occur for the Redfern-Waterloo Plan in general. This ground rule is equally applicable to consultation on implementation of the Human Services Plan. It suggests:

<i>The NSW Government will reach agreement with the local communities on</i>
--

the Implementation Strategy for the Redfern-Waterloo Plan.

When adopted, the agreed Implementation Strategy will guide all stages of the Redfern-Waterloo Plan.

This means that no specific stage of the Redfern-Waterloo Plan will be implemented until the local communities have reached agreement with the NSW Government on:

- § outcomes for that stage of the Plan, including:*
 - ú what the outcomes for this stage of the Plan are*
 - ú how these outcomes will help achieve the overall objectives and broad outcomes for the Redfern-Waterloo Plan as a whole*
 - ú what changes need to be made to other stages of the Plan to support the outcomes for the current stage*
 - ú what other things are needed to support them*
 - ú who needs to do all these things*
 - ú when they need to do them*
 - ú who will pay for them*
- § a strategy for turning the above agreements into action*
- § a review strategy, consistent with the ground rules for Implementation (see below), that will allow everyone to be able to tell that these outcomes have been achieved.*

9. Monitoring, evaluation and review

Community participation is also needed in decisions about monitoring, evaluation and review.

The REDWatch submission to the RWA (referred to in Section 8 above) provides a suggested ground rule for how this should occur for the Redfern-Waterloo Plan in general. This ground rule is equally applicable to consultation on monitoring, evaluation and review for the Human Services Plan. It suggests:

The NSW Government will reach agreement with the local communities on a Review Strategy for the Plan which includes:

- § review of the specific stages of the Redfern-Waterloo Plan*
- § review of the Redfern-Waterloo Plan as a whole*
- § how these reviews will be linked.*

When adopted, the agreed Review Strategy will guide all stages of the Redfern-Waterloo Plan.

This means that no specific stage of the Redfern-Waterloo Plan will be implemented until the local communities have reached agreement with the NSW Government on:

- § what will indicate success or failure for that stage of the Redfern-Waterloo Plan*
- § the type of information that will be collected to measure success or failure*
- § how and when the results will be reported to the local communities*
- § how the local communities will be involved in working with the NSW Government to decide:*
 - ú what the results mean*
 - ú what changes need to be made to improve the results.*

A further point relates to how the NSW government and the community will be able to evaluate the contribution made by individual agencies (government or non-government) in relation to outcomes that depend either on inputs from a range of agencies, or on the policies or actions of external bodies.

This is an issue addressed in the NSW Treasury's Financial Management Framework, through its 2004 paper: *What You Do And Why: An Agency Guide To Defining Results And Services*, which "provides General Government agencies with the foundational guidance they need to prepare their Results and Services Plans" (p i).

The advice in this paper could assist the RWA to develop an appropriate way of evaluating interdependent contributions to the achievement of the Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan's outcomes.

References

(Note: For internet references, date of publication is given when the document referenced provides that information. Where the document does not provide this information, only the last date the internet link was viewed is given.)

Fine, M, Pancharatnam, K and Thomson, C 2005, *Coordinated and Integrated Human Service Delivery Models: SPRC Report 1/05*, Social Policy Research Centre, UNSW, Sydney.

(Report prepared for The NSW Cabinet Office in 2000, but not published until 2005.)

Gungil Jindibah Centre 1994, *Learning from the Past: Aboriginal perspectives on the Effects and Implications of Welfare Policies and Practices on Aboriginal Families in New South Wales*, Southern Cross University, Lismore for NSW Department of Community Services, Sydney.

IPAA (Institute of Public Administration Australia) NSW 2005, *Home Page* viewed 11 November 2005 <<http://www.nsw.ipaa.org.au/>>

IPAA (Institute of Public Administration Australia) NSW 2005, *Integrated Services Special Interest Group: 2005 Frontline Round Table Series* viewed 11 November 2005 https://wic135dp.server-secure.com/vs8227_secure/uploads/Frontline%20round%20table%20series%20flyer%203.pdf

NSW Department of Aboriginal Affairs 2005, *Two Ways Together Report* viewed 11 November 2005
<<http://www.daa.nsw.gov.au/data/files//TwoWaysTogetherReportFINAL1.pdf>>

NSW Department of Commerce, *Better Service Delivery Program* viewed 11 November 2005 <<http://bsdpc.hsnet.nsw.gov.au/#Home>>

NSW Department of Community Services 1999, *The Right to Better Service: Aboriginal Policy Directions* viewed 11 November 2005
http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/documents/policy_aborig.pdf

NSW Department of Community Services, *DoCS Early Intervention Program* viewed 11 November 2005
<http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/html/child_protect/early_intervention.htm>

NSW Department of Community Services, *Families First and Aboriginal Child, Youth and Family Strategy* (formerly auspiced by The NSW Cabinet Office) viewed 11 November 2005
<http://www.familiesfirst.nsw.gov.au/public/s26_homepage/default.aspx>

NSW Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources, *Community Engagement in the NSW Planning System* viewed 11 November 2005
<<http://www.iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement/index.jsp>> and
<<http://203.147.162.100/pia/engagement/>>

NSW Premier's Department, *Strategic Management Framework* viewed 11 November 2005
<<http://www.premiers.nsw.gov.au/WorkAndBusiness/WorkingForGovernment/StrategicManagementFramework/>>

NSW Treasury 2004, *Financial Management Framework: What You Do And Why - An Agency Guide To Defining Results And Services* viewed 11 November 2005
<<http://www.treasury.nsw.gov.au/pubs/tpp2004/tpp04-4.pdf>>

Read, P 1998 (Rev Edn), *The Stolen Generations: The Removal of Aboriginal People in NSW 1883 to 1969*, NSW Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs, Occasional Paper No 1, republished by NSW Department of Aboriginal Affairs, Sydney.

Redfern-Waterloo Authority 2005, *Draft Redfern-Waterloo Human Services Plan (DHSP)*, viewed 11 November 2005
<http://www.redfernwaterloo.nsw.gov.au/other/draft_human_services_plan.pdf>

Redfern–Waterloo Authority Act 2004 No 107 (NSW) Sydney, NSW Government Information Service.

REDWatch 2005, *Submission on RW Plan* viewed 11 November 2005
<<http://www.redwatch.org.au/redwatch/statements/050531Plan/>>

SCRGSP (Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision) 2005, *Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage: Key Indicators 2005*, Productivity Commission, Canberra.