

Report

TEI Program Reform South Western Sydney District Workshops

Department of Family &
Community Services

Nexus Management Consulting
302/1 Marian St Redfern 2016
ABN 44 076 308 006

www.nexusmc.com

INTRODUCTION

The NSW Government has initiated a reform of the Targeted Earlier Intervention (TEI) Programs, managed by the Department of Family and Community Services (FACS), which cover a broad spectrum including:

- Community development
- Prevention and early intervention
- Support to families with greater need.

Under these categories are nine programs, all of which aim to improve child and family outcomes and build community capacity. The nine programs are:

• Child Youth and Family Support (CYFS)	\$54.2m
• Community Builders	\$43.1m
• Families NSW	\$26.5m
• Youth Hope	\$10.2m
• Staying Home Leaving Violence	\$5.0m
• Aboriginal Child Youth & Family Strategy	\$4.3m
• Integrated Domestic & Family Violence Services	\$3.5m
• Getting it Together	\$2.1m
• Positive Parenting Program (Triple P)	\$0.48m

FACS has recently released a *Sector Consultation Paper* as part of the engagement process on the TEI reforms¹. The paper sets out the reform aims, which are to:

- Improve outcomes for clients of targeted earlier intervention services
- Create a service system continuum grounded in evidence-based best practice
- Target resources to those with the greatest needs
- Facilitate District decision making on the design and delivery of local services
- Increase flexibility so that clients are the centre of the system.

¹ Department of Family and Community Services 2015, *Targeted Earlier Intervention Programs Sector Consultation Paper*,
http://www.facs.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0005/335165/CS_TIER_consultation_paper.pdf

The consultation process for the TEI reform comprises several elements:

- District responses to the Sector Consultation Paper
- Specific cohort consultation sessions (managed by the Families and Place Unit of the FACS central office in consultation with peak organisations)
- District-led consultation sessions with the local sector
- Inter-government consultation (managed by Families and Place).

To assist the District-led consultations with the local sector, Families and Place offered to provide an external facilitator and Nexus was subsequently engaged to facilitate sector consultations for a number of the 15 FACS Districts. This paper summarises the key outputs of the facilitated workshops for the South Western Sydney District held in Ingleburn on 24 September and Bankstown on 2 October 2015. The report is structured as follows:

- Section 1 presents some key themes that emerged across all the District consultations
- Sections 2 to 5 present the data from the small group discussions of four TEI reform questions:
 1. What works well with the current District TEI services and service system?
 2. What are three key things you would change to improve the way TEI services are delivered in the District to vulnerable children, families and communities?
 3. What are three key things you would change to improve FACS's management of TEI programs?
 4. How would you like to be informed and involved in the reform and consultation process?

The data for sections 2 to 5 were derived from 'report back templates' (see appendix 1) that were used to capture the key messages from the small group discussions. It should be noted that these data are in raw form and have not been edited or analysed. Accordingly, the responses should not be read as representing a consensus and, indeed, some responses are in conflict with others.

Nexus has also prepared a report that consolidates the key state-wide themes across the above four questions.

1. KEY THEMES

Fourteen key themes or ‘areas of concern’ emerged from our consultations across *a//* Districts:

- Flexibility
- Service coordination
- Service integration
- Resourcing and procurement
- Data collection and reporting
- Outcomes measurement and evaluation
- Evidence-based decision-making
- Capabilities of the sector
- Responsiveness and adaptability
- Service relevance/legitimacy
- Autonomy
- Continuum and quantum of services
- Engagement
- Client-oriented service design.

Many of these themes cut across issues of service system design, service delivery, program improvement and program support. It is important to note, however, that these themes resonate differently, depending on the context that which they refer to, and to keep this in mind when drawing insights from the data presented in the next sections.

For example, while service flexibility was identified frequently across all districts, it was used in different senses. In many cases, flexibility referred to either increased service provider autonomy in decision-making, and in some cases, less rigid contractual arrangements. From the perspective of the service system design and service delivery, flexibility was also identified as the general ‘sector or system capability’ required in order to accommodate differences in delivery styles, service culture and ways of working, and to adapt to different community or client needs. In other contexts, flexibility referred to a broadening of program guidelines, definitions (particularly definitions of early intervention) and funded activities, and implies program design change, rather than system change necessarily.

2. WHAT WORKS WELL

What works well with the current District TEI services and service system?

Bankstown

-
- Universal services provide good soft entry points
 - Mix of individual v. group services
 - Mix of multi-cultural services (e.g. Arabic, Vietnamese speaking etc)
 - Partnerships with districts, relationships between services - collaboration
 - Community Builders: flexible and caters to meet community needs
 - Community Builders events are good engagement
 - Holistic approach/service delivery
 - Range of services is good
 - Soft entry points are good, especially playgroup
-
- Targeting works well (e.g. ATSI community groups)
 - Supported playgroups which link to case management
 - Living skills program for families with children with disabilities
 - Local trustful relationships with clients and community
 - Family support programs with case management and direct service delivery
 - SACCs?
 - FNSW interagencies are key to supporting and resourcing collaboration
 - Working together/partnerships between services and govt
-
- Partnerships with districts, relationships between services - collaboration
 - Sharing of information/collaboration
 - Experienced and expert staff
 - Knowledge of referral pathways within the district
 - TEI services manage police well- e.g. DV services
-
- Collaboration between services - when this happens it's very beneficial
 - Relationship with CPOs has been good
-
- Flexibility within services to meet client needs
 - Diverse range of services reaching broad range of clients
 - Services not restrictive based on visa status

- Relationship with CPOs has been good
- Inter-agency networks. (Bankstown- youth, child family etc)

- Partnerships - good among local services
- Range of services is good
- Face-to-face contact with CPO - local "on the ground"
- Integrated DV and family violence program
- Awareness raising of services through schools and interagencies

- Broad spectrum of services available
- Focus on early intervention
- Coordination- good interagencies
- Partnerships with districts, relationships between service
- DV services aren't restricted on who they can assist
- Casework
- Case-collaboration that links multiple organisations
- Collaboration between services
- Culturally relevant services
- Community Builder - flexible and caters to meet community needs
- Community Builders - good soft entry point

Ingleburn

- Casework
- Group work (e.g. parenting courses, at risk girls program in schools)
- Groups at school at risk of disengaging
- Supported playgroups
- Working with local high schools
- Flexibility of use of Community Builders funding
- Information sessions for seniors works well
- Soft entry where they exist, especially FOCUS and volunteer home visits
- FNSW-funded whole-of-government approach

- Clear guidelines means we know what is expected of us
- Collaboration within region is effective
- Brokerage has now become more flexible (e.g. rego etc)

- Service flexibility
 - Lower risk factors
 - Services are generalist which means a wider community can be serviced
-
- Allocations within sector - development (Community Builders)
 - Agencies able to work together in programs
 - Flexibility - clients able to choose some programs. Ability for soft entry programs/service which can lead to referrals
 - Ability to be involved with interagency meetings and networks
 - Small local based agencies allow for enhanced local understanding
-
- Supported playgroups and family workers allow early identification of families/children and then referral to appropriate services
 - Very good collaboration between NGOs, FACS and others (e.g. schools)
 - FNSW interagencies are key to supporting and resourcing collaboration
 - NGOs (i.e. FACS) upfront about their capacities and capabilities
 - FNSW portal (not EIPP)
 - Agencies with multiple programs can flexibly assist families (have their own continuum of services)
-
- Soft entry points
 - Community development (e.g. cook and chat, BBQ outreach) - reaching people
 - Local based projects
 - Parent support groups
 - Referrals - partnerships - outreach - home visits, cultural competent
 - Giving information in a non-threatening way
 - Soft entry points - upskilling community
 - CB - flexibility - catering to meet community needs
 - (When it works well) - collaborative approach - have a common goal, services working together, specific working groups - a neutral driver
 - Sustainability in funding

3. IMPROVEMENTS TO TEI SERVICES

What are three key things you would change to improve the way TEI services are delivered in the District to vulnerable children, families and communities?

Bankstown

-
- Eligibility criteria is too restrictive
 - Poor health-service coordination with families engaging with FACS programs
 - Flexibility - delivery timeframes
 - Long waiting lists for services
 - Capacity building for service providers
-
- Supported playgroup in ATSI community- have variety of additional service offerings for those who need greater support
 - Short term funding. Longer funding cycles
 - Competitive tendering inhibiting collaboration
 - Eligibility criteria is too restrictive - playgroup based on parent need not child development
-
- Eligibility criteria is too restrictive
 - Staff retention issues due to short-term funding (min 3 years)
 - Service should be funded to work with families long-term rather refer on
 - Lack of housing to ensure safe environments
 - Additional funding for new growth areas e.g. newly settled areas/ migrant communities
-
- Longer term funding periods
 - Capacity building for service providers
 - Staff development and training
 - Broadening of funding guidelines
 - Funding to work with a client longer
 - Integrated service delivery models
 - Develop single entry points as well as outreach services
-
- Soft entry points have disappeared
 - Outreach - insufficient

- Services should be funded to work with families in their home rather than centre-based
 - Recruitment & retention - staff not qualified to work with complex clients
 - Services need to coordinate with each other more intentionally around complex clients
-
- Data collection/surveys. Outcome measurement not output. Feedback of children not collected in survey
 - Flexible program design- EIPP, integrated DV and family violence programs. Timeframes and eligibility too restrictive
 - Staff development and training
-
- Improved data collection, reporting and evidence base
 - Streamline data system across different systems
 - Schools as community centres- working closely with schools
 - 9-12 program/funding gap
 - Sharing resources more
 - LGA link with district is needed

Ingleburn

-
- See some casework provision within Community Builders
 - Soft entry points have disappeared, would like to see them return especially youth & new babies
 - Age restriction lifted up to 24 y.o.
 - Brokerage component would make a huge difference
 - Services that are funded to deliver in certain areas and don't quite get there
 - More self-sufficiency, one-stop-shop with local fit
 - Flexible program design
 - Inclusion of young PWD in universal programs
-
- Unequal funding within/across regions
 - Updated directory of funded services
 - Unrealistic expectations from clients
 - 'Gaps' within the system
 - Lack of 'accountability' of services
 - Historically funded services that haven't been reviewed

- Services working in 'silos'
 - Vulnerable areas not accessing services
 - Client data reporting inconsistent
 - Lack of specialised services mean burn out and low efficacy
 - Time limited
 - Client packages so their funding goes with them
 - Measurement of reduction in ROSH reports
 - Geographical boundaries to stretch
 - Reduction of ROSH reports
-
- Allowing adequate funding for interpreters and having an improvement in CALD services
 - How to make real partnerships work. Making it mandatory to work collaboratively across areas and programs within existing resources
 - Capacity to be more flexible - around program guidelines and criteria (e.g. age groups etc)
 - Length of funding rounds (5 years)
-
- Better measurement of outcomes for children and families
 - Client-centred work can't be tied to artificial time frames
 - More CALD specific/appropriate service provision (funding to allow it) - means service provision can't be tied to program specific timeframes
 - Broaden definition of 'earlier intervention' to cover adult survivors of child sexual abuse
 - Strong support for District level decision making
 - Appropriate properties for accommodation services
-
- Model to review case management - soft entry point e.g. case management shift not enough soft entry be flexible
 - Culturally specific workers
 - Central information distribution centre
 - One-stop-shop
 - Short term funding e.g. min 10 years

4. FACS's PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

What are three key things you would change to improve FACS's management of TEI programs?

Bankstown

- Data tool - doesn't reflect work being done, not user friendly, doesn't reflect on quality
- Improved data collection tools and outcome measures
- FACS to clarify where their service sits within the continuum of services within a district
- Improved partnership with CPOs
- Change formula for unit costing- get rid of advice and referral
- Data tool - doesn't reflect work being done, not user friendly, doesn't reflect on quality
- Define 'good outcome'
- Long-term funding - 3-5 years would be better
- Define 'early intervention'
- Flexibility to alter service-agreements/ contracts
- Reporting requirements take time away from helping families (onerous/unwieldy). Simplify recording of events/processes
- Make programs less siloed
- Long-term funding- with incentives for collaboration and service integration
- Realistic funding to reflect true cost of service delivery
- FACS to facilitate collaboration between government departments
- Long-term funding - 3-5 years would be better
- Ability to change contract conditions
- Services funded based on needs
- Better communication with CPOs
- FACS to facilitate collaboration between government departments
- CPOs less focused on contract management and more on community development and service capacity building role
- Better communication with CPOs

- Stability of CPOs role
- CPO more active at grassroots level

Ingleburn

-
- Challenges with surveys that don't measure outcomes effectively - prevents local responses (quantitative vs. qualitative)
 - Move to outcomes/impact focused client centred approach
 - Network approach to District planning - use what exists and build strength of system
 - Build on evidence based practice and training with support from FACS and other services
 - FACS information - portal to share resources, evidence, evaluation e.g. HSNet - chat room
 - Directory of funded services driven by FACS/funders (HSNet) including other departments
-
- Ineffective data reporting and spreadsheets that hinder work flow - not user friendly
 - Effective communication - including mainstream services (Centrelink, police, health, schools, employment services) where are they? Key players unaware of today's consultation process
 - Client driven funding
 - Working across departments (federal vs. state, FACS - social services)
 - Define 'early intervention'
 - Look at 'gaps' - 'medium risk families', 'youth aged 19-24 years'
-
- FACS to make organisations accountable for delivery of programs/services in all LGAs as specified in their contract areas
 - Reporting guidelines to be focused more on outcomes rather than data (numbers) as well as a review of current surveys used
 - How can we improve the current ratio of ROSH from 1-5 without clogging the TEI service system
-
- Contract manager (CPO) role important in actively supporting services and service provision
 - Local flexibility around contract/service provision
 - Support developing/encouraging partnerships
-
- Surveys time consuming - repetitive, not necessary

- Data tool - doesn't reflect work being done, not user friendly, doesn't reflect on quality
- Need to have a good relationship with funder FACS
- Focus on building relationship - building a better understanding of current problems - focus on reform goals - collaborative approach
- Rising cost of overheads of funded services
- Communities agenda vs. FACS (e.g. Claymore - what community want does not meet the CLF want)

5. TEI REFORM CONSULTATION

How would you like to be informed and involved in the reform and consultation process?

Bankstown

-
- Face-to-face forums
 - Updates via email
 - Workshops on specific topic areas (also for other services not funded by FACS)
 - RSS feed on website
 - Subscription to updates on website
 - Direction from FACS on how they want services to communicate with them
-
- Networking with other services that complement each other
 - Frequent questions and answers
 - Email
-
- Forums are good to keep people up to date with FACS thinking and opportunity for feedback (more forums at appropriate times)
 - Comments on website
 - Email
 - Newsletters
 - Realistic timeframes and milestones communicated in advance
-
- FACS to go to core groups and attend interagency meetings
 - Timely information on funding contracts (new) and for the benefit of recruitment
 - Realistic timeframes and milestones communicated in advance
-
- Open to feedback at various stages
 - More connection to CPOs - discussion, negotiation, flexibility
-
- Consultation to be ongoing and over time and staged process
 - Regular, relevant, clear and concise updates about the reform process
 - Email
 - Realistic timeframes
 - Advisory groups

- Service-specific forums
- Consultation to be ongoing and over time and staged process
- Local level (LGA) consultation as well as District level

Ingleburn

- All update immediately
- Provide summary of information leading to paper
- Develop a local group/build on current networks (e.g. managers to further develop structure)
- Timely information on funding contracts (new) and for the benefit of recruitment
- The local rep to keep in touch regularly in specific area. This would facilitate collaboration
- FACS to go to core groups and attend interagency meetings
- Consultation to be ongoing and over time and staged process
- If there is any updates regarding reform FACS to send emails to organisations with a link to the updates
- Extension of current funding round - immediate notice of outcomes
- Allowing for more flexibility i.e. involvement of organisations e.g. webinars
- Immediate notice of community consultations - how? when? will CALD communities be provided with the tools to voice their concerns
- Forums are good to keep people up to date with FACS thinking and opportunity for feedback (more forums at appropriate times)
- Newsletter/FAQs
- Through District staff at forums/interagencies etc
- Keep the website up to date and interacting (allows small NGOs to participate)
- Give plenty of notice of timeframe for when new system starts
- More meetings like this
- Peak body Sector Connect
- FACS website
- FACS District with constant communication
- Make sure SWS is kept separate

APPENDIX 1: REPORT BACK TEMPLATE

Targeted Earlier Intervention Reform District Consultation Sessions SOUTH WESTERN SYDNEY DISTRICT

REPORT BACK TEMPLATE

1. What works well with the current District TEI services and service system?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. What are three key things you would change to improve the way TEI services are delivered in the District to vulnerable children, families and communities?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....



Family &
Community
Services

Targeted Earlier Intervention Reform District Consultation Sessions SOUTH WESTERN SYDNEY DISTRICT

REPORT BACK TEMPLATE

3. What are three key things you would change to improve FACS's management of TEI programs?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

4. How would you like to be informed and involved in the reform and consultation process?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....