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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the contemporary western human service environment, governments are increasingly seeking to purchase services which can guarantee results that intervene positively in the complex social problems of individuals and families. For young people, these results are increasingly focussed on the avoidance of foster care placements, the completion of schooling and successful entry into employment, the avoidance of contact with the juvenile justice system and the prevention of homelessness. Such 'results-based' service purchasing and planning has a corresponding system of accountability and a requirement upon services to be increasingly 'client-focussed'.

As the major funding body for youth services who support vulnerable young people in NSW, the NSW Department of Family and Community Services (FaCS) is interested in how it can work with the sector to achieve consistently high outcomes for young people. Service integration is viewed as a significant contributor to a client-focussed service system, ensuring results for young people's wellbeing, not least on the indicators suggested above. It is therefore integral to addressing the complex needs of vulnerable clients. This report sought to answer two major questions across the FaCS Sydney Metro Central Region:

1) Is integrated service delivery in the youth sector providing for the holistic needs of clients (e.g. working with families, other sectors, schools)?
2) To what level is integrated service delivery working to promote outcomes for clients?

These questions were explored using consultations with key services, interagencies and workers in the FaCS Metro Central Region along with key texts on organisational culture and change, sound business modelling, and trends in the funding and design of human services. Recommendations are then made for making the 'quantum leap' to a generative integrated service system that is geared to the optimal wellbeing of young people in the Region, and to the prevention of complex personal and social problems they may face.

The FaCS Metro Central Region covers 27 local government areas taking in Northern, Central and Southern Sydney. It is estimated that a significant proportion of young people in the region will require some level of support from the human service system at some point during their adolescence. Within this, around 20% will have significant needs and around 1.5% with have high-level ongoing needs.

The report finds that:

- There is generally good evidence of micro level integration occurring across the Region. Organisations on the whole share information and participate in some joint activities to service clients. There is also a firm understanding of the benefit of integration for clients, and almost all workers consulted could list several activities that they knew of that modelled “good integration”. Many of these examples included aspects of “meso level” integration, with Terms of Reference, memoranda of understanding, agreements, and other higher-level administrative supports in place;

- There are also some isolated examples of higher-level collaborative practice such as the Adolescent Interagency Meeting, and the DEEWR-funded Partnership Brokers Program.
However:

- The youth services sector does not have a high level of successful collaboration with other sectors such as schools, family services, and specialist homelessness services.

- On the whole, integration takes place via information sharing and loose, program-by-program cooperation. These are only the first steps on a path towards systemic integration.

Put another way: while there is considerable “bottom-up” will to adopt integrative and holistic practices for the benefit of clients, and some salient examples of where this is already happening, there are some major challenges and barriers currently holding the sector back. Hence, there needs to be a major undertaking to create a culture of integration and to implement thorough co-ordination and alignment. The ‘wide lens’ referred to in the report’s title signals the expansive and holistic scope needed to realise an integrative culture and a co-ordinated service system.

Recommendations for short and long-term change are made based on Dan S. Cohen's eight steps for organisational culture change.

Major areas of analysis and recommendations include:

- Increasing the “connectors” between sectors to encourage seamlessness and communication, such as a pilot of Student Support Officers in schools;

- Forming regional and state-wide “guiding teams” of cross-sector leaders to drive client-focused change across all levels;

- Investing in, and enabling, effective organisational leadership to improve client outcomes;

- Developing agreement of shared outcomes and frameworks to align services to both holistic (i.e. assessing and acting on the whole needs of the client) and “lifespan” perspectives for the benefit of clients;

- Focusing on information systems that can improve efficiency and effectiveness of information sharing;

- Developing comprehensive information-gathering and information-sharing systems to track the effectiveness of local and regional interventions;

- Increasing flexibility of funding and models of service delivery to better address client needs.
1.1 Purpose of this Report

It is widely accepted that the purpose of human services should be the achievement of positive outcomes for clients. However, the challenges of measuring, reaching and sustaining positive outcomes across a diverse sector are considerable, and these challenges often lead to a lowering in either the quality or quantity of service that is provided.

In a youth sector that is increasingly under pressure to be more accountable, targeted and outcomes-driven, this report looks at some of the issues associated with doing "more with less", or how to achieve a greater impact for young people in the NSW Department of Family and Community Services (FaCS) Metro Central Region, with the same or less funding.

Specifically, the scope of this report is to look how to begin to achieve systemic improvement to produce better client outcomes across youth services in the FaCS Metro Central Region. It is well-established that 'integrated service delivery' – co-ordinated, ongoing contact and communication between service providers, such as on-site co-location of agencies – is the ideal mode for achieving these better outcomes and ensuring the sector is centred on the needs of clients. As such the research for this report focussed on two main themes:

1) Is integrated service delivery in the youth sector providing for the holistic needs of clients (e.g. working with families, other sectors, schools)?
2) To what level is integrated service delivery working to promote outcomes for clients?

1.2 Report Methodology

This report was written in consultation with a significant number of stakeholders across the FaCS Metro Central Region. This consultation process involved three main collection strategies:

1) Interagency consultations: Largely the administration of a paper-based survey to collect data from many stakeholders at one time. Where there was time or the capacity of the meeting to allow it, a facilitated discussion was also conducted;

2) Focus groups: Comprising of three or more workers, often from the same area or organisation;

3) In-depth interviews: Conducted with targeted workers to explore the issues identified in interagencies and focus groups.

Across the consultation process, thematic analyses were conducted regularly in order to have participants “add value” to areas that seemed to be of particular concern or interest. This ongoing process was slightly due to the tight timeframe of the project, but also meant that many “sides” of an issue could be explored quite quickly and effectively.
1.3 Outline of the Report Structure

It may seem a little counter-intuitive, but this report starts at the end. It begins by asking the question “where are we going?” I firmly believe that presenting a clear, firm goal gives any discussion an aim, and assists in challenging existing ideas and assumptions that may normally hold change initiatives back. Therefore, Section 2.0 sets out a vision of an effective, integrated youth service system.

Section 3.0 asks “where are we now?” It shows some aspects of the current state of client-centred practice across the Region, as well as some things that may assist in providing this picture more clearly in the future.

Finally, Section 4.0 asks “how will we get from the ‘now’ to our ‘vision’”. Given the scope of changes necessary, this is the bulk of the report, and presents recommendations not as isolated improvements, but as a series of logical steps in a culture change process.
The human services are part of what has become a very complex policy and economic environment that exerts significant pressure on their funding and design. The 2008 Global Financial Crisis revealed the relative insecurity of economic growth, and to ensure ongoing funding services must continually “fall-in-line” with the philosophies and priorities of successive governments at local, state and National levels.

Within this complex context, human services have been placed in competition with a range of other programs, initiatives and policies that can be funded by government or public institutions. As a consequence, there has been a considerable shift towards accountability for results, visibility of impacts across population groups, and return-on-investment for expenditure on human services.

For example, the UK has recently seen a shift towards Social Bonds and Payment-By-Results schemes, applied to both family and juvenile justice settings. Both are attempts to shift the human services sector away from an “activities” mode of operation (i.e. “we have done this work”) to an outcomes orientation (i.e. “we achieved this with our client”, or “our client achieved this”).

Implemented in early 2012 in England, Payment-By-Results is administered through the Central Government, which enables local Councils to manage the trajectories of 120,000 of England’s most “troubled” families. Under the scheme;

“Local authorities will be able to claim up to £4,000 for each family they transform, on the basis that they get children back into school, reduce youth crime and antisocial behaviour, put adults on a path back to work and bring down the £9bn annual costs caused by dealing with such families. Part of this cash will be available upfront to kick-start the activity.”

Similarly, the US has seen a shift towards the “business” of investing in human services. A 2009 DeLoitte report titled Human Services Financing for the 21st Century: Building Stronger Children & Families explains the reasoning for such a shift:

“Each year, approximately $1 Trillion in federal, state and philanthropic funding is allocated. Yet funders are increasingly concerned about accountability, providers have trouble ensuring sustainability, and our most vulnerable populations often struggle finding services to help them meet their basic needs.”

As a result of these wider shifts in accountability, performance and outcomes sought in human services, a raft of measures, systems and measurements have been developed, trialled and implemented, including Results-Based Accountability, Social Return-On-Investment, the Outcomes Star, and a range of Risk & Asset matrices. These are supported by disciplines such as Evidence-Based Practice, Knowledge Brokering, Prevention Science, and, within this, concepts such as program fidelity, implementation and reinvestment as well as social impact and social innovation.

In Australia, there has been a definite push towards accountability for the implementation of high-impact programs, with frameworks including Results-Based Accountability\(^3\) and Asset-

---

Based Community Development\(^4\) being adopted widely across a range of human services. This has been supported by an increased interest in partnerships for the purpose of evaluation of program implementation and impacts. In 2011 the NSW government began a pilot program trialling Social Benefit Bonds across 3 programs to attract investment from external sources, effectively linking ongoing funding firmly to results achieved\(^5\).

### 2.2 The Vision for Effective Human & Youth Services

This report signals the commitment of FaCS NSW to supporting the youth services in the FaCS Metro Central Region in shifting towards more accountable and client-centred modes of service provision. The purpose of this report is to outline the first few baby steps of a process that will take many years and a great deal of vision, commitment, cooperation, trust, and continuous effort to achieve. To assist in driving this process, a vision of the ideal system to aim for is particularly important. Without this vision, many of the underlying issues that currently hamper the achievement of outcomes by youth services in the region may never be addressed or rectified. As such, it can be very useful to vision backwards – to start not at what we are doing now, but at what we would like to be achieving in the future. A number of possible elements of this vision are offered below.

![Figure 2: Establishing the ‘Gap’](image)

Writing about what makes a good Health Care system, Alan Gilles says that patients/clients “want three fundamental things: They want it to keep them healthy if possible; where this is not possible, they want it to make them better if possible; and, they want it to do this at the minimum cost consistent with these goals.”\(^6\) Arguably, these aims are the same for any human services system:

1) Where possible, emphasise “health” and prevent issues developing;

---

\(^4\) Kretzmann, & McKnight, (1993)


2) Where this is not always possible, ensure that effective services are in place to intervene early and avoid entrenchment or escalation, and;
3) Have both points 1 and 2 operating as effectively as possible to minimise cost.

The report of a human services summit convened at Harvard University in 2010 titled *The Next Generation of Human Services* presents a unique way of thinking about markers of achievement that we might apply to the FaCS Metro Central Region. The diagram below shows the “Human Services Value Curve”, and suggests that improvements across a service system in both efficiency and effectiveness of achieving outcomes can be driven by a shift from “regulated” to “generative” systems, which are complex enough to address multi-dimensional social problems, and become predictive (as opposed to reactive) in nature.⁷

![Figure 3: Human Services Value Curve](image)

On this logic, increased efficiency in achieving outcomes will present either significant cost savings to the system, or increased impact through larger quantities of clients serviced, while increased effectiveness will provide greater client outcomes. Hence, the further a system shifts along the curve, the greater the collective outcomes of the system, and the greater the cost savings or ability to re-invest in further systemic value creation.

However, the above outcomes are not easy to achieve locally, let alone across a regional network of services. To present a little more detail, the qualities of an impactful human services system are⁸:

---


Outcomes-Driven; Preventative; Connected/Client-centred; Well informed; Coordinated; Professional; and, Evidence based.

2.2.1 Outcomes-Driven

Effective youth services focus on outcomes: knowing what they are achieving, and why these achievements are important. As stated by Clarence Carter, Director of Human Services in Washington D.C.,

“The intention of the old system was to deliver a benefit or service someone was eligible for. This is the fatal flaw of our system – we have focused on transactions and haven’t been intentional about effectively working across organizations and using resources to grow human capacity...The new objective in DC is to align the human services system in order to actually grow the capacity of the customers that we serve – so that those people can then be free of public dependence and achieve their highest potential.”

This shift, from “doing” to “achieving”, is integral to the planning and measurement of youth service performance. An outcomes-driven organisation knows what activities will produce the greatest benefit, and delivers these with that benefit in mind - balancing quality of service and efficiency of resource use to achieve their sought goals. As outlined by the Productivity Commission, in community organisations “quality, including quality of process, is strongly linked to effectiveness of the activity”. Echoing Carter (above) the Commission stressed the importance that the “doing” does not take precedence over the “achieving”.

To be effective, an outcomes-orientation requires a robust infrastructure composed of stakeholder engagement, planning, measurement, feedback, evaluation and improvement. It requires the ability to not just execute a program or initiative, but also conduct a process that rigorously states and measures the why, the how, and the how well. In the words of the aforementioned Harvard report:

“We need to renew our focus on outcomes for the customer – that’s what resonates and what cuts across all other issues. It’s a different environment now.”

2.2.2 Preventative

The challenges that youth services in the region face are not new. However, the complexity of clients’ needs has become more evident, and more intensive practices of case management and family intervention are preferred as service models (e.g. the shift within NSW Government Community Services from the Community Services Grants Program to Early Intervention and Placement Prevention). Hence, in 2013

youth services are undertaking much more complex work than they may have been in earlier funding rounds. This shift was supported in consultation data, with “case management” being the highest category of service provision recorded by workers across interagencies (24% of responses).

As the evidence around common risk factors for young people has developed, youth services and funding bodies are increasingly coming to grips with the large numbers of complex young people that need to be serviced now and in the future (for more on this, see Section 3.5). To enable successful service provision to be fully realised, it is necessary to have effective services operating across the continuum of response, from prevention right through to intensive crisis intervention and support. Effective prevention services operating universally should, over time, reduce the need for a large number of medium to intensive intervention services, reserving these only for young people that “fall through the cracks”, rather than trying to catch the large groups that “fall through” when there is little prevention to divert them early.

### 2.2.3 Connected/Client-Centred

Jane Waldfogel asserts that “the goals of service integration efforts are, first, to attain a better match between clients’ needs and the services provided and, second, to create a more co-ordinated system for delivering those services.”13 Indeed, there is a significant body of evidence that connected, cooperative and coordinated services get significant results for clients, for a significantly lower cost than stand-alone services. For example, a 2007 Australian Research Alliance for Children and Young People survey of collaboration efforts found that 85% of “respondents reported that the outcomes of their projects would not be achievable without collaboration.” Furthermore, “the majority of respondents also agreed that they worked on problems that others have had great difficulty in solving.”14

This commitment to fulfilling the range of needs of the client, and providing all clients with an accessible interface, is becoming increasingly emphasised as research demonstrates more about the complexity of a range of social phenomena. For example, where mental illness was once considered an unavoidable product of genetic makeup, research has shown many types of mental disturbance to be highly related to the presence or absence of a range of environmental factors, protective forces, risk forces, and individual variables such as stress thresholds. With this highly individualised, case-by-case experience, the only treatments that can effectively respond to prevention or mitigation of mental health issues are those that are flexible and able to assess the current situation and needs of the individual client. It goes without saying that no effective intervention would ever be exactly the same, and therefore a service system must be both adequately complex and adequately flexible and responsive to be able to assist the client.

In considering integration, a model proposed by Leutz15 as an amendment of an initial framework provided by Fine, Thomson and Graham16 outlines a continuum of integration:

---

Autonomy | Cooperative Links | Collaboration | Integration
---|---|---|---
Parties/agencies act without reference to each other, although the actions of one may affect the other(s). | Parties establish ongoing ties, but formal surrender of independence not required. A willingness to work together for some common goals. Communication emphasised. Requires good will and some mutual understanding. | Planned harmonisation of activities between the separate parties. Duplication of activities and resources is minimised. Requires agreed plans and protocols or appointment of an external coordinator or (case) manager. | Links between the separate parties draw them into a single system. Boundaries between parties begin to dissolve as they become effectively work units or subgroups within a single, larger organisation.

**Figure 4: Continuum of Integration**

Konrad\(^{17}\) presents a similar continuum (which will be explained and applied in greater depth in Section 3.4), with “fragmented” behaviours beginning with “information sharing” and “communication”, and moving through cooperation and coordination, collaboration, consolidation, to integration.

As can be seen, a shift from “autonomy” towards “integration” requires a concerted effort to structurally integrate – to effectively lift integration above the level of individual workers and relationships. In achieving integration, there are two possible scenarios:

1) Integrative practice can be achieved by one organisation equipped to respond appropriately to a high degree of complexity with multiple supports; or,

2) By a system of smaller, more specialised organisations that are integrated enough to provide a seamless and individually responsive client experience.

### 2.2.4 Well-Informed

Well-coordinated services are informed by extensive data to guide their efforts, often at the population level and across multiple years as they seek to make a collective impact on large scales or areas. At the optimal level of service integration that Oftelie calls “generative”, he says that,

> “Social networks and advanced information analytics will help organizations synthesize information and trends across the ecosystem of organizations, jurisdictions and communities in order to become predictive in nature – enabling co-creation of policy and adaptation of programs in response to real-time conditions.” \(^{18}\)

---


The vision of creating a well-informed service network has 5 major challenges:

1) collecting enough (and of the right type) of data to mobilise coordinated and effective service responses to complex social phenomena;

2) ensuring that collected data is available and can be used at the points in the system where it is most needed;

3) collecting data regularly, to measure changes and trends over time;

4) linking any trends directly to service efforts and systemic responses;

5) ensuring that data collection is meaningful and part of normal processes, to avoid burn-out of both clients and staff members.

The complexity of a generative service system is captured if we imagine collecting enough data to intervene early in a location that had an escalating rate of family breakdown. First, an agreed and evidence-based set of data relating to family wellbeing would have to be collected on every family in the given population (imagine a suburb, or a state). Next, this data would have to be fed to a central coordinating body, who could then mobilise a considered service system response that could effectively curtail the trend – effectively intervening for families already under current stress, and simultaneously either addressing the social factors adding stress across the location, or working to strengthen other families across the location to serve as a preventative measure.

In short, without robust data infrastructure to inform either local, regional or national decisions, service system responses will always be reacting late to a series of isolated incidents that appear unrelated.

2.2.5 Coordinated

As outlined in Section 2.2.4, a responsive service system exhibits internal leadership. In a fragmented system with many autonomous organisations, there is a high likelihood of duplication (both of work with highly visible clients, and of services provided), and under-servicing of potential clients. This diffuse state also makes it almost impossible to assess and respond to area-wide needs, and collect the total impact of organisations on the area. This produces a great deal of systemic inefficiency and waste, and also decreases the effectiveness of services offered. As expressed by one researcher:

“Attaining (integrative client) goals requires both the capacity to identify individuals’ and families’ needs and the capacity to make adjustments to the service delivery system to meet those needs. At the state level, this means having a process to identify and adapt to changing needs. It also means removing barriers to integration and taking positive steps to facilitate integration, whether through integrating services in existing programs or coordinating services across programs.”19

When discussing meaningful coordination of services across a region, Waldfogel20 argues that integration can occur at three levels:

---

Macro Level | National and State Government | Policy, planning, finance and administration of different programs and service types
---|---|---
Meso Level | Local Services | Links between regional services at management level
Micro Level | Individual Consumers and Staff | Teamwork between different service providers assisting the same individual

Table 1: Waldfogel’s levels of integration

For integration to be possible at the micro level, policies and management strategies at the macro and meso levels must align to allow the flexibility and accountability that true integration and client-centeredness entails.

In such a system, a structure, leader, manager or administrative body is required to facilitate the effective flow of communication between organisations, enabling staff to be part of planning and delivering integrative strategies; conducting higher-order planning, resource allocation and evaluation of service outcomes.

For the effectiveness of this regional intermediary, we only need to look to the business model of installing a regional manager above local representatives. Imagine if a company left all of its local stores or sales representatives to operate independently – the product would be marked by inefficiencies, massive quality variation, and a distinct lack of overall accountability and overarching strategy. Furthermore, the individual stores or representatives would not be able to collectively mobilise to respond to threats, trends, or opportunities – instead they would all compete! This is exactly what analysts believe happened to a quickly expanding Starbucks in the mid-2000’s. Too many stores too close together, and a wavering in overarching strategy and mission produced large quality variations, inter-store competition, and a massive slump in the value of the company.\(^{21}\)

Given the complex nature of the service system, these cross-organisational coordination points often don’t arise organically. Instead, they are a strategic investment required if a sector or region is to achieve a greater level of maturity marked by increased achievement of outcomes.

### 2.2.6 Professional

Staff delivering integrated, holistic services must be appropriately trained, able to navigate complex service scape interrelationships, and create relationships that deliver results for clients.

Collins\(^{22}\) suggests that the Not-For-Profit sector faces significant challenges with relation to staff selection and retention. He outlines that many organisations often lack the resources to acquire and retain high quality staff, and that tenure systems and volunteer dynamics can complicate getting the wrong people “off the bus”.

Anecdotally, this is seen in the significant turn-over of staff within the Human Services sectors. In a 2011 survey of NSW Youth Workers, the Youth Action and Policy Association found that almost 60% of workers had less than 5 year’s experience\(^{23}\).

---


Given the operating ecologies of youth services, and their often challenging financial and political positions, skilled managers are vital. A manager in a youth service may have duties as varied as program design, stakeholder communication, staff recruitment and performance management, financial management and budgeting, program evaluation, business/relationship development, reporting, and a range of other service-related duties. Only by ensuring that all of these areas are covered (either by an exceptional manager, executive team or board) can an organisation truly hope to have a significant and lasting impact.

Outside of individual services, leadership remains a significant factor in creating a culture of collaboration and integration. Indeed, the Toronto First Duty Program (an Early Childhood Integration project) calls leadership “a ‘make or break’ variable”24 in local integration efforts. The report accurately lays out some of the enabling behaviours that supportive leaders demonstrate in facilitating effective integration in the early childhood sector;

“Leadership leveraged many supports, including innovative approaches to expanding child care capacity, maximizing the use of school space, and finding resources for staff release time. The latter was repeatedly identified as essential if staff are to plan for and implement joint activities or programs.”25

2.2.7 Evidence-Based

Finally, an impactful human service is sure of its impact. It is aware of current research into its field, and invests its (often scant) resources into inputs that deliver results. It runs these evidence-based programs with high fidelity, and therefore is high in effectiveness (doing the right things in the right way).

25 Ibid.
3.1 The FaCS Metro Central Region

The FaCS Metro Central Region takes in 27 Local Government Areas covering Northern, Central and Southern Sydney. At the 2011 Census the Region had a population of 134,402 12-17 year olds, and covered areas with Index of Relative Social Advantage and Disadvantage (IRSAD) scores ranging between 1164 (the highest recorded SEIFA rating in NSW) and 872 (in only the 6th percentile across NSW).

When turning our attention to youth services in the region, the current picture is surprisingly hard to grasp. To the best of the author’s ability, the following indicators give some picture of youth services in the region:

- the number of youth services in the region;
- the role these services currently play;
- the outcomes these services achieve; and,
- the client demand that the sector is attempting to meet across the region.

3.2 Number of Youth Services

There are approximately 280 projects or activities funded under the FaCS Early Intervention Placement Prevention (EIPP) and Community Builders programs within the region. From information provided by FaCS, many organisations hold multiple contracts for either EIPP or Community Builders services, resulting in 140 individual organisations providing these services across 27 Local Government Areas, plus 11 statewide funded services.

In addition to EIPP and Community Builders, a number of other local, state and federal funding arrangements, plus charities and not-for-profit Non-Government Organisations (NGO’s) add significantly to the service scape.

The 2011 Youth Action & Policy Association Youth Work Snapshot found that across NSW 41.3% of respondent’s project funding came from the State Government, 24.2% from Local Government, and 19% from Federal Government. Only 15.5% of total project funding came from others sources such as trusts or foundations, donations, fundraising and sponsorship or fees.26

26 YAPA NSW (2011) Youth Work Snapshot 2011: YAPA Survey of Youth Services & Workers in NSW.
Therefore, most youth services in the Sydney Metro Region are likely to receive some form of either EIPP or Community Builders funding. Upon reviewing several current Youth Service Directories across LGA’s, most place-based (i.e. based within the LGA and servicing the young people of that LGA) organisations or programs correspond to those found in the list of organisations that receive some EIPP or Community Builders funding. There are also several charities that receive no government funding that provide services to young people (e.g. Streetwork, Vinnies, Raise Foundation), but these seem to be quite rare, and would not impact significantly on the estimated number of organisations providing youth services across the region.

Adding to this number are programs such as:

- Youth Connections (funded by the Federal Government’s Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations to integrate marginalised young people back into education and training to finish Year 12)\(^{27}\). There are approximately 8 Youth Connections programs across the FaCS Metro Central Region;

- Links to Learning (funded by the NSW Department of Education and Communities to improve educational outcomes for young people leaving or at risk of leaving school)\(^{28}\). There are 9 Links to Learning Programs across the FaCS Metro Central Region;

- Reconnect (funded by the Federal Government’s Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs to prevent homelessness). There are approximately 5 Reconnect Programs across the FaCS Metro Central Region\(^{29}\);

- Police & Citizens Youth Clubs (PCYC’s). There are approximately 13 PCYC’s across the FaCS Metro Central Region;

- The National School Chaplaincy and Student Welfare Program (funded by the Federal Government’s Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations to support the wellbeing of students at school). No information was available on the scope of this program across the region;

- Student Support Officers (funded by the NSW Department of Education & Communities give students and staff extra help to deal with complex social issues like bullying, transition to high school, coping skills, safe use of social media and student behaviour). This is a pilot program, with Student Support Officers currently only being placed at 5 schools: South Sydney High School, Dulwich Hill High School; Endeavour Sports High School, Caringbah and Canterbury Boy’s High School;

- Youth Health Services (funded by NSW Health) offer a range of primary and tertiary health services for disadvantaged young people. There are 9 specialist youth health services across the FaCS Metro Central Region;

- Youth Mental Health services (funded at a State level by NSW Health, or Federally through the Headspace initiative) provide assessment and treatment of a range of mental health disorders for young people. Data on the number of adolescent mental health services available through NSW Health was not available, however there are 2 Headspace centres in the FaCS Metro Central Region;

- Specialist Homelessness services;

\(^{27}\) DEEWR (2013) Youth Connections Fact Sheet.


Juvenile Justice services.

Excluding the specialist services outlined (youth health services, youth mental health services, specialist homelessness services and juvenile justice services, most of which can be viewed as clinical or crisis services, and therefore contra to the preventative/early intervention ideals of EIPP and CB’s) there are almost 320 programs or activities provided throughout the Sydney Metro Region, across approximately 150 organisations.

3.3 What Role do Youth Services Currently Play?

The role of youth services in Australia is currently a topic of much debate within the youth sector. The Australian Youth Affairs Coalition (AYAC) recently released a discussion paper aimed at “facilitating a national dialogue that will result in (a) … national definition of youth work, which will be a vehicle for positive change across the youth sector and be of real benefit to the young people (youth services) work with.”

This lack of a consensus as to the roles and aims of youth services is reflected in the many and varied activities that a typical youth service undertakes. Rather than a complete whole, generalist (as opposed to specialist responses such as mental health and crisis accommodation) youth services often find themselves running a diverse range of activities, with each benefiting young people in different ways. The activities provided by generalist youth services can include recreational drop-in services, school holiday activities, educational support, case management, counselling, referral to specialist services, and early intervention in homelessness, mental health, family breakdown, and a range of other complex situations that young people may face.

As a result, the role of generalist youth services is generally the identification of young people who may now, or in the future, be in need of some kind of support, and providing early intervention in attempting to divert them from needing more intense and specialised support at a later stage.

In this way, a generalist youth service seeks to engage “marginalised” young people, build a trusting relationship, and then through programs, internal case management, or referrals to other services, assist them to alter their trajectories away from a range of undesirable outcomes, such as engagement with the criminal justice system, school disengagement etc. Previously, most generalist youth services were funded under the Community Service Grants Program (CSGP). Recently, this funding was split into the major funding streams provided from FaCS to youth services: EIPP and Community Builders. As Section 3.1 demonstrates, these programs remain the central pillars of the youth sector in NSW. Therefore, in line with this vision of a generalist youth service, the “Youth and Family Support” stream of the EIPP program “targets low to medium risk young people aged 12 to 18 years and families where presenting problems, if left unattended, would likely escalate to the point where either a more intensive service … would be required, or risk of significant harm (would be) identified.”

Youth services/centres funded under the FaCS Community Builders program aim to improve connections, resourcefulness, participation, trust and respect amongst targeted communities. Therefore a youth centre funded as a “community hub” is funded to strengthen the social fabric of that community, and see that those who may need assistance are provided useful information and supported referrals to other relevant services.

---

31 Family & Community Services, Community Services (2011) *Early Intervention & Placement Prevention Program Funding program Guidelines.*
Other types of youth services seek to divert young people from a range of negative outcomes in other strategic ways. There is a great deal of current evidence that both schools and families serve to “protect” young people from experiencing the negative situations of homelessness, out-of-home care, and contact with the juvenile justice system. For these reasons, the focus of Youth Connections, Reconnect, National School Chaplaincy and Student Welfare Program, Links to Learning and Student Support Officers are to preserve the number of young people who maintain the “protective” influences of their schools and families.

The other specialist services listed in 3.2 seek to intervene in, or mitigate, the ongoing effects of specifically identified acute needs or crisis points for young people. For example, a Specialist Homeless Service will intervene when it becomes clear that a young person is at risk of homelessness, or when they are actually homeless, and seek to minimise either the risk or harm that may come from either of these states. Likewise, Juvenile Justice services aim to divert young people from crime (and associated custodial sentences) and re-offending.

Despite a lack of shared aims or objectives, youth services in the FaCS Metro Central Region aim to prevent young people from achieving a range of poor outcomes.

### 3.4 What Outcomes Do Youth Services in FaCS Metro Central Region Achieve?

Due to the current fractured and uncoordinated nature of the youth sector (Section 4 provides greater detail), there is no concrete way to either assess or understand the collective impact of services on young people across the region. Figure 5 illustrates the major services funded in the FaCS Metro Central Region, and links them to outcomes (shown in pink) that programs attempt to achieve for a young person. Programs or areas funded largely by the Australian Government are shown in green, while NSW Government funding is shown in orange.

As the below shows, a range of programs are on offer to prevent negative outcomes, pathways or trajectories for the region’s young people. Based on the experiences of the author, and the consultations carried out as part of this report, it is obvious that each program often successfully achieves its stated outcomes. However, little or no public data is available to evaluate the effectiveness of any of the above preventative or crisis services over time.

This “fractured” funding situation was reinforced also through the consultation process. Funding for organisations in attendance at interagencies (and therefore members of the youth sector) came from more than 9 state funding bodies, and 7 federal funding bodies, with a great deal of support also from local government grants and funding (approximately 35 programs). Therefore, it would be almost impossible to collect evidence together to paint a cohesive picture of the sectors shared achievements across the FaCS Metro Central Region.

---

3.5 Supply and Demand

The previous sections of this report demonstrate an interesting challenge for youth services across the region. Through a mix of Federal, State and local funding, we can see the number and types of programs that are provided to young people. However, available data makes no reference to program capacities, nor to what kind of demand that services experience. Services interviewed for this project made heavy reference to needing increased levels of funding to achieve either:

1) greater capacity to service larger amounts of young people; or,

2) greater capacity to deliver an increased quality of service for clients.

In an effort to add some greater clarity around this discussion of potential demand on services if operating at full capacity, we developed the below sector need curve.
Figure 6: Sector Need Curve

The curve is based on the ideas outlined in the ARACY report *Inverting the Pyramid*[^34], in which a public health model is used to focus on the relatively low per-unit cost of investment in preventative service provision, rather than the expensive (and often ineffective) focus on treatment services. The representations of the following four groups along the curve across the FaCS Metro Central Region are outlined below:

- **Population Group 1**: “All Young People”, High Proportion – Low Intensity Services
- **Population Group 2**: “Some Need”, Up to 20% of the population per annum – Low Intensity Services
- **Population Group 3**: “High Need”, Up to 2.5% of the population per annum – High Intensity Services
- **Population Group 4**: “Life-Long Need”, 0.5-1% of the population – Extreme Intensity Services

3.5.1 **Population Group 1: “All Young People”, High Proportion**

It is well established that prevention is better (and cheaper) than cure. In this way, money spent on the provision of universal services to ensure that the majority are “well”, and not in need of higher intensity services, represents the most valuable form of investment in services. Currently, there are 134,402 young people aged 12-17 across the FaCS Metro Central region. Most of these young people will be captured by

educational institutions (mainly high schools). At this level, to ensure that service support is universal, services should have the capacity to deliver wellbeing-focused programs in schools to cover the 134,402 young people in the target age group. There should also be effective mechanisms to ensure that potential issues in this population group are identified early, and comprehensive pathways to higher intensity services are accessible.

3.5.2 Population Group 2: “Some Need”, Up to 20% of the population per annum – Low Intensity Services

This “some need” population is the stage of “early intervention” in issues, before they escalate into more entrenched or complex problems. This group is assessed as being up to 20% of the total population of young people in any one year, based on available statistics for risk factors such as:

- school suspensions or truanting\(^\text{35}\);
- mild behavioural diagnoses\(^\text{36}\);
- presentation of mild depression and anxiety\(^\text{37}\).

As such, services across the Sydney Metro Region should be equipped to provide up to 26,880 young people with this level of support.

As the early intervention stage in a range of issues, these young people may need short-term access to a number of low-intensity services, including:

- school and education engagement programs;
- short-term mental health support, including psychologists, counsellors and support groups;
- family mediation services;
- pathways to further education or training;
- social and emotional wellbeing programs, such as mentoring, positive recreation etc.

3.5.3 Population Group 3: “High Need”, Up to 2.5% of the population per annum – High Intensity Services

Quality and effective service provision is integral for this population group in ensuring that they don’t progress onwards to the highest and most entrenched level of need. We assess this group as being up 2.5% of the population of young people per year, or up to 3,360 young people across the region.

These young people are identified by the following risk factors:

- risk of entry into Out-of-Home Care (“concern reports”);

---

\(^{35}\) NSW DEC (2011) *Suspension & Expulsions 2011*.


\(^{37}\) Ibid.
• presentation of acute or long-term mental health issues;
• contact with criminal justice system (cautions etc.)38;
• risk of homelessness;
• family breakdown;
• disengaged/disengaging from education and/or employment.

As a more intensive level of service provision, these clients are likely to have more complex needs, and require a significantly higher level of resourcing (both in terms of worker time and number of services), and therefore a higher degree of communication between services. Some of the services that these clients may require:

• case management, to coordinate multi-agency responses and assist with navigating secondary services such as Centrelink, Health etc.;
• legal services;
• homelessness prevention or intervention services (including accommodation);
• high-intensity/long-term mental health services;
• disability services;
• medium-term education and/or employment support programs;
• access to those services provided to the above tiers, to facilitate effective pathways and transitions.

3.5.4 Population Group 4: “Life-long Need”, 0.5-1% of the population – Extreme

These young people are those who represent the highest level of need for the service system. Many of their issues are entrenched, and they likely present with complex behaviours, and high comorbidity. For young people in this group, the system has failed, and without effective, sustained and coordinated support they may never be able to participate fully in society.

There is anecdotal evidence that the cost of these young people to the state can exceed hundreds of thousands of dollars each year, with no evidenced positive outcomes.

These young people may be:

• at Risk of Significant Harm (ROSH);
• homeless;
• placed in Out-of-Home Care;
• in frequent contact with the justice system, in a juvenile detention facility, or on community supervision.

---

The services required by these young people need to be intensive, highly planned and coordinated, and sustained over a long period of time. Pathways from the youth sector to the adult service sector must be well-established to support the transition of their ongoing access to appropriate support. These clients may require a mix of:

- intensive, long-term and highly coordinated case management, to plan and coordinate multi-agency responses, including the provision of clinical services;
- care services;
- extensive family preservation or family reunification services (likely including family case management);
- legal services and representation;
- financial services;
- homelessness services, including medium to long term accommodation;
- high-intensity/long-term mental health services;
- disability services;
- long-term education and/or employment support programs;
- access to those services provided to the above tiers, to facilitate effective pathways and transitions.

As can be seen, an important aspect of appropriate client support is ensuring that clients have access to right kinds (both purpose and intensity) of services at the right times, for the right duration, and in the right ways (how they access the service). The level of service integration and coordination is an indicator of how well this is currently happening in the sector, and is the major focus of this report.

### 3.6 State of Integration and Client-Centredness across the FaCS Metro Central Region

In considering the current level of integration (reflecting client-centredness) present in the FaCS Metro Central region’s youth sector, we found it useful to look at behaviours that were in evidence to determine actual integration, rather than perceived integration. This was useful for two key reasons:

1) There is often a difference between individual definitions of terms such as “integration”, “collaboration” etc;
2) Actions speak louder than words – often culture is best observed for the relics or patterns not spoken about, rather than those that are.

As outlined in Section 2.2.3, Konrad\(^\text{39}\) proposes a framework for classifying integrative efforts along a continuum of engagement in integration, from low engagement to high engagement. This framework is applied to youth services in Metro Central in the figure below.

---

## Table 2: Levels of integration across the FaCS Metro Central Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration Level</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Major Initiatives/Examples Noted in FaCS Metro Central Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Information Sharing and Communication** | • Roles of collaborative partners are loosely defined;  
• Agencies begin sharing generic information;  
• Irregular contact between agencies. | • Most youth interagencies;  
• Community Supporting Youth Network;  
• Individual worker relationships. |
| **Cooperation and Coordination** | • Collaboration continues to be informal;  
• Agencies gain a better understanding of the functionality of collaborative relationships;  
• Common goal is established. | • Several youth interagencies (include regional planning, relationship-building etc);  
• Many examples of referrals between agencies;  
• Many examples of organisations delivering programs within other organisations (e.g. Youth Connections in schools);  
• Local issue-specific committees, such as Community Drug Action Teams (CDAT), Outreach Alliance etc. |
| **Collaboration** | • Agencies formalise collaboration within this step;  
• Responsibilities are shared while partners maintain their autonomy in the collaborative relationship. | • Adolescent Interagency Meeting (AIM);  
• Complex Case Coordination Panel;  
• Glebe Pathways Project;  
• Inner City Youth-At-Risk Project;  
• “Love Bites” program;  
• Youth Alliance. |
| **Consolidation** | • High level of information sharing and cross-program coordination/collaboration;  
• Partners begin contributing their independent agency’s resources to overall;  
• Potentially centralisation of functions (such as intakes, assessments) or resources. | • Headspace, Inner City;  
• Youthblock;  
• Some larger youth service providers with several/many funding streams. |
| **Integration** | • Agencies (or one integrated agency) operate collectively, are comprehensive in scope, tailor offerings individually, and are multipurpose;  
• Clients are treated as part of complex systems;  
• Management and accountability is clear and unified. | |

As can be seen, it was quite easy for respondents to identify initiatives that represented “great examples of integration” across the region. However, it can also be observed that most fell into the lower end of the integration continuum. Furthermore, the four initiatives that are listed under “collaboration” (the highest level achieved) were initiated by a government agency for a specific purpose (e.g. child protection, mental health access).

---

Using Waldfogel’s framework of micro, meso and macro level integration (see Section 2.2.5), it was noted that much of the emphasis of current collaborative/integrative behaviour was located at the micro (individual worker or program-by-program) level, and there seemed to be precious few examples of integration occurring higher than this within the youth sector. In some ways, this shows the willingness of workers to engage in collaborative practice, but it is also concerning that this will is not supported by the larger structures and culture of the youth sector.

The youth sector’s collaboration with other sectors (e.g. schools, specialist homelessness and child & family services) was also looked at. Generally, there was a strong desire expressed by services to work with schools, but most reported difficulties in either establishing or maintaining a positive, collaborative relationship with schools. There also seemed to be very little contact (formal or otherwise) between youth services and the child & family sector, which is likely affecting clients in transitioning successfully to support services. This indicates that clients are not being considered from a lifespan perspective (both by the youth and the child & family sectors), but instead as a discrete piece of service delivery independent of previous types of service contact. The value of this lifespan approach was articulated by one respondent, who said that “working in a family service has assisted me in understanding young people more, as most of my client’s families have worked with a family worker when they were younger. It gives you a really good perspective of how they were helped prior to coming to a youth service.”

As such, it could be said that the present state of integration for client outcomes across the youth sector, when compared against the vision laid out in Section 2, is quite poor. There is a willingness to engage in low-level integrative behaviours at the individual worker level, but few examples of higher-order integration, and little available evidence to prove conclusively that these initiatives are achieving client outcomes. Similarly, the youth sector’s partnerships with other sectors are extremely weak, and this may be affecting transitions and lifelong outcomes for clients.
This is a challenging section of the report to write. The issues that impact on effective service integration in the FaCS Metro Central region are so large (and often exert their influence from well outside of the region) that a list of short-term regional action items will only represent the first steps of a long and complex path towards true service integration. However, part of the scope of this report was to present several actions that could be implemented in the 2013-14 financial year to begin the work of deepening client-centred/integrative practice across the youth sector in the region.

As such, Section 4 presents analysis and recommendations in two orders. Both are tied together by applying Dan S. Cohen’s 8-step model of culture change to bring a tried-and-true structure to bear on the issues at hand, rather than simply recommending an unlinked list of actions. The first-order recommendations are presented as several small-ticket items that can be acted on within one year to strategically affect client-centred practice across the region. The second order takes the longer view, using Cohen’s steps to suggest future directions that may assist in sustaining and accelerating effective culture change efforts in the region. It thereby maps out the challenges that the sector faces in continuing to shift towards integration, and where possible indicates key points of influence around which future strategies can be developed.

As illustrated in Figure 6, Cohen breaks any culture change efforts up into 8 steps across 3 stages:

![Cohen's culture change process](image)

Figure 6: Cohen's culture change process

He outlines several rules that govern the use of the above steps in achieving successful culture change - all of the steps must happen, but their order is not necessarily linear, as change in an organisation or complex system is dynamic:
“Large-scale transformation is never that straightforward. The process of change is, by nature, dynamic. As a result, the change process might start in the middle, with creating a team or establishing a few short-term wins in order to boost urgency. Alternatively, it may be necessary for leaders to increase urgency (step 1) while also enabling action (step 5) and creating short-term wins (step 6) to energize the organization and create the climate for change.”

4.1 Where to Begin? Describing the Integrative Culture in the FaCS Metro Central Region

As described in Section 3.6, there is generally good evidence of micro level integration occurring across the region. Organisations (normally via individual workers) on the whole share information, and participate in some joint activities to service clients. There is also a firm understanding of the benefits of integration for clients, and almost all workers consulted could list several activities that they knew of that modelled “good integration”. Many of these examples included aspects of meso level integration, with Terms of Reference, memoranda of understanding, agreements, and other higher-level administrative supports in place.

Examples of collaborative practice frequently cited by workers included the Adolescent Interagency Meeting (AIM), which brings non-government agencies together to discuss complex cases, and assigns lead-agency responsibility to an agreed organisation, supported by the other organisations around the table. Similarly, the DEEWR-funded Partnership Brokers program facilitates cross-sectoral partnerships between organisations, and where possible encourages formalisation of the roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of the various partners in achieving outcomes for young people. Both Oasis and the Inner City Youth-At-Risk project were also listed by many participants as excellent models of collaboration that responded to targeted regional needs.

Despite these examples, the predominate levels of collaborative and integrative behaviours observed fall into the lower end of the continuum. Information sharing and loose, program-by-program cooperation represents only the first steps on a path towards systemic integration. By achieving this level, the sector is picking the “low hanging fruit” from the tree of integration; the challenge remains how we all continue moving towards subsequent, more sophisticated, and more effective levels, such as collaboration (independent agencies working together towards a common goal, often with partnership agreements etc in place), consolidation, and finally to complete integration.

To progress a structured discussion of deepening integration across the sector, the remainder of this report applies Cohen’s culture change model to present both short- and long-term steps that may assist in achieving a more sustainably integrated and effective system that produces exceptional outcomes for large numbers of clients.

The complexity of this task cannot be exaggerated. These shifts will have to occur within workers, teams and organisations, and across localities, regions, states, sectors and party lines. However, the potential gains to clients, government, and human service workers from a widespread culture shift are considerable.

The key message at this stage of a change effort is simple: your people have to come with you. Cohen explains it thus:

“Most (leaders) agree that the most common reason their initiatives failed was that they did not address the people-related challenges... why don’t they do something about it from the beginning of their transformation effort? The answer is simple—it takes a lot of time and energy. So instead, they focus on the aspects that are more tactical and expect people to get on board. You’ve probably heard a leader say something like, “This is the direction we are going, and you just need to accept it and move on.” Rarely does this approach result in lasting change.”

The approach he advocates is quite simple: create an environment that is accepting of change because; 1) everyone feels the need and the urgency; 2) because people at all levels are championing it; and, 3) because there is a clear, inspiring vision to rally behind.

From the consultations undertaken, a number of themes emerged to assist in the formulation of initiatives at each step of the following stages.

**4.2.1 Increase Urgency**

The importance of this step cannot be overstated:

“Creating a sense of urgency takes time and energy, and if the leader has already developed a concrete business case for the change, why bother? Our research and practice has shown us time and time again that while a concrete business case may be necessary, alone it is not enough to successfully change behavior; people first have to see and then feel the need to change. To change behavior, leaders need to know where any fear, anger, or complacency might have built up ... and these emotions must be addressed in the approach to change. If they are not, the change effort will be in jeopardy of not making it out of the gate, and certainly the urgency needed to sustain the change will not persist in the later stages of

---


43 A report by the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI) notes the importance of both top-down and bottom-up drivers in achieving service integration, indicating that this change process cannot only be a matter of policy and funding drivers.
the process. To jump ahead without the needed level of urgency is like trying to fly a plane without fuel. Do not make this mistake!  

The discussions with workers that inform this report demonstrated great will amongst services “on the ground” to achieve better outcomes for clients. There are several indicators of this:

a) The amount of “vertical integration" that occurs within organisations, or the degree to which they provide complementary services to their area of specialisation, often without funding allocated to do so;

b) The amount and degree of frustration at being told to do “more with less”. Many services argue that they are already doing as much as they can for their client loads, and this impedes their ability to build their capacity around integration (e.g. forming relationships, professional development);

c) The great energy for discussions around integration that occurred when networks and workers were consulted as part of the research process.

However, there was also a shared feeling that there were significant barriers that were standing in the way of effective integration. The most commonly cited barriers were a lack of time due to occasions of service required under funding agreements, a sense of competition with other services due to competitive tendering policies, lack of prior templates for collaboration, and a lack of organisational capacity to initiate or participate in higher-order collaborative efforts.

Indeed, Waldfogel articulates that there are several key characteristics of service systems that inhibit reform and culture change efforts:

a) Fiscal and caseload pressures;

b) High-level rhetoric of integration exceeding the willingness or ability of local services to deliver or participate;

c) Bureaucratic inertia (“if we just drag our heels, this latest reform will go away”);

d) Categorical funding that encourages agencies to draw a sharp line between those they will serve and those they will not;

e) The orientation and training of professionals that lead them to believe that clients are best served by individual specialists rather than generalists;

f) “Turfism” - historical rivalries, and mistrust among agencies that now must collaborate.

Acknowledging these and other normal hindrances to change is important in moving towards a culture and a system of integration. All of the above are normal, and the result of a complex culture that has developed over time, often in the face of endless change initiatives, changing political imperatives, and consistent political pressure.

These factors also have a strong impact on the ability and will of services to integrate within the FaCS Metro Central Region. In addition to the fiscal and caseload considerations mentioned, instances of the remaining behaviours were also witnessed during the consultation process to varying degrees, indicating that there may be

---


**45** Ibid.

substantial (but very normal) ground-level factors influencing the success of integration activities.

Some of the largest considerations in creating a “sense of urgency” to enable further progress towards effective integration seem to be:

a) Most youth services are already oriented to providing the largest client benefit possible with their resources;

b) Most organisations/services seem to strive for high levels of “vertical integration” (internally providing programs themselves if possible), and undertake some degree of micro level integration/cooperation to form referral pathways for specialised services that they can’t provide. Hence, creating a sense of urgency within services to undertake higher-level integration efforts (e.g. consortiums, MOU’s, sharing of funding, co-location, sharing of administration etc) should take priority;

c) Who communicates the urgency? It is an ethical imperative for most youth workers to work for the needs of their clients in a holistic fashion, and many seem to resist the idea that they are possibly “just doing child protection”. Added to this, there is not necessarily a high level of trust between FaCS and services, with services expressing concern about divergent priorities and values (child protection, for FaCS vs prevention and holistic programming, for the services). For any further integrative efforts to be successful in the youth sector, a sense of client-focused urgency must be created that includes the values of workers and the sector, rather than led as a top-down drive for legislated child protection. As the peak body tying these different organisations together, and as a potentially more trusted alternative to FaCS, Youth Action may be in a better position to lead this process locally and regionally.

Short-term recommendation 1: Youth Action as lead culture change agent for sector-wide integration initiatives

Youth Action to be the lead body in initiating and implementing sector-wide integration initiatives. This includes assembling the hierarchy of “guiding teams” that are recommended at various stages across this report, including a state-wide, “whole-of-sector”/government team and regional teams.

d) Who shares the urgency? One of the major expressions of frustration during consultations included systemic issues around information sharing, cooperation and collaboration involving state or federal services. As one worker said, “we can be told until the cows come home to work better together, but in the end you have massive departments that don’t share information internally, between themselves, or with us.” An example was given of the Complex Case Coordination Panel, which brings together executives from a range of government departments to coordinate responses to a small number of complex cases. It was reported that initially non-government organisations were excluded from these meetings due to confidentiality restrictions, although many of the clients were already in contact with, or known to other services. Similarly, many workers or organisations could quote instances of government departments not being allowed to participate in even basic collaborative activity due to internal policies or other restrictions. Without a sense of urgency from other organisations that work with young people, any change within the youth sector is doomed to fail, or achieve little at best.
Long-term recommendation 1: “Whole of Sector” Audit of integration-friendly policies and procedure

Via a “whole-of-sector” approach to young people (likely through a statewide guiding team), State and Federal Government Departments conduct an audit of internal policies and procedures that may be acting as barriers to effective service integration. Special attention should be paid to information sharing, data collection and confidentiality restrictions that may impact vital information reaching non-government services.

4.2.2 Build Guiding Teams

While ideally every organisation should be a guiding team for service integration, the immense fracturing of a service system for young people documented in this report indicates that there is no overall direction applied to the “sector”. Departments of Health (also covering mental health), Housing, Family and Community Services, Education and Communities, and Juvenile Justice all play significant roles. Add Australian government departments such as Human Services, Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, Sporting, Arts, and a large non-government sector, and this mix is even more complex. This complexity demonstrates the importance of guiding teams to participate in, monitor and drive integration across the multiple levels of the system are necessary.

Cohen explains that guiding teams are made up of cross-organisation staff who “actively champion the (change) effort and take the necessary action when the effort comes up against barriers. Effective guiding teams not only have the credibility to influence stakeholders at the grassroots level, but also to engage and guide the organization through the change itself. Without strong guiding teams, change initiatives seldom have the support, energy, speed, and sense of urgency needed to succeed.”

At present, there are several such teams operating at a local/semi-regional level through interagencies. However, they are not supported by any significant infrastructure above them - they are not coalesced by a vision, there is no sense of teamwork or communication between interagencies, and they do not have access to localised/regional data and other useful decision-making tools to coordinate service responses to local issues.

The other main area in which collaborative teams operate is case management. Because of the intensity of service provision required for complex clients, and the potential for overlap, several versions of case coordination panels exist to manage the roles of workers around particular clients. The Complex Case Coordination Panel, the Adolescent Interagency Meeting, and several other local varieties are all examples. Again, there is little overall structure or assistance provided to these groups, and they tend to sit in isolation of any other initiatives, thereby lacking the ability to drive cross-sector integration (e.g. with child & family services), and to coordinate any forward planning or proactive large-scale responses.

There are, furthermore, a small number of “connector” organisations or services that currently operate across the youth sector to add some level of coordination:

a) Partnership Brokers: Aim to facilitate formal partnerships between schools, community and business to improve “education and transition outcomes for all young people.” In some areas, these brokers add capacity to the facilitation of interagencies, and formalise partnerships between a diverse range of stakeholders to create sustainable partnerships to support young people (often in school or transitioning out);

b) Student Support Officers: A pilot program coordinated by the Department of Education and Communities “to give students and staff at … schools extra help to deal with complex social issues like bullying, transition to high school, coping skills, safe use of social media and student behaviour.” In effect, these positions are currently operating as in-school case managers and change agents for student wellbeing. They collect information from teachers and school staff, refer students out to appropriate community organisations, and coordinate external agencies coming into the school.

At present the Student Support Officer program is a pilot program, with only 5 schools across the region having access to these positions. Given their ability to identify students subject to a range of risks, and thereby enable and coordinate effective early interventions, these positions are a significant asset to ensuring the wellbeing of a large proportion of an areas young people. A meta-analysis of integration efforts around the world conducted by ARACY supports this:

“While collaborative programs led by health services are known to be effective for early years services, there are promising signs that schools can also be effective in leading collaborations… schools are near-universal services, and even families who have lost contact with the health system will have contact with schools.”

Short term recommendation 2: Roll-out of Student Support Officers

The Student Support Officer pilot positions be supported in their roll-out across the Region.

---

c) Medicare Locals: An Australian government program initiated in 2012, these local organisations work to coordinate, plan and integrate primary health services across regions.\(^{51}\) Interestingly, several Medicare Local workers are active or involved in youth interagencies across the region, informally providing a link between health services and the youth sector.

---

**Figure 8: “Connector” positions linking youth services to other sectors**

All of the above groups and organisations play a role in either coordinating or connecting youth service provision. However, there is a significant gap in the overall strategy of connection and integration at either the regional or state levels. For a culture of “working together” to permeate the youth sector, a hierarchy of guiding teams should be formed to support this practice. There are recommendations for several types of guiding teams throughout the remainder of this report. Particular attention should be paid to:

a) Establishing regional guiding teams, with the following roles:

- The collection of data across regions to ingrain a culture of client-centredness;
- Professional development of local workers to embed a “wide lens” view of clients, and facilitate relationships and connections between workers;
- Coordinating local planning and sector responses to local/regional needs.
- Supporting guiding teams at the local level to plan and effect further change efforts.

Members of these teams should demonstrate the following traits: tolerance of ambiguity, flexibility and adaptability, enthusiasm and motivation, political awareness and sensitivity, a helicopter view, commitment to continuous learning, purposefulness and persistence, conflict resolution, ability to network, and finally communication skills.\(^{52}\)

---

\(^{52}\) Dunphey, Griffiths and Benn (2007), Dovers (cited in Benn, Dunphey and Griffiths 2006) and Jenkins (cited in Benn, Dunphey and Griffiths 2006).
Short term recommendation 3: Establishment of a pilot regional “guiding team”

Youth Action and FaCS pilot the establishment of a regional “guiding team” with the aim of increasing client outcomes through integrative practice, fulfilling the above roles.\(^{53}\)

b) Establishing a state-wide guiding team: Linking to Section 4.2.3 (below), there is the need for a single uniting vision for young people, and the continuum of services that ensure their care and support. This vision will need to be articulated by a high-level guiding team, and supported by this team modelling and leading integrative efforts. This initiative also links strongly to a “whole-of-sector” approach to young people.

Long term recommendation 2: Establishment of a “whole of sector” guiding team

Formation of a state-wide “guiding team” taking a “whole of sector” (including government) approach to drive long-term, structural change initiatives.

4.2.3 Get the Vision Right

The research for this report strongly suggests a distinct lack of an inspiring, uniting vision for the youth sector. This is most likely an effect of the large range of organisations and departments (each with their own vision and professional identity) that are responsible for service delivery.

It is very clear that the service landscape in the FaCS Metro Central Region is populated by a range of organisations working in a diverse range of sectors. The challenge of this diversity is that it encourages the individual streaming of services into ‘siloes’. For example, the State Plan, *NSW 2021*, outlines several goals which relate to young people:

“Goal 13: Better protect the most vulnerable members of our community and break the cycle of disadvantage;
Goal 15: Improve education and learning outcomes for all students;
Goal 17: Prevent and reduce the level of re–offending.”\(^{54}\)

Other areas of the Plan that specifically target young people include Mental Health, preventable hospitalisations and obesity.

Within the plan, each goal is delegated to a different Minister, and therefore to a different lead agency. Hence:

- schools working in disadvantaged communities will implement initiatives to keep their cohorts engaged with school and have them achieve their HSC, believing that this is the “best” outcome for young people;

---

\(^{53}\) It is important to note that current Child & Family Collaborative Practice Management Groups across South Eastern Sydney, the Inner West and Northern Sydney include young people in their vision. However, in their domain of operation is strictly linked to the Child and Family sector. It may be possible to include the youth sector in the existing change agenda of these groups.

health teams will try to keep the same young people from being overweight or undertaking activities that lead to hospitalisations, such as risky drinking or smoking, believing that these are the “best” outcomes for young people;

• Community Services workers will try to ensure that as a child they have received a high quality early education, or intervene to ensure that the young person doesn’t need to be removed from their parent’s care or become homeless, believing that these are the “best” outcomes for young people;

• Police will undertake crime prevention activities locally, or have juvenile offenders cautioned, charged, or potentially admitted to a detention facility, believing that these are the “best” outcomes for young people;

• Juvenile Justice will implement initiatives to lower re-offending rates of young people with convictions, believing that these are the “best” outcomes for young people.

Add to these outcomes those of Australian Government agencies (such as Centrelink, Medicare, student support etc.) and there are even more agencies working for even more visions of what is the “best” outcome for a young client.

One of the learnings proposed by authors evaluating the Toronto First Duty early childhood program was that:

“Separate funding, governance, and legislative structures for education, child care, and other family and children’s services make it difficult to integrate people and programs at the local level. Different employers, staffing requirements, regulations, and funding structures become obstacles. Sustainable change requires an overhaul of legislative requirements, professional education, funding mechanisms and governance structures from the ministry through to the program management.”

An inconsistent vision for young people means that services will naturally work in isolation in achieving their unique objectives. This is most obviously seen in the notable challenges that youth services currently face in working with schools. For teachers, the prevailing view is that educating their students is “core business”, whilst evaluating and working for their overall wellbeing is a second-tier responsibility. Hence, when youth services approach schools to “assist” with students, there is a natural systemic barrier to this partnership beginning – teachers would rightly ask “why would I make working with a youth service a priority?”

Similarly, a lack of clarity or shared outcomes seems to produce a large gap between the youth sector and the child and family sector. There is very little evidence of communication and information sharing between the two sectors, except where a youth worker was embedded in a family support service, or a large organisation that conducted youth service provision also had an arm that coordinated family service provision. Without a lifespan perspective including shared outcomes, clients accessing a service for a period of time are often left to fend for themselves until they have some reason to appear on the radar of another sector (often as risk increases, such as when in contact with police, at risk of homelessness etc.).

This specialisation of outcomes also manifests itself interestingly between funding bodies and youth services. As established in Section 3, most youth services receive multiple funding streams from a range of funding bodies, each of which contributes to the organisation’s ability to operate as one entity, rather than as a suite of separate

programs. However, each organisation also has its own mission, values, and models of working, and most see themselves as providing a holistic suite of services – all of which can present a tension with the requirements of multiple streams of funding (and by default tension with funding bodies, outcomes, data collection etc). A move towards being “contract managed” in the provision of discrete child protection services (such as case management or Adolescent Family Counselling) seems to rub against the culture of many youth services. This maintenance of a single organisational mission was an underlying theme expressed by many youth services during the consultations. Each articulated the value of their “suite-based” approach for engaging with sizable numbers of marginalised young people, which enabled:

1) early detection and intervention in a range of issues that may be emerging for individual young people, including families and siblings of clients;

2) trusting and respectful relationships which could be built upon when case managing/supporting marginalised young people, producing higher efficiency of outcomes;

In summary, it seems clear that youth services feel pulled in many directions by the different outcomes of the programs they are often funded by. This is compounded by the “compartmentalising” of a whole child/young person into a range of issues and outcomes covered by different programs, agencies and sectors. If a cultural change is to be made towards holistic practice, at some stage a conversation will have to be initiated that synchronises outcomes across these many groups, under which a comprehensive assessment of a young person is undertaken, and agencies (or one full-service agency) work in a coordinated fashion to address the client’s many needs. The Australian Research Alliance for Children and Young People (ARACY) has proposed a Common Approach to Assessment, Referral and Support (CAARS). The approach “can help to identify and verify early signs that a child or family needs support; think holistically about the strengths and needs of the child and family; and, provide or link the child and family with the support they need before problems escalate into crises.”56 The approach and assessment diagram is shown below.

---

Figure 8: The CAARS Model developed by ARACY\textsuperscript{57}

Until there is a shared approach to young people, and a shared vision that is articulated with leadership and passion, practitioners will likely continue to find systemic barriers to collaboration and integration for client outcomes, and therefore continue to participate in, or reinforce, a culture of separation and diffusion.

As part of this Wide Lens project, Peter Slattery is developing a holistic assessment tool for use by the NSW youth sector. There is value in encouraging youth services to implement this “Wide Lens” holistic assessment, support and referral framework, through training and ongoing support. This training should be sure to include school wellbeing contacts, who have access to the universal collection of young people that schools provide. To be specific, the training should also be open to DEC’s Student Support Officers, Chaplains and Student Welfare Officers under the DEEWR program, principals, and Head Teacher – Welfare positions.

Short term recommendation 4: Effectively roll-out the “Wide-lens” holistic assessment framework

Roll-out the “Wide Lens” holistic assessment framework for youth services (including youth homelessness, health and mental health services) and school wellbeing contacts.

To assist with adoption of the “Wide Lens” framework, a pilot site should be chosen where a number of tools and initiatives are specifically developed to incorporate “Wide Lens” approaches and processes into worker, agency and interagency practice. In order to assess the effect of this framework on integrative practice and client outcomes, evaluation of the project should be undertaken to collect data on the success of:

a)ability to increase integrative efforts, as measured by:

i. accessibility of services, or the logistics of access, such as opening times, client satisfaction;

ii. seamlessness of services, including clear designation of roles and responsibilities, clarity in shared policy and process (such as shared paperwork, information exchange);

iii. integration of services, including the ability of workers to detect future needs; and,

iv. the tailoring of services, including flexibility of response.

b)ability to increase client outcomes across the spectrum of needs, from prevention through to complex case management, as measured by:

i. an increase in the number of agencies per client that provide specialised support to a young person in crisis (indicating a more holistic response);

ii. the efficiency of outcomes, i.e. the average term of case management under the system (a more holistic service through its comprehensiveness should ideally reduce the time taken in intensive services);

iii. an increase in the average number of factors identified and supports/interventions put in place in agreement with the young person (indicating a more holistic assessment and service provision);

iv. an increase in the number of medium to low-risk clients who have needs identified and supports enacted (showing that a more comprehensive assessment is providing a preventative function).

Short term recommendation 5: Pilot an evaluation of “Wide Lens” framework in practice

A pilot site be established to integrate the “Wide Lens” framework into worker, agency and interagency practice. This pilot should be externally evaluated to establish the ongoing roll-out of the framework.

In the longer term, the interface between youth and child & family workers should also be considered. As part of the holistic assessment of the “wide lens” framework, relationships and resultant referral pathways between these sectors will become increasingly important as both sectors take increasing responsibility for each other’s

---

clients. As a result, there will be significant value in ensuring that the “wide lens” framework is shared between these two sectors for ease of information collection and sharing and referral.

Long term recommendation 3: Sharing a “lifespan” view of client needs

The child & family sector to adopt the “wide lens” framework (or an alternative shared framework developed/adopted) to assist with effective sector interfacing and client collaboration.

4.3 The Change Process – Applying Stage 2 – Engaging and Enabling the Whole Sector

Once a climate for change has been established – there is a sense of urgency, an inspiring, cohesive vision, and passionate people capable of and committed to driving it, the next step is ensuring that the rest of the sector will come along for the ride.

Although this sounds simple, the complexities of managing emotions, resistance, habits and competing priorities of stakeholders all play a significant role. Cohen states:

“A common misconception in … transformation is that training will be enough to ready employees for their job changes. While training does help prepare individuals for the technical aspects of their jobs, it often does not encompass everything needed to sustain long-term success. When individuals begin training without any understanding of the changes and their specific impacts, they spend much of their time coming to grips with how their job is changing and how they will be affected. When resistance, in the form of fear, anger, or complacency, is in the way, true learning cannot occur.”

The added complication of undertaking sector transformation means that the change message (and associated action) has to be owned not just by employees, but by whole organisations that will then flow this through to internal practices. However, the steps remain the same:

- communicate to get stakeholder buy-in (both organisations and staff);
- enable action of stakeholders; and
- create short-term wins.

4.3.1 Communicate for Buy-In

Once the right vision has been found, it is meaningless if it is does not reach stakeholders to enable thought, critique, challenge, possibilities or action. The message needs to be consistent, positive and clear: “where are we going, how are we getting there, and what is your role in the process?”

The size, structure and fragmentation of the youth sector create obvious challenges for this step of a culture change process:

1) Which parts of the youth sector? Given the diverse number and responsibilities of organisations that service young people’s needs, communicating en-masse with all organisations is almost impossible. Communication will have to occur at the guiding teams level, and be sustained and engaging across multiple levels of government, sectors and organisations;

2) Accountability? Any buy-in around a large-scale vision for young people will require shifts in funding, programs, and structures. Again, the diverse interests of the sector make this a very challenging notion;

3) How do we know that buy-in has occurred? The extreme lack of available data across the sector means that even if integrated practice was happening extremely well, it would be almost impossible to know as things currently stand.

Any approach to buy-in will have to be personal, sustained, and multi-faceted. Success will mean that every organisational leader buys in to the process, and both within and without of their organisation act as change agents to place the client at the centre of all decisions.

This step, despite its difficulty, is one of the major enablers in any transformation process. Only once all stakeholders have effectively bought in to the larger vision will truly integrative behaviours become possible: only once the client is the sole interest do amalgamations and the sharing of funds and staff, key resources, information systems and data become possible. Until funding bodies buy in to client-centred approaches to coordinate and synchronise expected outcomes, expectations of services will remain fragmented, leading the way for fragmentary behaviours and approaches.

This approach to communication for buy-in will best be led by independent guiding teams across the micro, meso and macro levels – no other organisation or department will have the jurisdiction, authority or personal reach to claim a holistic vision for young people and drive this process.

Long term recommendation 4: Coordination of guiding teams to communicate for sector buy-in

Guiding teams across local, regional and state levels coordinate communication processes and messages to ensure buy-in of stakeholders, services and funding bodies.

4.3.2 Enable Action

This is the stage at which (hopefully) there is a swell of momentum and enthusiasm across the sector as individuals, groups and organisations discuss, own and innovate around integration. But they can only do this if they are enabled and rewarded for this effort.
The purpose of this step is to “enable a broad base of people to take action by removing as many barriers to the implementation of the change vision as possible.” This includes what Cohen calls “busting barriers”, and encouraging those involved to be innovative and take risks. There are three main areas in which he identifies that barriers often need to be “busted”, and each deserves attention when looking at “enabling” in the youth sector. They include:

a) organisational structure;
b) lack of skills; and,
c) organisational systems.61

a) Organisational Structure:

As outlined at several points throughout this report, the youth sector is a very diverse and loosely connected group of organisations that provide a range of services to young people. If it was thought of as one organisation, it would be an extremely decentralised, localised grouping of franchises, each operating largely independently of each other, with some informal communication and sharing between some of its parts. In some aspects of its operation it is has long accountability structures and chains of management (such as when an organisation is responsible for child protection or when a program is part of a large organisation), and in other aspects is nearly flat, with little accountability or management (such as when it receives a small grant, or has funds to run its own program).

The often loose ties and lack of coordination between organisations means that there are significant systemic inefficiencies, and a lack of either information systems or formalised mechanisms for sharing of information means that units operate largely independently of each other.

In short, as a sector, there is very little “structure” to speak of.

The obvious result of this lack of structure is that there are enormous duplications across the sector in organisational administration. For example, without a body driving local or regional planning, every organisation operating in this area will undertake their own needs assessment and planning processes. Similarly, human resources systems, information systems, premises and other infrastructure, management, processes and knowledge are duplicated many times over within a local area, resulting in significant inefficiencies that produce no greater outcomes for clients.

However, the body that funds the largest number of projects and programs across the sector (or at least those consulted for this project) is the NSW Government. To reach young people, this significant resource allocation is funnelled through several service systems, including Family and Community Services, NSW Health, the Department of Education and Communities, and the Department of Juvenile Justice. With a planned, top-down, whole-of-sector approach to the wellbeing of young people, and a bottom-up culture shift towards integrative practice across the child, youth and family sectors, many of these inefficiencies could be thoroughly addressed.

Viewing young people’s needs as a preventative continuum (such as laid out in the “Need Curve” in Section 3.5) rather than as discrete fixed funding categories opens up a range of possibilities. Reviewing the structure of services provided to young people to encourage integrative approaches is a necessity if consistent and exceptional outcomes across the service system are to be realised. As a preventative model (i.e.

61 Ibid.
focused on avoiding more intensive models of service provision), this system will need to be linked to impacts on population-level data rather than instances of service provision. This therefore necessitates the widespread adoption of robust data collection across young people to gauge effects of prevention initiatives.

**Long term recommendation 5: Flexibility of achieving outcomes**

A statewide “guiding team” to assess the viability of restructuring youth service funding around a preventative continuum of holistic needs, rather than discrete streams targeting specific issues. This may take in ideas such as Payment-By-Results, social bonds etc, which allow services to design programming, as long as it can demonstrate effectiveness in meeting client needs.

**Long term recommendation 6: Measuring the impact of the service continuum**

Youth Action to lead a process aimed at establishing a system of common preventative indicators to assess the impact of youth services across population groups and regions.

Finally, when discussing organisational structure, there is one salient point regarding organisational structures at the service level that is likely to be a barrier to any change initiatives or processes. It was also raised consistently by participants in the consultations. There was a clear message that current organisational structures under these piecemeal funding arrangements are under pressure, largely due to a lack of financial support for management and organisational capacity. Due to the number of contracts (and the associated applications, data collection and reporting requirements) that make up the funding of services across the region, organisations have reported that they have almost no capacity to improve or manage their practices. As stated by the Productivity Commission:

“Governments often adopt a partial funding model for a range of services, even for contracts that are deemed to be purchase agreements. This requires (Not For Profits) to subsidise service costs from other revenue sources. A significant consequence, especially for community services, has been that wages have been squeezed to the point where many NFPs find it difficult to attract or retain professional staff, with implications for the quality of services.

Contracts requiring the return of any surplus mean little funding is available for investment to improve effectiveness or efficiency, such as in information technology. In addition, governments have moved away from making grants for capital, contributing only about 7.6 per cent of the funding for new capital expenditure in 2006-07. This presents problems for NFPs, many of which find it difficult to access finance, or to build a surplus to fund investment.”

The second implication of this partial funding approach is that one of the “service costs” to be subsidised by the organisation itself is its senior management. The natural result of this situation for any cultural shift towards client-centred models is that:

- organisational management does not have the capacity to participate in, support or drive change initiatives within their organisations;

---

organisational management cannot instigate or participate in processes (e.g. partnerships, collaborations) outside of their organisation; and,

due to financial pressures, managers with lower skills are employed, which again affects the capacity of the organisation to innovate, respond flexibly, and meet changing expectations.

Therefore, the message is clear: if client-centred practice is to become a major cornerstone of the youth sector, significant thought must be given to how to best fund capacity for innovation, professional development and leadership within youth organisations to shift to more complex, innovative modes of client-centrism.

Long term recommendation 7: Strategy for increasing (and funding) strong leaders

FaCS, Youth Action and funding bodies to develop a plan for increasing leadership capacity across youth services. This would likely include a mix of supervision, training, mentoring and business partnerships.

b) Skills:

Any environmental change requires changes within organisations in order to meet the demands of these new conditions. This means that naturally the skills required of workers within the organisation or sector are likely to change as old practices are replaced by new ones.

One of the largest challenges of a holistic approach to young people is the "wide lens" required by workers to make the system truly effective. Workers must be able to assess multiple (often complex) needs appropriately and accurately, and then work flexibly across multiple domains to create positive outcomes for the client. When appropriate, they also need to be able to refer to others who can help, and ensure that these others have access to the right information, and that they pass relevant information back.

In the current youth work context, workers are increasingly being expected to play an initial transformative role in the family environments directly affecting young people, usually with the aim of preserving their home as a protective factor rather than a source of conflict and distress. During the consultations, services fed back that while many of the skills of rapport building, negotiation, needs analysis, case management and referrals are the same, the challenges of building trust and achieving outcomes with complex and vulnerable families are significant. Added to this, there has traditionally been very little interface between the youth sector and the child and family sector, and as such many workers find it difficult to refer families to appropriate services, or to call in experts from family services when required.

Short term recommendation 6: Facilitate relationship-building between child and family and youth sectors

Increase opportunities for interface/relationship-building between child and family and youth sectors. This should take several forms:

- Shared meetings of youth and child and family interagencies;
- Development of an information system that enables efficient and effective referral between youth and child and family organisations;
- Cross-sector relationship building initiatives, such as mentoring programs, worker exchange, networking events.
Short term recommendation 7: Family-centred practice for youth workers

As part of the roll-out of the “Wide Lens” framework, implement a training program for youth sector workers in assessing and responding to the needs of families/family-centred practice.

In the longer term, there will also be value in aligning national training packages and other relevant qualifications to the skill set required to operate in a well-integrated sector.

Of special note, the training, support and enabling of service managers to navigate, negotiate and innovate within an increasingly integrated service environment will be a long-term priority. For the sustainability of system change, it is essential that the capacity of leaders within the sector is being grown to continue to propel the sector forward. This means that managers need to not only have the skills to successfully steer their own organisation, but also to participate in higher levels of client-centred collaboration and integration (such as regional guiding teams, mentoring of new managers etc.).

c) Systems

Given the high level of local variation within the youth sector, we suggest that systems to support integration present some of the largest opportunities to increase efficiency and enable integrative practice. This is because “specific … systems and processes, such as compensation, performance, management, training, talent management, and so on, often perpetuate behaviours that hamper the progress of change.”

The first point to note in relation to integrative systems is that while models of reward and compensation cannot be the driver of culture change, they can often stand in the way of change efforts. One of the 5 “laws” of integration suggested by Leutz is that “integration costs before it pays.” Similarly, Valentine, Katz and Griffiths note that “a common feature of many of the more successful attempts at service integration therefore involve new programs which provide increased funding as an incentive for agencies to work together. ‘Joining up’ in the context of funding reductions is far more challenging.”

To initiate new cross-organisational initiatives, and address systemic issues within particular regions, regional guiding teams should have the ability to allocate discretionary funding which can be directed into strategic integration initiatives, to enable the creation of local capacity to realise collaborative goals.

Short term recommendation 8: Allocate regional guiding team discretionary funding

The pilot regional guiding team be allocated an amount of discretionary funding to realign systems in the area and address systemic boundaries to integration, and enable organisational action.

A second major systemic issue within the sector relates to information flow across several levels. Currently, youth interagencies are assets that are highly valued by the sector and funding bodies for stimulating integrative behaviours, such as communication between organisations, positive relationships between workers, and

---

joint planning and responses to local needs. There are currently 12 general youth interagencies across the region. In attending a majority of these youth interagencies, some key similarities across the interagencies were:

a) Similarity of structure: Most were coordinated by one or more local government representatives, supported to some extent by other members of the network;

b) The prominence of information sharing: When asked, the key benefit that most drew attendees to the interagencies was to share and receive information relating to programs and activities;

c) The turn-over of staff: When asked, between 50% and 75% of attendees had not been in their position a year previously;

d) They were all wrestling with similar issues: Including the role of the leader/convenor, how best to produce accessible and timely information, the level of commitment to collaborative projects, communication issues, group membership etc;

Interagencies differed significantly in the frequency of their meetings, numbers in attendance, location of meetings, sector stakeholders in attendance (schools, guest speakers, libraries, shopping centres etc), level of engagement of attendees, items and areas covered by the agenda (from coordinating joint responses to issues, to stimulating meaningful relationships between workers).

A key characteristic of integrated service systems is the extent to which they can respond quickly and flexibly to the needs of clients. This infers that workers in an integrated system have access to networks that can meet many types of client needs (including for the families of clients). At present, interagencies seem to be the major mechanism for the maintenance of worker’s response networks. However, as a mechanism fulfilling this role, interagencies seem hamstrung by several trends:

a) Frequency of meetings: Feedback from case workers and other crisis response staff was that, “when we need information, we need information”. The frequency of meetings meant that it could be between one and three months between interagencies. In this way, interagency meeting do not fulfil the need for flexible and real-time access to information required by many workers;

b) Operating in a constant state of change: As mentioned, the constant changing of workers and organisations in the area means that information provided at these networks is often out of date extremely quickly. Feedback was that attempts to systematise access to information (through service directories etc) were also hampered almost immediately by this trend;

c) Not everyone attends: Feedback from many workers (particularly specialised or clinical staff) was that they could not always make a priority of leaving “client-facing” work to attend interagencies to maintain their contacts. The impact of non-attendance at interagencies is that:

i) the worker that doesn’t attend isn’t up to date with changes in the local sector;

ii) everyone who does attend isn’t aware of the role of the worker that is missing.

For these reasons, interagencies seem to be an inefficient way to resource information flow in an integrated system. Access to information on programs and workers needs to be immediate, easy to access, and up-to-date to enable smooth referral processes. This system should be underpinned by worker’s individual relationships and networks, which make referral processes more efficient, but as a minimum, each worker in the
system should at least know who to refer to, or have access to efficient networks that can direct them to appropriate referrals.

While the frequency of interagency meetings varies across the region, the duplication of information sharing functions across interagencies is significant. If all of the “information sharing” that was conducted across child, youth and family interagencies in the region was tallied each month, I am sure that it would reach hundreds of hours of worker time. Similarly, substantial funds and worker time are poured into keeping a multiplicity of localised service directories (either online or in hard copy) up to date for the purpose of referrals and collaborations. A systemic approach to information management across the child, youth and family sectors would enable gains in capacity through the efficiency and effectiveness of information sharing.

There appear to be two salient opportunities to address this need.

The first opportunity is to use the existing infrastructure of HSNet. This online system is coordinated by Family and Community Services to facilitate communication and referrals across the human services system. During the consultations, end-user critiques of the HSNet system were significant; including issues with logging in, keeping information up-to-date, and overall ease of use. However, we suggest that HSNet is the most cost-effective way to meet the needs of the sector around referral information and pathways, as it will be more cost-effective to perfect an existing system than create an entirely new one. Changes that would need to be made to enable its use widely across the youth sector include:

a) Improvements to the functionality and appearance of the system/interface;

b) Assisting with the update of information. Feedback from the creators of several online directories and interagency convenors indicates that many services will not prioritise, or do not have the capacity to manage, the continuous updating of their service information. I suggest that funding several “information officers” who are responsible for ongoing population of the database would benefit the usefulness of the system significantly, and redistribute a large number of decentralised costs from organisations, and centralise the cost to FaCS.

Short term recommendation 9: Improvements to HSNet

**FaCS to undertake an overhaul of HSNet to improve usability and adoption by organisations. In funding the system, there is likely also value in investing in several “information officers” to form relationships across the sector and populate service information on a regular basis.**

The second opportunity to address this informational need currently being duplicated across many networks is the new Family Referral Service (FRS). Although still in its early stages of implementation, the FRS (coordinated by Barnardo’s in the FaCS Metro Central Region) is currently undertaking an extensive scoping and information gathering exercise to support the effective intake and referral of children and families to organisations that can provide necessary services. The FRS will collect and collate information on available services and programs, and provide a telephone intake and referral service to assist both clients and services in accessing relevant information or organisations. The FRS also has a short-term case management function if an appropriate case manager cannot be found.

Given the extensive scope of the data collection required to effectively manage referrals across the region, it seems possible that the FRS may represent a useful way to maintain an active database of program and service information. There are then two options for how this information could be shared with other organisations:
1) Through the existing telephone service;

2) Through an online database of the information collected by Barnardo’s.

Using the FRS as a source of publicly available program data would be an extension of the current contract, and developing a second system would present this as a higher cost than using the existing HSNet. There may also be ongoing propriety issues around information gathered and maintained in a database.

Alternate short term recommendation 9: Family Referral Service program database

The Family Referral Service to use existing data collection practices (currently being developed) to populate and maintain an accessible database of up-to-date service information.

Alternate short term recommendation 9: HSNet and the FRS working together

FaCS and the FRS may be able to work together to collect joint information that populates HSNet, representing a collaborative effort to deliver access to information collected by one organisation in an existing system created (and improved) by FaCS.

Several longer-term areas of interest for considering “enabling” information systems include:

1) Data management and access: Services reported that they submit significant amounts of data to various funding bodies, but this data is rarely (if ever) available in assisting them to make decisions or inform their work with clients. Similarly, integrating data collection across programs, departments and organisations (so that there is a complete regional picture of services available, numbers of clients worked with, outcomes achieved, population and service trends etc) would likely produce a more efficient, focused and responsive service system;

2) Client information: Whilst issues around privacy, confidentiality and inter-sector information sharing currently inhibit much of this practice, enabling client information to be stored centrally and accessed by authorised organisations would greatly assist in a lifespan approach to service provision. In this, it should be noted that a major drawback of the use of HSNet is its ownership by FaCS, and therefore its natural association with child protection. A suggested long-term measure is the development of a system for providing collaborative client information for families, children and young people that are not yet in contact with the child protection system. This system could be managed between FaMS and Youth Action, and if well-executed could enable a significant amount of good quality and efficient information sharing.

Long term recommendation 8: System for sharing client information

Develop a system to support automatic collection and sharing of client information across the spectrum of child, youth and family services. Special consideration should be given to how this links to child protection, justice, health, and other existing client systems.

The final system that will need to be addressed before the sector can reach the vision for the integrated, client-focused system outlined in Section 1 is the system by which
the workers in the sector are managed, resourced and cultivated – systems around leadership, performance, recruitment, retention and remuneration. Improving this system – how “good” people are attracted, kept, supported and enabled, is key to sustaining an effective youth service system into the future.

The Productivity Commission outlines that “demand for staff with higher level qualifications is expected to continue growing as clients present with more complex needs and community expectations of standards of care rise.” This was reinforced by several service managers, who stated that to handle the increasing complexities of their clients, they preferred to hire staff with social work or psychology degrees, or an equivalent level of higher education. They also reported that paying enough to attract these skilled workers was hard, if not impossible.

As youth services shift more into the realm of child protection, and the increasingly complex clients that this involves, it is reasonable to expect that services would need to be more integrated to achieve significant outcomes for clients. However, it seems that differences in the perception of case management between services and funding bodies is actually contributing to lower levels of collaboration, and therefore potentially poorer outcomes for clients. As outlined by one service manager:

“NGOs, youth services aren’t just hip guys running around with kids shooting hoops any more, we employ social workers, we are good at this work but we’re not resourced to do it, because we’ve gotta get 396 occasions of service under EIPP. If you want us to do cases like this – dramatically lower our target level or just give us more money to increase our capacity!”

Similarly, many workers explained during the consultations that they felt a constant pressure to “take new clients” to meet their service specifications, whilst trying to balance the increasingly high needs of their current clients. They felt that the timelines for the achievement of outcomes were not reasonable, and that case loads were not conducive to quality service provision for clients.

Following on from this, when consulting with interagencies about barriers they face in working collaboratively, by far the most common theme was around capacity, time, funding and support for forming relationships. Many workers stated that their case loads or “day-to-day” tasks prevented them from undertaking anything more than basic information sharing, or their part-time status meant that they couldn’t attend interagencies or case conferences. Service managers were similarly frustrated, saying that piecemeal funding for their organisations meant that they were too operationally involved in the organisation (writing funding applications, compiling reports, filling in gaps in programs) to give significant time to strategic relationships, planning, supervision etc.

This feedback opens up two equally interesting possibilities:

1) That case managers see collaborative efforts not as their “core” business – this is strictly client work; or,

2) That restricted, contract-based funding coupled with high expectations of case management figures is actually decreasing collaboration, rather than increasing it.

In either of these instances, long-term attention will have to be paid to how to enable organisations and workers in the sector to effectively balance client-facing work, administrative and support functions (including relationship-building), and internal organisational development (such as strategic planning, supervision, evaluation,

---

performance, continuous improvement, innovation etc). By shifting to contract-based purchasing, funding systems are stripping organisations of their ability to recruit and retain high-quality talent, and also their ability to continuously engage in improvement of their service delivery (both efficiency and effectiveness).

Internationally, this pressure has required funding bodies and NGO’s to work collaboratively to cost out various forms of service provision. In the UK, this produced a Full Cost Recovery (FCR) model which enabled NGO’s to transparently and accurately account for the direct costs of service provision, and the indirect or overhead costs to the organisation in supplying the activity. The FCR model acknowledges that,

"Historically, overhead costs have sometimes been considered negatively and separate from project costs. The result has been the adoption of a number of detrimental funding practices such as an add-on guesstimate percentage to project costs, or marginal cost funding where only the additional costs of running a project or service are funded." 67

As mentioned previously, this lack of accounting for organisational overheads also has a significant impact on leadership and management systems. The impact of exceptional leadership and management under challenging conditions cannot be overstated. However, the extensive turnover of staff experienced in the sector, and the poor relative pay of the sector when compared to other sectors makes retaining great managers extremely challenging. Furthermore, opportunities for leadership development equivalent to those provided in the private sector are scarce, if not almost entirely non-existent. As articulated by the Productivity Commission, “management in the NFP sector is often made up of service delivery employees looking for career advancement who may not necessarily have sufficient management skills.”67 In particular, when thinking about removing barriers to enabling change, inexperienced or under-equipped management and leadership staff may be resistant to change efforts, and/or unable to transition their organisations successfully into new and more complex service environments.

Long term recommendation 9: Full Cost Recovery Benchmarking

FaCS, Health and other funding bodies (likely initiated by state-wide guiding team) to undertake a collaborative process of Full Cost Recovery benchmarking to determine the real overhead costs of leadership, administration and infrastructure required to achieve effective client outcomes.

Overall, the impact of fiscal challenges on organisations is having a significantly detrimental effect on the culture of the sector. The pressures these impacts have are summarised by the Productivity Commission as,

"Underfunding is seen as having a range of effects on the efficiency and effectiveness of the sector — on the reach of services and their quality, on access to services in rural and remote areas, and on the scope for services to innovate. Other suggested effects include inadequate provision of resources for design, evaluation and organisational management; reduced quantity of service provided, and restricted ability for providers to respond to the changed support needs of clients and communities; reduced ability to raise capital; reduced ability to recruit and retain staff with the required; the

---

This list of decreased outcomes is unintentionally producing a culture of frustration, pressure, victimisation, blame, competition, distrust and reactivity. This culture is producing many of the key characteristics of the sector that we often see: a service orientation, worker and organisational isolation, low collaboration, high competition, and a lack of performance culture.

We have not given a great deal of attention to the last three steps in Cohen’s culture change process. They are mainly steps to follow-up, reinforce and sustain the changes that are made as part of a culture change, and are most usefully covered at a point in time when a comprehensive, long-term culture change strategy has been formulated and is underway.

### 4.3.3 Create Short-Term Wins

During any change process, the small steps to realising the larger vision need to be noticed, acknowledged and celebrated.

> “In successful change efforts, empowered people create short-term wins—victories that nourish faith in the change effort, emotionally reward the hard workers, keep the critics at bay, and build momentum. Without sufficient wins that are visible, timely, unambiguous, and meaningful to others, change efforts inevitably run into serious problems.”

This means having a plan for communicating these wins, and ways to involve organisations and individuals in the “celebrating” process. This helps to maintain momentum and enthusiasm, and shows that the investment in change is paying off.

A major challenge is that in the change planning process thought needs to be given to evidence that would show that the initiative is having an impact – what are the Key Performance Indicators that should be changing, what should be different along the way?

Trying to collect “wins” also allows guiding teams to test whether the change initiative is working during the process, not just at the end. It gives the ability to refine the process, re-visit steps, and make alterations in real time.

One of the real challenges for any change process towards collaboration and integration in the youth sector is defining a scope for success. Establishing agreements, forming task groups or coalitions, defining working relationships etc. are all steps towards providing better client outcomes.

In our opinion, the “story” of client outcomes is told far too infrequently in the sector. We suggest that any “wins” (or, for that matter, any current “losses”) should be at the client level, not at the agencies-working-together level. It is not enough that we rely on workers to tell us whether their work with clients has been effective. With sustained story-telling around improved client outcomes from collaborative work, and a story of increasing wins from excellent practice, any change initiative is far more likely to; 1) align with the values of the sector; and, 2) be successful and sustainable.

---


Unfortunately, a change process isn’t over quickly (if ever) – in a movement across a sector it is going to take a massive amount of grit, determination, vision and passion, all sustained over years. The following two steps are about turning change from an event, and into an escalating movement that has a lasting impact.

- Don’t let up
- Make it stick

### 4.4.1 Don’t Let Up

The first wins that are accounted for and communicated are only the beginning of the process, regardless of how challenging they were to gain - “The momentum created by short-term wins often propels the change effort forward, and enables stakeholders to tackle the bigger and deeper changes.”

In this report, the success (not of implementation, but of outcomes for clients) of some of the short-term recommendations may be valuable as “wins”. However, none of them are easy – despite being the “low-hanging fruit” of a change process, they are only the first steps. Once these footholds are gained, if change is to be truly effective, the areas pointed to in the long-term recommendations will have to be resolved in some way, otherwise these wins are unlikely to be sustained, or produce long-term improvements in client outcomes.

### 4.4.2 Make It Stick

This final step is about ensuring that there are sufficient systemic, attitudinal and behavioural changes in place to weave change into the fabric of the sector.

In essence, this step would mean that the vision outlined in Section 1 has been achieved, and is now being consolidated, with “right” attitudes, approaches, initiatives and behaviours being acknowledged and rewarded. There are also systems in place that maintain the changes, and leaders across all levels are focused consistently on new goals that the enhanced system can achieve.

---

## 5.1 Short Term Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Corresponding Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Youth Action as lead culture change agent for sector-wide integration initiatives</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Action to be the lead body in initiating and implementing sector-wide integration initiatives. This includes assembling the hierarchy of “guiding teams” that are recommended at various stages across this report, including a state-wide, “whole-of-sector/government team and regional teams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Roll-Out of Student Support Officers</td>
<td>4.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student Support Officer pilot positions be supported in their roll-out across the Region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Establishment of a pilot regional “guiding team”</td>
<td>4.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Action and FaCS pilot the establishment of a regional “guiding team” with the aim of increasing client outcomes through integrative practice, fulfilling the roles of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the collection of data across regions to ingrain a culture of client-centredness;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• professional development of local workers to embed a “wide lens” view of clients, and facilitate relationships and connections between workers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• coordinating local planning and sector responses to local/regional needs;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• supporting guiding teams at the local level to plan and effect further change efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Effectively roll-out of the “Wide-lens” holistic assessment framework</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-out the “Wide Lens” holistic assessment framework for youth services (including youth homelessness, health and mental health services) and school wellbeing contacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pilot an evaluation of “Wide Lens” framework in practice</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pilot site be established to integrate the “Wide Lens” framework into worker, agency and interagency practice. This pilot should be externally evaluated to establish the ongoing roll-out of the framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Facilitate relationship-building between child and family and youth sectors. Increase opportunities for interface/relationship-building between child and family and youth sectors. This should take several forms:

- Shared meetings of youth and child and family interagencies;
- Development of an information system that enables efficient and effective referral to between youth and child and family organisations;
- Cross-sector relationship building initiatives, such as mentoring programs, worker exchange, networking events.

7 Family-centred practice for youth workers
As part of the roll-out of the “Wide Lens” framework, implement a training program for youth sector workers in assessing and responding to the needs of families/family-centred practice.

8 Allocate regional guiding team discretionary funding
The pilot regional guiding team be allocated an amount of discretionary funding to realign systems in the area and address systemic boundaries to integration and enable organisational action.

9 OPTION 1: Improvements to HSNet
FaCS to undertake an overhaul of HSNet to improve usability and adoption by organisations. In funding the system, there is likely also value in investing in several “information officers” to form relationships across the sector and populate service information on a regular basis.

OR

9 OPTION 2: Family Referral Service program database
The Family Referral Service to use existing data collection practices (currently being developed) to populate and maintain an accessible database of up-to-date service information.

OR

9 OPTION 3: HSNet and the FRS working together
FaCS and the FRS may be able to work together to collect joint information that populates HSNet, representing a collaborative effort to deliver access to information collected by one organisation in an existing system created (and improved) by FaCS.
5.1 Long Term Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Corresponding Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  “Whole of Government” Audit of integration-friendly policies and procedure</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via a “whole-of-government” approach to young people (likely through a statewide guiding team), State and Federal Government Departments conduct an audit of internal policies and procedures that may be acting as barriers to effective service integration. Special attention should be paid to information sharing, data collection and confidentiality restrictions that may impact vital information reaching non-government services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Establishment of a “whole of sector” guiding team</td>
<td>4.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of a state-wide “guiding team” taking a “whole of sector” (including government) approach to drive long-term, structural change initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sharing a “lifespan” view of client needs</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child &amp; family sector to adopt the “wide lens” framework (or an alternative shared framework developed/adopted) to assist with effective sector interfacing and client collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Coordination of guiding teams to communicate for sector buy-in</td>
<td>4.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding teams across local, regional and state levels coordinate communication processes and messages to ensure buy-in of stakeholders, services and funding bodies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Flexibility of achieving outcomes</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A statewide “guiding team” to assess the viability of restructuring youth service funding around a preventative continuum of holistic needs, rather than discrete streams targeting specific issues. This may take in ideas such as Payment-By-Results, social bonds etc, which allow services to design programming, as long as it can demonstrate effectiveness in meeting client needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Measuring the impact of the service continuum</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Action to lead a process aimed at establishing a system of common preventative indicators to assess the impact of youth services across population groups and regions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Strategy for increasing (and funding) strong leaders</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaCS, Youth Action and funding bodies to develop a plan for increasing leadership capacity across youth services. This would likely include a mix of supervision, training, mentoring and business partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 System for sharing client information</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a system to support automatic collection and sharing of client information across the spectrum of child, youth and family services. Special consideration should be given to how this links to child protection, justice, health, and other existing client systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Full Cost Recovery Benchmarking
FaCS, NSW Health and other funding bodies (likely initiated by state-wide guiding team) to undertake a collaborative process of Full Cost Recovery benchmarking to determine the real overhead costs of leadership, administration and infrastructure required to achieve effective client outcomes.
6.1 List of Organisations Consulted

Ashfield Community Hub
Ashfield Council
Barnardos Family Referral Service
Belmore Boys High School
Belmore Youth Resource Centre
Benevolent Society South Eastern Sydney
Bondi Outreach Project
Canterbury City Council
Centre for Hope
Centrelink (Redfern)
City of Sydney Youth Services
Come in Youth and Resource Centre
Creative for Youth Initiative
Department of Education & Communities
Family and Community Services
Glebe Youth Service
Good Shepherd
Headspace Central Sydney
Hurstville City Council
Jacaranda Cottage
Justice Health and Forensic Mental Health Network
Kirketon Road Centre
Kogarah City Council
Launchpad Youth Community
Leichhardt Council - Youth Services
Leichhardt Library Service
Mission Australia, Belmore
Mission Australia, The Crossing
MTC Work Solutions - Youth Connections
Oasis Youth Support Network
Pole Depot Community Centre - Youth Zone
Project Youth
Raise Foundation
Reconnect Inner City (Mission Australia)
Relationships Australia NSW
Rosemount
Shopfront Youth Arts
Shopfront Youth Legal Service
South Eastern and Northern Sydney Family Referral Service
South Eastern Sydney Medicare Local
South Sydney High School
Southern Sydney Youth Refuge
St George Careers Development Centre
St George Youth Services
St Vincent de Paul Society
Sutherland Business Education Network
Sutherland Shire Family Services
Sydney Sexual Health Centre
TAFE
Ted Noffs Foundation
The Fact Tree Youth Service
The Shack Youth Service
Vinnies Youth Services
Weave Youth Family Community
Woolahra Council
Young Peoples Refuge
Youth Action
Youthblock Youth Health Service
6.2 List of Interagencies Consulted

- City of Sydney Youth Interagency
- Eastern Suburbs Youth Interagency
- Hornsby/Ku-ring-gai Youth Network
- Inner West Youth Network
- St George Youth Network
- Sutherland Youth Network

6.3 Summary of Consultation Results

**Funding streams used by organisations to undertake activities/projects**

- State Government: 42%
- Federal Government: 15%
- Local Government: 21%
- Other: 9%
- Corporate/Philanthropic: 13%
Breakdown of funding streams within the corporate/philanthropic stream

Breakdown of funding streams within the Federal Government stream
Breakdown of funding streams within the Local Government stream

Breakdown of funding streams within the ‘other’ stream
Breakdown of funding streams within the State Government stream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of programs/activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHC</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts NSW</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia Council for the Arts</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJJ</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaCS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaCS - Community Builders</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaCS - Early Intervention</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaCS - Placement Prevention</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaCS - SHS</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAHCSIA</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPHA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Health</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Office of Communities</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What the worker does

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Specialist</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Case Management</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Education</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Life Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Management</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of General</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>