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1 Executive Summary and Recommendations

This Pre-evaluation Study reviews progress in improving service delivery and the coordination of Government services in particular on Palm Island, Doomadgee and Mornington Island.

Conducted by independent consultant Chris Chappell, the Study is based on interviews with 51 service managers, staff and community members and survey questionnaires received from 41 stakeholders. Of the total inputs received:

- 34% related to Doomadgee, 26% for Mornington Island and 39% for Palm Island
- 40% were from Community members and community based NGOs, 13% from Council staff and members and 47% from State Government staff and managers

From those consultations it is clear that Government Coordination activities are having a demonstrable and overall positive impact on the three Communities reviewed and the service systems supporting them. Stakeholders almost universally look to those activities and the broader coordination agenda to create real and positive change on the Communities.

However, the Study also found four key blockages to progress:

- Centrally designed, managed and allocated program budgets and centrally (or out-of-region) initiated activities/interventions “imposed” on communities outside of the established and agreed coordinating structures and processes.
- A lack of consensus within communities about direction and priorities, who the leaders are and who speaks for the community.
- The lack of engagement of the Commonwealth Government in joined-up direction and process.
- The lack of capacity on Communities, particularly in terms of Councils and community based NGOs and the development of new leadership within communities.

In order to overcome these blockages, a more comprehensive and concerted approach is required that ratchets-up the coordination agenda to achieve meaningful change on and for the Communities.

The following recommendations sketch the components of such a comprehensive and concerted place-based approach:

**Recommendation 1: Whole of Government, Whole of Community Approach**

Negotiate with the Australian Government for a truly joined-up policy and approach to the development of Communities which builds on or integrates with existing State Government structures, processes and learnings and addresses the subsequent recommendations below.

**Recommendation 2: Future Focused, Place-based Policy and Investment Framework**

Establish a coherent, future focused policy and investment framework which explicitly focuses on and commits to investing in and building viability and a positive future for Communities.

This policy and investment framework would:

- have a 5 to (ideally) 10 year horizon
- address both short-term priorities and the medium to long-term development of communities, their people, infrastructure, economies and service systems
- have as an objective the development of positive and sustainable futures for communities
mandate a place-based approach that includes community capacity building, government coordination and collaboration and shared sustainable resourcing of initiatives.

**Recommendation 3: Community Planning Framework**

For each Community, fund the establishment of a 10-20 year Vision Plan and 3-5 year Strategic Plan to support and provide an agreed framework and direction for annual local action plans (LIPA).

Implementation of this recommendation would be most effective if it were jointly funded by State and Federal Governments, auspiced by local Councils and conducted by skilled, culturally competent and experienced community planners.

**Recommendation 4: Place Based Budget and Program Decision Making**

The pooling of program/budget funds to create a Community Budget linked to the aspirations and targets from the Community Planning Framework and with local flexibility to determine how the Budget targets and outcomes are pursued and met.

Although significant work is required on designing the detail of this approach, it is envisaged that:

- All three levels of Government would be captured under the Community Budget
- The Budget would be for a 3-5 year period, supported by an annual Budget cycle.
- The DGC would have the key reporting responsibility—effectively fulfilling the role of Budget Manager.
- The Regional Manager’s Coordination Networks would have a critical role in monitoring and reporting on the performance of individual agencies against their Community Budget or related targets and performance measures.
- Either as part of or as an adjunct to the Community Budget, Departments’ staff housing and office accommodation budgets would be pooled at the Community level to provide a rationalised approach to meeting agencies’ accommodation needs.

**Recommendation 5: Community and Stakeholder Engagement Model**

Establish a two-tiered coordination structure on communities in conjunction with the Community Planning model recommended above:

- **Community Planning Forum** open to all community members and organisations to discuss, negotiate and agree community issues and priorities
- **Community Action Working Group** representative of all key stakeholders and reporting to and receiving feedback from the regular Community Planning Forum
- **Negotiation Table** in its current form to discussion/resolution of unresolved issues and endorsement and subsequent monitoring and reporting of the LIPA.

**Recommendation 6: Community Capacity Building**

As a component of the proposed 3-5 year Community Budget, establish a Community Capacity Building Investment Strategy that includes a focus on:

- Building the service delivery and management capacity of community based NGOs
- Resourcing and building the capacity of Councils (staff and elected members) to manage and deliver the services and roles required/expected of them
- Community leadership development and succession planning
Recommendation 7: Directors Government Coordination and Government Coordination Centres
Locate the position of Director, Government Coordination for each Community in the most appropriate Regional Centre with a Project Officer located in the community and working from a Government Coordination Centre (the Palm Island Model).

It should be particularly noted however that the success of this model is critically dependant on selecting and then fully supporting the right person in the Project Officer’s role.

It is also recommended that the DGC positions be full-time (i.e. not shared with a service function). The preference is for a stand-alone DGC position for each community which would likely be essential in the event that the approaches recommended here are adopted.

However, where there are sufficient workload and other operations considerations to justify sharing a DGC between two communities (e.g. as an interim measure while a joined-up approach is negotiated with the Commonwealth), it would be essential to maintain a GCC and Project Staff in both communities.

Recommendation 8: Integrating Services for Community Members with Complex Needs
Further investigation is required on whether the Integrated Case Management model can be meaningfully applied in remote communities.

While it is unclear whether the range of services required would be available to be applied to the task, the evidence of the model’s effectiveness in managing and affecting change in the lives of clients (individuals, families or households) with complex needs suggests that at least the trialling of the approach on communities is warranted.

One approach for such a trial would be to attached a case coordinator to the GCC (i.e. independent of any one service agency) to drive the development of the integrated local practices, manage early cases and negotiate sign off at both a policy and program level to using the ICM approach in the community.

An alternative approach of locating that case coordinator with a community based NGO would also be worthy of trialling – particularly for its capacity building spin-offs for the NGO involved.

Conclusion
While most who were interviewed and surveyed for this Study reported that Government Coordination initiatives were having a real effect on the delivery of services in Communities, perhaps the strongest consensus among stakeholders was about:

- the desire to build strong, positive and viable communities, and
- the need to further transform the way we do business in order to achieve that change.

The recommendations made here are necessarily sketchy given the scope and timeframe for the Study. They require considerable fleshing-out and in all probability a staged implementation.

However, they outline an approach which builds on successful Government Coordination initiatives, practices and processes to date while ramping-up the effort to create real change for these communities and the people who live and work in them.

As such, they represent quite a radical shift in the way Governments, service delivery agencies and communities do business – one that will require all stakeholders’ commitment to, and investment in, building a positive and viable future for Queensland’s Indigenous communities.
For those who, like the author, like to conceptualise in pictures, the following diagrams summarise some of the key paradigms and systemic relationships in the recommended approach.
2 Background and Methodology

2.1 Background

The former Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy (DATSIP) established the Palm Island Government Coordination Centre (GCC) in February 2005 as a means of improving the coordination of service delivery to the community. A Director of the GCC was appointed - based in the regional centre of Townsville.

As a result of a Cabinet Decision in August 2005, the Government Coordination Office, Indigenous Service Delivery was to be set up to work across the State, broadening the work begun by the Palm Island GCC and developing models of good practice in service delivery to the 19 remote, Indigenous communities in the State (including Palm Island).

As part of this approach, senior Directors, Government Coordination were to be appointed for an MCMC community or cluster of communities, to lead local and regional coordination of services.

In March 2006 – the Dullama Committee was brought together for the first time for a workshop in Mt Isa to examine a proposal for coordinating government services in the Doomadgee community. The Government Champion played a lead role in this development and a model developed around a government Service Delivery Plan (SDP). Mornington Island also developed a SDP.

In August 2006, the Government Coordinator, Indigenous Service Delivery, commenced duty within the Government Coordination Office in Brisbane. At this point these three communities (and Lockhart River) already had government coordination activities underway. As a result of this staged development, several different models of government coordination have developed without a clearly established framework or common way of doing things on the ground.

Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement

The Government Coordination Office has since led the development of integrated, single planning process for Indigenous communities built around the State-wide Indigenous Partnership Agreement and implemented through distinct Local Indigenous Partnership Agreements for all 19 communities.

The first such LIPA was signed on Mornington Island in May 2007.

2.2 The pre-evaluation study

Government coordination activities have therefore been running for one to two years in some locations and we need to understand what is working, and what isn’t.

The Government Coordinator, Indigenous Service Delivery therefore announced a two phase review of activities to date starting with a “Pre-Evaluation Study” in late 2007 of the developing Government coordination models at Palm Island, Mornington Island and the Dullama Strategy at Doomadgee (selected because of their longevity, the different models being used, and the fact that Mornington Island is past the first quarter of delivering a LIPA). This will lead into a later full evaluation across all 19 communities.

This Study therefore seeks to document what is working (and what isn’t), and identify operating principles and benchmarks for good practice in government coordination in indigenous communities.

The study was conducted by independent consultant, Chris Chappell, and sought to focus on learnings and insights gained from the experiences of all the stakeholders.
The study is not a full-scale evaluation - nor does it focus on outcomes at this time.

**Methodology**
The study used a combination of web and paper based surveys and face-to-face interviews with 51 stakeholders. Interviews were predominately held with community members, local Councils and local service workers and senior managers and followed the questioning themes in the formal survey form (see Appendix 3 – Survey Questionnaire and Appendix 2 – Survey Response Tables for the Survey data tables.)

Interviews were conducted with 28 Community members and community based NGO staff (55%), 5 (10%) were held with Council members and staff and 18 (35%) with State Government workers and managers.

Survey responses were received from 41 Stakeholders, 12 for Doomadgee, 12 for Mornington Island and 17 for Palm Island.

As shown in Table 1 below, no survey responses were received from community members in Doomadgee and as such their results are skewed by the over representation of State Government managers in particular. Similarly, Councils are poorly represented in the survey responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington Is</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community member</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council member</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organisation manager...</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government worker</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government manager</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, the Study received 114 survey and interview inputs from 92 individuals with some completing both and some participants providing input for more than one community:

- 34% relating to Doomadgee, 26% for Mornington Island and 39% for Palm Island
- 40% from Community members and community based NGOs, 13% from Council staff and members and 47% from State Government staff and managers

Participants’ comments from both survey and interview are shown in this report in an italicised cursive font. A small number of those comments have had minor edits to improve readability.

**About the Author**
Chris Chappell is an independent consultant with over 30 years experience in business, politics, the public sector and not-for-profit organisations.

Chris has managed major national public sector programs, been a senior corporate and public sector executive, a lobbyist and social policy analyst and policy adviser to Federal and State Ministers. He has worked and lived in most States and Territories and has done his time in Canberra.

Now settled in Townsville in North Queensland, Chris can be slow to adopt new jargon which is why in this report he persists in using terms like “the Commonwealth” and “the Federal Government” to describe what the style manuals now call “The Australian Government”.

Chris can be contacted at [www.cichappell.com](http://www.cichappell.com) or [chris@cichappell.com](mailto:chris@cichappell.com)
3 Key Themes & Observations

3.1 Coordination as a change strategy
While this study has principally examined progress in improving service delivery and the coordination of Government activities on Palm Island, Doomadgee and Mornington Island, study participants almost universally look to those initiatives and the broader coordination agenda to create real and positive change on the communities.

The desire for change is palpable amongst all stakeholder groups – “one plan, one direction” was the process for change that most were seeking and for most it was also the expectation (or hope) they had for the structures and processes developing as part of the Government Coordination initiative.

That expectation is not being (and arguably can’t be) met by the existing structural initiatives – Local Indigenous Partnership Agreements (LIPA), Coordination Steering Committees (Future Directions Group, Dullama Committee), Government Coordination Centres (GCC) and Directors Government Coordination (DGC).

As such, those existing initiatives are being conducted in something of a strategic vacuum for service decision makers, management and staff. Similarly, community members want to see how those initiatives fit within and contribute to a positive vision for their communities.

Best practice would have a 10-20 year vision plan for each community, a 3-5 year Strategic Plan and an annual operational plan (LIPA) – a widely established model for both community and organisational planning.

While many noted that this vision and direction setting and community planning and development is the natural responsibility of Local Government (as has been demonstrated in the Palm Island Vision Plan), it is apparent that some councils (Doomadgee and Mornington Island in this Study) do not have the resources or the capability to effectively undertake such an exercise.

The need for a long-term planning and resourcing framework for each community and the agencies serving them was raised consistently throughout the study.

3.2 What are we coordinating?

- **System-oriented models** have ambitious goals that are focused on reforming the delivery system and seek to change the way agencies plan and fund programs.
- **Service-oriented models** have more modest goals and attempt to link clients to existing services and unite various service providers without altering program budgeting or funding processes, service agency responsibilities, or organizational structures.

Government Coordination initiatives to date essentially fall into this second category.

While those later service coordination initiatives have resulted in some major and many modest successes, two themes developed during the study:
- Efforts tend to be issue rather than client/consumer focused – largely because the priority is to get services into a community rather than coordinating the relatively few services already there.

As a result, we are a long way from providing integrated, client centred, service responses particularly to the needs and circumstances of those living on communities who have complex needs.

- Systemic blockages to progress are not being effectively dealt with – centralised program design and decision making, program funding rigidities and “short-term-ism” and a lack of understanding, commitment and priority in some agencies and staff is restricting the ability of Government Coordination structures and processes to deliver the desired solutions to local priorities.

3.3 Who are we coordinating?

While Government Coordination initiatives are, at least in the first instance, about the better coordination of State government services, it is apparent that, to achieve the change objectives of all stakeholders, those same stakeholders need to be engaged in and have ownership of the change agenda and its structures and processes:

Community

There has been patchy engagement of Communities in the Coordination initiatives to date and community ownership is generally low.

However, a consistent learning across all communities (and most stakeholders) is that Community ownership is:

- Achieved through their full engagement in the processes.
- Critical to success – not only for short term goals but, more importantly, for strategic goals such as building consensus, cohesiveness and community direction and capacity.

A useful guide for the levels of community engagement required to maximise the effect of the coordination/change agenda is the Public Participation Matrix developed by the International Association for Public Participation:
Currently, efforts on communities are a mix of inform, consult and perhaps involve and collaborate. However, the promise of each is yet to be fully realised and current approaches are a long way from being empowering.

**Non-Government Organisations**

Engagement of both community based and externally based non-government organisations (NGOs) has also been patchy. In the open engagement approach foreshadowed above, all NGOs would be seen as partners in the change agenda. The challenge is to ensure that:

- Community based NGOs have the capacity to participate as full partners and to develop their service delivery capacity and capabilities
- External NGOs operating or wanting to operate in the communities are fully engaged as well.

In terms of external NGOs there appears to be a particular issue with Commonwealth funded, mainstream NGO provided, nation-wide services (e.g. Jobnetwork, Family Relationship Centres) which are effectively imposed on the community irrespective of established activities and processes, the coordination agenda or community priorities.

Such program funding approaches are serving to deprive the community of the opportunity to build the capacity of local organisations to provide those services.

**Government**

The lack of engagement of the Commonwealth in the process and their propensity to act unilaterally has been a significant impediment, and even counter-productive, to the coordination agenda.
Similarly, State Government processes conducted outside of the change process and structures (e.g. AMPs) have been counter productive in their impact on community engagement and consensus building.

For both State and Federal Governments, the findings by CAEPR in their Indigenous Governance Project are very relevant in the communities studied:

> Currently, governments’ ability to deliver on its Indigenous governance and capacity development goals is seriously diminished by entrenched problems of: counter-productive statutory and program frameworks; policy and funding fragmentation; erratic policy implementation; poor engagement at the local level; and failure to sustain coordination across agencies and jurisdictions.

> Unilateral intervention and/or imposed priorities undermine participation (by communities)²

The change of Government federally of course provides an excellent opportunity to develop a truly joined-up, collaborative approach in these communities. In particular, the federal ALP Social Inclusion Policy released by the Deputy Prime Minister during the election campaign describes an approach that is very sympathetic to that already adopted by the State, one that will be:

> “...characterised by partnerships with State and local governments, the not for profit and private sectors to deliver targeted and tailored interventions which address localised systemic disadvantage.

> Social Inclusion Plans would include clear targets, clear benchmarks, their ongoing measurement, data collection and defined roles and responsibilities for all parties involved.”³

However, the challenge will be in integrating these Social Inclusion Plans with LIPAs, the existing coordination structures and processes and the vision, strategic and investment planning proposed here.

A compounding challenge will be to avoid the “proceduralization” of a good idea as has been the common experience with the Commonwealth’s Shared Responsibility Agreements (SRA) - once Commonwealth Managers’ became driven to meet short-term performance targets for SRAs signed, the focus shifted from developing quality agreements aimed at affecting real change to a focus on achieving maximum through-put.

As such, it is apparent from this study that it is critical that the State leads any effort to integrate these (and in fact all three) levels of Government.

### 3.4 Key success factors

Drawing on Interview and Survey responses (described more fully in Section 10.2 Key success factors; and Section 10.3 Effective approaches to overcoming blockages to change), 11 Key Success Factors for effective service coordination on communities are identified:

- **Time, intent and commitment to** build: trust and relationships; a shared vision and plan; agreed processes; and a long-term investment for real change.

- **Trust and relationships building** through open, transparent and regular communication between all stakeholders

---


c. **Open communication** through regular open engagement with and reporting to the community and other stakeholders.

d. **Leadership** within all stakeholder groups and including leadership development and succession planning

e. **Community ownership** through effective engagement and "bottom-up processes"

f. **Effective planning framework.** Vision, Strategic and Action planning - One plan; one direction.

g. **Capable, committed and well supported people**

h. **Sufficient and flexibly applied resources.** Sufficient to meet at least basic service needs and flexible funding can be applied appropriately to community needs and circumstances

i. **Open and transparent coordination structures, processes, procedures and decision making**

j. **True whole-of government approach** - Place Based budgets and targets. Program Managers’ performance measures related to place.

k. **Empowered partners** through devolved decision-making and program design

### 3.5 Coordination structures and processes

**Director Government Coordination & the Government Coordination Centres**

There is a clear sense from the Study of the value and generally high level of acceptance of the DGC and GCC role and resource. Overall the role is seen as a positive initiative that is adding value to and delivering the Coordination agenda.

In all communities – people and processes are identified as critical to the success of the DGC and GCC functions:

- The very personal attributes and style of, and processes used by, the DGC and Project Officers have proven to be critical in their acceptance by, and effectiveness in working with, the community and local level service providers.

- On the communities, DGC acceptance is built by their being a listener - someone who takes the necessary time to explain and to built-up trust in the community.

- Within the bureaucracy and service system, acceptance is built by being an effective (even courageous) advocate, negotiator and solution finder.

In interviews and survey responses there was strong support (in the order 3-1) for the DGC to be based in the most appropriate Regional Centre with a Project Officer located in the community working from a Government Coordination Centre (the Palm Island Model). While the findings of this Study also support this model there should be one caution:

- Compared to other models examined, its success is far more dependant on selecting and then fully supporting the right person in the Project Officer’s role in the Community.

Community members and local workers were more strongly supportive of a locally based DGC. However, there was generally agreement that:

- A local presence (e.g. GCC with a skilled Project Officer) was more critical than the DGC being based locally,

- The DGC role should not be a part-time one (the Doomadgee Model).

**Negotiation Tables**
Negotiation Tables are regarded with a mix of acceptance, acknowledgement for the real results that they have delivered, and scepticism (about motives, the “fly-in/fly-out caravan” nature of them, their ability to achieve real results on longer term hard issues, and/or who represents the community at the table etc).

The status of and support for the Negotiation Table process on both Mornington and Palm Islands appears to have taken a beating as a result of separate (i.e. uncoordinated) Government initiated processes (in particular the AMP process) and a perceived failure to adequately address community raised alcohol management related issues (Family oriented licensed Club, provision of diversion, detox, rehab, post-rehab services etc)

Generally, communities see the model as a good one but want it to be able to capture all Government activity (e.g. AMPs, PICC) as well as the communities’ long-term vision/aspirations/issues.

There is a mixed reaction across the communities to Government Champions – very much centred on the personal style of the individual involved and their ability to listen, explain and build relationships and trust. In essence, community and local service providers look for the same cultural awareness and inter-personal skills in Champions as they do in DGCs – in effect, DGCs have established a model or benchmark for how all government officials operating on the Communities.

Coordination Committees
All communities have a working structure that operates between Negotiating Tables to drive the LIPA priorities and Government Coordination agenda – on Palm Island, the Future Directions Group; on Mornington Island, the Coordination Steering Committee; and on Doomadgee, the Dullama Committee.

A key learning across all communities is that community stakeholders clearly want open structures, processes and communication and that such an approach is required in order to build community consensus, ownership and capacity. Community engagement on both Palm Island and Doomadgee was set back when the Future Directions Group (FDG) and Dullama Committee largely failed to adequately involve and communicate with community stakeholders in their early stages.

As noted by CAEPR in their Indigenous Governance Project:

"People’s participation ... is greatest when they feel they have a real stake ... when they have real power over real resources, and can make decisions about the things that are of immediate concern to them:

" Local control generates legitimacy
" Local control generates capacity development”

The evolving best practice model is to have a representative working group of all key stakeholders reporting to and receiving feedback from a regular open community forum which discusses, negotiates and agrees issues and priorities.

Local Indigenous Partnership Agreements
The LIPA model is generally seen positively by community and other stakeholders although most also indicated that they are “waiting to see the results”. The transparency and accountability inherent in the model was seen as a positive.

---

There was a general concern that (to date) the LIPA process (as with the Negotiating Table) is not dealing with the longer term/strategic issues facing communities or those issues over which the Commonwealth have primarily policy and financial responsibility.

**Other levels of Government**

As noted elsewhere, the Commonwealth’s lack of engagement to make a true whole-of-government approach is a significant deficiency in current arrangements.

The study also raises a general concern about the capacity of Councils in the coordination processes and structures. On Palm and Mornington Islands and particularly on Doomadgee, there was real concern expressed by a range of stakeholders about whether Councils could deliver what they had agreed through the LIPA.

As noted in Section 9, Shire Councils were seen by all stakeholder groups (including Councils) as being under resourced with very limited capability and, as such, a source of blockage to, or at least a brake on, change. In particular, Councils are not seen as being able to fulfil their strategic planning, infrastructure and community development roles for the Community.

In discussing these concerns, Council stakeholders (and others) were particularly critical of the lack of appropriate and sufficient support and scaffolding to enable the significant transformation of Councils that is required and is implicit in the Local Government reforms and more generally in Government expectations of them.

**3.6 Blockages to effective coordination**

The study found 4 key blockages to progress:

- All stakeholder groups and all three communities nominated ‘Brisbane’ or ‘central office’ as the foremost blockage to effective coordination of action that addresses local circumstances – in particular:
  - Centrally initiated activities/interventions “imposed” on communities outside of the established and agreed coordinating structures and processes.
  - Centrally designed, managed and allocated program budgets

- Conversely, Government more often identified the community itself - the lack of clarity and consistency about who the leaders are and who speaks for the community and the lack of consensus about direction and priorities.

- Capacity issues within the communities and in particular the lack of sufficient capacity in local Councils and community based NGOs. A related issue is the aging of Communities old/establish leaders and the lack of new leadership coming through

- As mentioned previously, the lack of engagement of the Commonwealth Government in the process and the capacity of Councils was also generally seen as sources of blockage.

Blockages to effective coordination are discussed more fully in Section 9 and responses to those blockages in Section 10.3

**3.7 Moving forward**

From the Study, two developments of the current approach are proposed to take the Government Coordination agenda (and the Communities’ change agenda) forward:

**a) An integrated place based development approach**

Key components of such an approach would include:
Full involvement of all levels of Government and resourcing of local Councils to enable their full and meaningful involvement.

Reflecting widely accepted organisational and community planning models, the development of an agreed, long-term Vision and Strategic (Social, economic and environmental) planning framework for each community.

In mainstream circumstances Councils would be expected to facilitate this activity but it is very doubtful whether they could on Doomadgee and Mornington in particular.

Funding Councils to develop (or update) community vision plans and strategic plans would enable this deficiency to be relatively quickly resolved with the added benefit of ensuring that those plans are Whole-of-Community and Whole-of-Government focused rather than narrowly focused on Local; Government priorities only.

A shift in effort and focus from a largely reactive service coordination one to also, and in addition, embrace service planning and design functions.

Effectively planning and design of local services in this way of course implies the delegation of such planning, design and financial decisions to the regional/local level.

In addition to this delegation of program decision making, the approach also requires the pooling of at least some program/budget funds to create a Community Budget (ideally capturing all three levels of Government) with associated outcome targets and measures.

Importantly, this approach necessarily requires local flexibility to determine how those outcomes are pursued and met.

This will significantly impact on the role of the Regional Managers Forum, especially in monitoring and reporting on the performance of individual agencies against their Community Budget or related targets and performance measures.

Similarly, an integrated place-based approach would see the pooling of Departments’ staff housing budgets at the Community level. In particular, rather than individual agencies negotiating land for and constructing staff accommodation, this would see the pooling of funds to provide a rationalised (and rational) approach to meeting those accommodation needs.

Ideally (and in line with the longer term change / community development agenda) this approach would also be used to foster the development of local construction and property management/maintenance ventures.

Open and regular communications with the community and other stakeholders by coordination structures – generally seen as regular community forums in which the community establish their priorities and issues which are then taken to the local Coordination structure/committee

As a long-term change strategy, the proposed approach will also require (and be critically dependant on) a focus on developing new leadership on communities and the structured engagement and development of young leaders in Community structures.

b) An integrated client-based approach to managing community members/families/households with complex needs

One of the ways the three communities differ from other comparably sized rural and remote communities in Queensland is the relatively high proportion of community members/households who have multiple and complex service needs (e.g., mental health, primary health, alcohol dependence, violence etc).
There is significant evidence (and two examples currently being used with public drinkers in Mt Isa and Townsville) where a most effective way if intervening and changing those people’s lives is through an integrated case management approach. Integrated Case Management (ICM) takes case management as it is generally understood that one step further – placing the client at the centre of the service system and flexibly applying the service system’s resources to an agreed development plan. Ideally, the client and their family are full participants in the planning and review processes.

A brief introduction to the ICM model is provided at Appendix 4 - the presentation used by the Author to workshops of service providers in Townsville and Mt Isa.

There is one significant caution in considering such an approach – it cannot work unless the necessary service responses are available to be applied in a client development plan.

**Change the language, change the paradigm**

The use of the terminology “Government Coordination” to describe the set of activities examined in this study was presumably chosen to send a clear message to government agencies and staff that their activities on communities were to be coordinated. Clearly, the strategy has had the desired effect – albeit, certainly not in every case.

However, the terminology does not capture the change expectations that stakeholders almost universally have for the initiative(s). Similarly the language suggests “now” rather than the “future”, “reactive” rather than “proactive”. At its worst, to some stakeholders it has a paternalist ring – “something done to you rather than with you”.

Although problematic in their implementation, the naming of both the Future Directions group on Palm Island and the Dullama Committee on Doomadgee were both attempts to establish strong, forward looking language to describe the activities and change agenda.

Accordingly, announcement and implementation of the developments identified above would also provide the opportunity to introduce new, more positive language to describe the purpose of the “Government Coordination” agenda and activities.

Ideally, the opportunity would also be used to place these developments within a new policy framework that integrates (or integrates with) the Commonwealth’s Social Inclusion framework and looks to and invests in building viable futures for communities as well as addressing their immediate priorities.

**Maintaining the achievements**

Finally, one further quite key issue moving forward is to maintain the achievements made to date and those things that are working. For example, on Palm Island and, to a somewhat lesser extent the other communities, both Government and Community stakeholders identified that the good coordination of visits to the communities that had developed was falling away again.

Similarly and anecdotally, in Doomadgee and Mornington the school attendance achievements of earlier in 2007 have fallen away quite badly during the year.
4 Profile & Understanding of Coordination Initiatives

4.1 Profile and awareness of Government Coordination Initiatives

State Government initiatives to improve the coordination of service delivery and development on communities over the past 1-2 years appears to be reasonably well recognised at most levels.

Table 2 below shows the average rating by survey respondents to the question “On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is no awareness and 5 is fully aware, what do you believe is the level of awareness about government coordination efforts among:”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington island</th>
<th>Palm Island</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The community</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community managed services</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-government organisations</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Council</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown, awareness ratings were generally higher on Palm Island and lowest at the Community level.

In interview is was clear that, for Stakeholders at all levels, the profile and understanding of the Government Coordination initiatives has grown over time with Negotiating Tables playing a major role in focusing attention on the service coordination agenda after periods of instability on all communities.

The appointment of Directors Government Coordination (DGC) and Support Staff has clearly served to maintain an ongoing focus on (and communications about) the coordination agenda and on delivering results “on the ground”.

More recently, the development of Local Indigenous Partnership Agreements (LIPA) in each community generally has high recognition at all levels – (96% of all survey participants).

While the recognition factor for coordination initiatives is generally high, it is certainly not uniform amongst Stakeholders.

In particular, while virtually all those surveyed and interviewed had a clear view of the role of the DGC, (or the Government Coordination Centre) they didn’t always have an understanding of who filled the DGC role (88% of survey respondents could name the DGC).

This was more the case among community members and local service workers who tended to identify individuals rather than positions – if they dealt with the Government Coordination Project Officer then that is who they associate with the coordination agenda.

Similarly, community members and local service workers (again, not exclusively) tended to identify a community advocate role for the DGC.

From both survey and interview responses, it is apparent that the establishment of DGC positions is seen as a very positive initiative that has generated and influenced real change on the communities.

However, it should be noted that many expressed a concern about the DGC increasingly being caught-up in responding to “central office agendas, directives and interventions” rather than advocating for and responding to the communities’ change agenda.
Critically, in discussion with community members in particular (but certainly not exclusively), the personal attributes and style of the DGC and Project Officer’s and the processes they employ are seen as critical to their acceptance by the community and their effectiveness in working with the community.

On the communities, DGCs acceptance is built by being a listener - someone who takes the time to explain and to built-up trust in the community – while within the bureaucracy and service system acceptance is built by being an effective (even courageous) advocate, negotiator and solution finder.

4.2 Role of the Director Government Coordination

As noted above, virtually all study participants had a view on the role of the DGC and Project Staff.

Table 3 below summarises survey responses to the question “What do you see as the main role of the Director, Government Coordination in the community?” Although probably somewhat over-stated when presented in this format, the Table does illustrate a tension in expectations about the role of the DGC and Project Staff.

Stakeholders at the management level tended to see the role as one of systems coordination and management while community members and service workers in communities tended to identify more of a community development and community advocate role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service System Focus</th>
<th>Community Development Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Government programs and interventions.</td>
<td>To be the whole of government contact and to drive the strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>direction of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-governmental and inter-departmental network facilitation across senior and</td>
<td>Advocating the community’s view (including Council’s) to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle management levels</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding duplication and waste</td>
<td>Knowing community issues and coordinating the response and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>removing any blockages so that the identified service can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating services that come into the Community and coordinating a whole of</td>
<td>provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government response to issues raised in the community.</td>
<td>Provide support and direction for collaborative working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>environment within the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To coordinate state government service delivery on items identified through the LIPA</td>
<td>To Coordinate the activities of the community groups and to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop the community as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement negotiation tables or similar processes e.g. RMCN sub-committee</td>
<td>Getting agencies talking to each other; steering the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups and monitor planned and agreed initiatives</td>
<td>to a positive position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community development, establishment of working partnership,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future planning (10yrs), community consultation and providing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>direction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in the previous section, many participants also expressed concern that the DGC’s role appears to increasingly be focused on, and caught up in, responding to Central agencies, agendas and managers.
4.3 **How effectively has the initiative been communicated?**

To test how well the Government Coordination initiative has been communicated to stakeholders, survey respondents were asked: “On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is “not effective” and 5 is “very effective”, how effective has communication been in the community and in government agencies about the new approach to coordination of services?

Chart 1 below shows the percentage of respondents’ rankings on that 5-point scale for each community.

![Chart 1: Effectiveness of communications about service coordination](image)

As shown, rankings of 2-3 were the most frequent – with results skewed more negatively for Doomadgee and upwards for Palm Island.

5 **What’s changed, what’s been the impact?**

From both survey responses and interviews it is quite clear that the Government Coordination initiative is effecting change and having a generally positive impact on communities and on the service system.

5.1 **Has coordination improved?**

The following Table 4 shows that 73% of survey respondents (all communities) gave a “coordination of services improvement rating” of 2-3 the generally on a 5-point scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Improvement</th>
<th>Significant Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is no improvement and 5 is significantly improved, how would you rate the coordination of services generally (Government, Non-government and community managed services) in the community over the past year?"
Overall, responses were more positive about the improvement in the coordination of Government services over the previous year with 52% recording an “improvement rating” of 3-4 on the same 5-point scale – reflecting the coordination initiative’s initial primary focus in this area:

Table 5: Improvement in the coordination of Government services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Improvement</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6 below, these results were broadly reflected in responses for individual communities, with respondents being more pessimistic about progress on Palm Island:

Table 6: Improvement in the coordination of services by Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>All services</th>
<th>Govt. services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doomadgee</td>
<td>0% 54% 38% 8% 0%</td>
<td>0% 42% 17% 33% 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mornington Island</td>
<td>25% 25% 38% 13% 0%</td>
<td>25% 13% 38% 25% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Island</td>
<td>14% 43% 21% 21% 0%</td>
<td>21% 29% 36% 14% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judgements about whether service coordination has improved are of course influenced by expectations.

Interviewing not only community members, in particular, but also service providers and managers (and certainly the DGC’s and project staff), there was often frustration expressed about how much progress had been achieved in terms of real coordination of services and /or real results for individuals and communities.

5.2 Has there been an impact?

Clearly, from both survey responses and interviews, Government Coordination initiatives are having an impact.

Survey responses across all communities shows 61% gave an “impact rating” of 3-4 on a 5-point scale for Government coordination activities over the previous year:
Table 7: Impact of coordination activities

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is little impact and 5 is significant impact, how would you rate the impact of government coordination activities in the community over the last year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, this picture was broadly similar for responses for individual communities, with Mornington and Palm Islands showing a somewhat less positive result than Doomadgee:

Table 8: Impact of coordination activities by Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doomadgee</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mornington Is</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Is</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course, how that impact is viewed partly depends on where you sit in the service system (or outside of it), and partly on your expectations for change.

For some service managers and community members in Doomadgee, the negotiation and signing of a LIPA was in itself a major impact.

On both Doomadgee and Mornington Island, success earlier in 2007 in significantly lifting school attendance rates was identified as a real “on-the-ground” impact.

5.3 What’s changed?

The following samples the range of responses by participants when asked “What is the single most significant positive change you have seen in the community over the past year?”

**Doomadgee**
- *The Guest House and the LIPA*
- *There has been improvement but much slower*
- *Permanent presence of Probation and Parole*
- *Shire Council’s ability to engage in a meaningful way with government*

**Mornington Island**
- *Implementation of the Safe Haven*
- *Positive and productive thinking by community representatives at Negotiation Tables*
- *Community are becoming more able to understand what “mutual obligation” is really about*
- *The pub has reduced opening hours by one hour per day.*

**Palm Island**
Establishment of the Senior Phase of Learning partnership between Kirwan High, BRT, EQ
Drive of the Community to ensure the development of the Palm Islands - especially in relation to the Palm Island Economic Development Plan.
Final draft of Palm Island LIPA
Through the efforts of Community Governance Improvement Strategy (CGIS), transparency and accountability has improved.

In survey responses and in interview discussions, positive change was either viewed in community development terms (increased community cohesiveness, working to a common purpose, community self-worth) and/or in practical service delivery options.

Again, a frustration about the rate of positive change was evident in all communities.

Similarly, there were some concerns express by participants about the some changes in the communities:

- In particular, the AMP process was seen by some participants (community members and others) as one which had run contrary to and even set-back what is generally seen as the collaborative intent of the Government Coordination Initiative
- On Doomadgee, the initial approach taken by the Dullama Committee to limit its membership and its engagement with the community was seen as a negative change

5.4 How far have we come – where are we now?

Are we heading in a common direction?
Chart 2 below summarises survey responses for each community to the question “On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is totally incorrect, and 5 is totally correct, please rate the following statement as it applies to this community - “Services generally in the community are working together to a common goal / heading in a common direction”

As can be seen, responses indicate that services generally are in the order of 30-40% along the track towards working together to a common goal / heading in a common direction.

In light of interviews and discussion on Mornington Island, the relatively high (positive) 4-Rating for Doomadgee is considered a sampling error.

Chart 2: Are services generally working in a common direction?
Chart 3 below shows survey responses to the same question and using the same 5-point scale – this time asking whether “Government services/agencies in the community are working together to a common goal / heading in a common direction”

As noted elsewhere, expectations differ – what “Government services/agencies in the community are working together to a common goal / heading in a common direction” is in part dependant on whether you sit inside of the service system as a manager or worker or outside of it as a consumer other stakeholder. From interviews it is apparent that the less positive picture for coordination of Government Services shown here for Mornington and Palm Islands, again in part, reflects anger/frustration at the AMP process.

Notably, for Palm Island, this result also reflects a widely raised concern (at manager, worker and community levels) about visits, consultations and other interventions on the Island from Central agencies/staff without reference to the coordination agenda, structures, processes or protocols.

Where are we now?
Table 9 shows the average ratings survey respondents give in response to the following question: “For this community, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, please rate the current level coordination of government activities in the following areas”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Current levels of Coordination by function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service planning &amp; design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service funding / grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service management &amp; decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While not a particularly well framed question, the data it does show a relatively consistent (and very neutral or “neither good nor bad”) result across communities and across service components.

How far have we gone towards whole-of-government planning and coordination?
The following Table 10 shows survey responses across all communities to the choice of 5 statements describing “how far have we gone towards whole-of-government planning and coordination of services in the community?”
Responses fell between 2-3.1 on the 5-point scale – perhaps best characterised as “some coordination in place for priority issues”:

Table 10: Progress towards Whole-of-Government planning and coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low level of Coordination between Govt. agencies</th>
<th>Some coordination in place but it is ad-hoc</th>
<th>Coordination in place for priority issues</th>
<th>Whole-of Govt Coordination in place but not fully effective</th>
<th>Whole-of Govt Coordination in place and fully effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 11 below, responses were most positive about the progress made on Palm Island and less positive about progress made on Mornington Island.

Table 11: Level of coordination achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low level of coordination between government agencies</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington Is</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some coordination in place but it is ad-hoc</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination in place for priority issues</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole-of Government coordination in place but not yet fully effective</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole-of Government coordination in place and fully effective</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Who are the drivers of change?

There was broad consensus about who the drivers for change have been in the communities:
- Director Government Coordination and Project staff (All)
- ATSIP Regional Office Staff (All)
- Government Champions (Doomadgee & Mornington Island)
- Mayor (Mornington Island)

Perhaps the best and worst examples of drivers for change were:
- Community raised the issue. Discussed at a Future Direction Meeting. Engagement of Regional Executive Director of Education. Agreement on the issue and a proposal however lacking policy direction and resources. Elevated to the Negotiation Table where the Government Champions advocated with the DG DETA for implementation of a two year trial (Palm Island)
- Sometimes of course, circumstances themselves are the driver for change. As one Mornington Island worker noted “Unacceptable level of violence gave them little option if the pub was to remain.”
7 Who’s involved and taking ownership of the change?

Survey respondents were asked “On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is no involvement and 5 is fully involved, how would you rate the level of involvement of the following groups in efforts to improve service coordination in the community?”

The following Chart 4 shows that, as would be expected, involvement in efforts to improve service coordination in the community is seen as being highest among State Government stakeholders.

Seen as the least involved are the Community and the Commonwealth Government. In interviews, the full engagement of these two stakeholders (along with others) was identified as a critical prerequisite to moving the coordination agenda forward.

Of the Communities, Palm Island returned the best “involvement rating”.

![Chart 4: Levels of involvement by sector](chart4.png)

Involvement and ownership are, of course, quite different things. Ultimately, it is ownership (by all parties) of a change agenda that will largely determine the effectiveness of its implementation.

To test the levels of ownership of the effort to improve the coordination of services, participants were asked: “On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, please rate the level of ownership of these groups in the effort to improve the coordination of government services in the community”

Taking the average rating across all categories of 2.5 as the benchmark, the following Table 12 shows:

- Rating below the 2.5 benchmark were the Community and the Commonwealth (particularly on Palm Island)
- Rating significantly above the benchmark were State Government Staff and local managers
Table 12: Level of ownership of coordination efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington Is</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The community generally</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community managed services at a management level</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community managed services staff level</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NGOs at a local Management level</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NGOs at a regional &amp; State level</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NGOs at a staff level</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Council at a management level</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Council at a staff level</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Govt agencies at a local management level</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Govt agencies at a regional &amp; State level</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Govt agencies at a staff level</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Govt agencies at a management level</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Govt agencies at a regional &amp; State level</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Govt agencies at a staff level</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 What hasn’t changed?

Although not specifically asked about what hadn’t change, in response to the question “What is the single most significant negative change you have seen in the community over the past year?”, participants tended to identify what hadn’t changed rather than negative changes as such:

**Doomadgee**

- Council seems to be functioning at a very low level, we can’t reach land use agreements with them that should be very easy, the council members are willing the mayor is not
- The community is generally moving in reverse
- The community mistakenly believing that the Government Coordination committee was about secret government plans to take over Doomadgee, and not enough information provided to community about the Government Coordination role.
- Local stakeholders meeting ceased in Feb. 2006 therefore information dissemination to the local community ceased and there was little communication between stakeholders in the community

**Mornington Island**

- The AMP review has not delivered any change so is still not working
- That the Council are using the GCC office to do ADMIN to the Steering Committee and Council work
the rising incidence of drug use, particularly amongst the youth.

Due to the Government Coordination centre being established, the community and its leaders have become more complacent. There is more involvement in the decision making process, however there is no follow through. This can be assumed that the community chooses to believe that the Government will implement the changes discussed, without truly knowing the process towards making this change.

Increased negative publicity being distributed widely e.g. YouTube by members of the Doomadgee community themselves; this has set back community/government relations somewhat and have slowed down some work until 'matters are past'

Lack of MSC follow-up on community responsibilities; talking the talk but not walking their walk

Palm Island

The ongoing negative aspect to the community is the in-fighting and disharmony amongst community members. This is evident among individuals, families and community organisations and leads to a lack of progress, trust and unreliable engagement processes.

The implementation of the AMP and the focus on the control/punitive components but not diversion, detox, rehab and post rehab consequently an increase in sly grogging and drugs

Funding of mainstream NGOs instead of supporting and building up local community NGOs

The sidelining of the Community Council in the planning process in favour of the Future Directions Group that no PI people attend and the absolute control the Government has taken over the community

More drugs coming into the community, more teenagers affected

Lack of good community facilitator to control our own mob i.e. Alf Lacey

9 Blockages to change

Chart 5 below summarises survey responses for each community to the question “At which level do you consider are the major blockages to the effective coordination of Government services for this community?” Of particular note:

State management were seen as being the most significant source of blockage in responses for Mornington Island and Palm Island.

From the interviews it would appear that this is in part due to the perceived impact on the coordination agenda of the AMP process.

However, on Palm Island in particular, there was also a strong feeling from the spectrum of stakeholders that centrally driven interventions and program and budget design and decision-making was a major barrier to moving forward.

The Regional Management Level was seen as significantly less of a source of blockage on Palm Island - the one community where the DGC works from a Regional centre rather than the Community.
The local community level was seen as the most significant source of blockage to change in Doomadgee.

**Chart 5: Where are the blockages?**

![Chart showing blockages at different levels](chart5)

Although not exhaustive, the following summarises the major blockages to change on/for communities identified in survey and interview responses (not in any particular order):

**Shire Councils**

Shire Councils were seen by all stakeholder groups (including Councils) as problematic and as such, a source of blockage to change.

In particular, it is evident that there are difficult tensions for Councils' to manage between:

- The increasing pressure from the State Government (and others) to adopt a mainstream municipal role
- Expectations (Community and others) that some non-core business functions be maintained – particularly in the absence of viable non-government and/or community organisations to assume those responsibilities
- Their size and narrow income base resulting in a lack of personnel and capacity – particularly in the planning and development functions.

Similarly, their narrow income base acts as a disincentive for Councils to give-up non-core but income generating functions (e.g. Mornington Island – “Community does not see a need to change. Council need the pub as an income source. Complete focus on alcohol rather than anything else in life.”)

- Elected members caught up in community and family politics and factionalism rather than attempting to plot a middle course
- The forthcoming 2008 Council Elections which have added a certain inertia (and perhaps self-interest) to Council decision-making
- Regular senior management changes in Councils

While each of these factors is a source of blockage in itself, together it is apparent that they result in Councils’ being un-able to fulfil their strategic, environmental, social and infrastructure planning and development roles for the Community.
Community-based non-Government Organisations
The capacity of local community-based organisations and NGOs was regularly cited as a blockage to change particularly in terms of their:

- Ability to deliver programs and services that Shire Councils are being expected to jettison
- Skills and resource base

“Factionalism and turf issues” between local NGOs was also often identified as a blockage to change, along with a lack of accountability of those organisations to their communities.

It is also worth noting that, from interviews, the standing of the Justice Groups within each community appears to have undergone a battering in recent times given their perceived role in mandating the AMPs. As such, their authority and leadership status within communities appears to have fallen away in recent years – leaving what many commented is a leadership vacuum in the communities.

Government Agencies
Criticisms by community stakeholders and local and regional service workers and managers of Government agencies, and the blockages they create, focused primarily on:

- The lack of flexibility in centrally designed and managed programs
- Centrally initiated interventions and activities which cut-across, ignore and/or counter the established structures, processes and plans for communities
- Instances where Government officers display “systemic paternalism reflected in their attitude, demeanour and language”
- Not listening, let alone hearing
- Lack of meaningful, long-term investment by line agencies
- Lack of consistency across agencies and lack of continuity of staff who are working with/in communities

For Government stakeholders, the lack of progress in meeting staff accommodation needs on communities was identified as a very real impediment to agencies being able to improve service delivery.

Commonwealth / State Alignment
Across all levels and for all communities, participants identified the lack of alignment of Commonwealth activities with State initiatives and processes as a significant barrier to coordinated interventions and to real change.

While (potentially) the best example of Commonwealth engagement and alignment was on Mornington Island, where the Indigenous Coordination Centre (ICC) located an officer for 12 months with the DGC, very few stakeholders interviewed could identify their role or “how they fitted in” to the service delivery picture – quite the opposite to the response for the DGC on the Island.

At the other extreme, one Palm Island community member identified as a blockage: the “Commonwealth being allowed by community to operate as the loose cannon – big money; big talk; limited happenings”.

Resourcing – Dollars and decision making
Participants cited a lack of services and financial resources in/for the Communities as a significant blockage to change, compounded by the lack of flexible program and infrastructure resources that can be applied against locally designed solutions/responses to local priorities.
Coordination structures and processes
While a lack of sufficient progress in coordinating services was identified as a barrier to change, more often cited was poor or insufficient communication between:

- stakeholder agencies
- coordination / decision making structures and communities

As a pointer to the limitations of those coordination structures and processes, the following statement reflects similar comments made by number of managers and staff:

“Other agencies feel they cannot reach out beyond their policies and it appears they use their policies to argue they are unable to become involved.”

Similarly, community members on all communities identified as a blockage to change continuing instances of Managers or agencies imposing what they deem to be best for a community without consultation.

Also identified as blockages to progress were:

- Re-emerging, and in some instances continuing, problems with services and agencies accessing the communities without referral to each other or the DGC and/or providing irregular visits and lack of time when they do visit.
- “Service delivery sourced from Brisbane or another region that lacks knowledge of the community or local Government Coordination practices” (all communities)

Community
The Communities themselves were identified as a source of blockage by participants at all levels (including by community members and elders):

A key barrier to change identified by many service providers and managers as well as community members was an overall community mistrust of Government that has developed over many years as “community members and Communities have been subjected to many people entering the community full of promises and no change.”

This often deeply felt mistrust of Government has led to reluctance by communities to fully engage with Government led change

This manifests as “community politics”, “rivalry and personal agendas”, “existing factions” etc as factors hindering progress and communication.

A further often cited blockage was the lack of effective leadership on communities – “most are still talking about self-determination i.e. 1984 thinking and they have not moved into the next century”

9.1 Blockages to coordination of Government Services
In addition to the above general blockages to change, survey and interview participants identified a number of specific blockages to the effective coordination of government services:

- The silo nature of funding Government services and programs
- Lack of delegated authority at local and regional levels.
- Lack of participation by Government agencies in existing collaborative community engagement practices - particularly when interventions or consultation programs are set up from Brisbane. “Government consultation isolated from other practices leads to uncoordinated responses/services”.
- Similarly, “some key agencies don’t send the most senior staff to Negotiation Tables” while others (agencies and individuals) are seen to be “imposing what they deem to be best for a
community without any consultation” while others are “looking for excuses not to commit to the community”

- The lack of progress on land tenure issues and the resultant inability to build accommodation for staff and therefore to lift service levels
- The inconsistent approach of the Australian Government and their (at times) propensity at act and negotiate to the exclusion and/or disregard to the State Government initiatives – the lack of joined-up approach
- Lack of community capacity building and intervention and prevention services - allowing perpetrators to remain in the communities therefore forcing children and young people to leave.
- Integrated responses are rare.
- Lack of community trust in Government and a lack of communication/engagement with the community
- The level of negativity shown by some state agencies (who fail) to view these two communities as real places and where some people want to live - their mindsets think only of non-DOGIT type communities

9.2 Why aren’t service delivery gaps being sorted-out sorted out?
Participants were also asked to identify why service gaps in the communities were not being addressed. Common responses include:

- The lack of resourcing of Councils and as a result their lack of capacity generally - “Council’s lack of land management practices that would allow for planning and delivery of the required infrastructure for the community (housing, service centres, infrastructure, business)”
- The lack of capacity in community organisations – “We need to have a long term plan for change”.
- Lack of appropriate accommodation for staff and lack of progress on negotiating land for new infrastructure
- Lack of any definitive long term (funded) action to develop local people to take over local service delivery roles in the future.
- Insufficient project/recurrent funding generally. “Government has to realise that decades of underinvestment in DOGIT communities now needs to be caught up.”
- Insufficient coordination between State and Federal Governments.
- Services are not being held accountable. The community is always held accountable for their actions; it should be the same for services that don’t produce results.
- At a basic level, there remains a lack of communication between the State, Commonwealth and non-government sector about who is supplying what, by whom and when.
10 Good coordination - What works

10.1 What is good coordination?
Participants variously described good government coordination as:

**Common goals and direction**
- Where every service and allocation of funding is pooled to support the common vision of the Island.
- Where all the agencies have a known common goal and staff who have an interest in this.
- Identifying goals for the year, assigning responsibilities, quarterly evaluations of achievements or progress, involve NGOs as well as Commonwealth Government.
- There is no kingdom building; genuine common purpose to delivery of government services to a community.
- A highly visible and highly skilled on-the-ground local Coordinator to ensure effective cross-departmental coordination.
- Community is aware of the Governments role in the GCC and the State and Commonwealth agencies are utilising the services of the GCC effectively.
- Honest, realistic, shared goals - committed to delivering on government priorities and that recognises the needs of the particular community concerned.

**Engaging Community**
- Information sharing, open communication, equality within forums. At current too much stature is still given to those who fly in for meetings, when some should be given to those in the community who choose to make a difference.
- Services are working in sync for the best outcome for the community.
- Ensuring community protocols are upheld and local needs are identified, while maintaining good working relationships with all organisations who provide services to the community.
- Not continually sliding back into a “Government knows best” stance.

**Accountability**
- Good government coordination needs to attach authority in terms of decisions with the accountability of doing the work.
- When agencies come together to address a need for the community, not to meet the needs of the agencies.

**Communication**
- Clear and concise communication and empowerment to stay focussed on agencies core business.
- Director to have good people skills, patience & understanding, well organized, open, honest and trustworthy.

Best-practice examples provided by participants of successful coordinated activities involving several agencies included:
- The Senior Phase of Learning, Council Deputation Day, Palm Island Voice initiatives and Infrastructure Projects such as the PCYC on Palm Island.
The establishment of LIPAs

Agencies coordinating their visits to communities with those of the monthly court circuit

The Community Justice Group working with Probation and Parole

Negotiation Tables

The Guest House (Doomadgee)

The Safe Haven and First Placement House projects on Palm Island - rather than 2 lots of consultation DOC, and Child Safety have shared findings and run meetings together.

Dept of Communities Coordinate travel between ATSIP staff, Youth Justice & CCSQ.

Staff always advise each other of planned travel to Doomadgee which allows them opportunity to travel together & utilise/share accommodation if necessary.

Providing child health checks - a day long event which involved several health agencies (local and visiting) and has remained on track with follow-up/recalls etc. (Mornington Island)

10.2 Key success factors for good coordination

Survey and interview participants were also asked the question: “Reflecting on the past year, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not important and 5 is very important; please rate the importance of these factors in the effective coordination of services in the community”:

As illustrated in the following Table 13 showing the average ratings across all survey respondents, all of the factors listed proved to be important. In fact, for all communities each factor was rated at an average of over 4.

Table 13: Importance of factors in effective coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination structures</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes and procedures</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership agreements</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview and Survey participants were also asked to describe what they saw as the key factors contributing to good coordination and the Key Success Factors for effective service coordination.

The following categorisation of the range responses provides 10 Key Success Factors for effective service coordination on communities

1. Time
   - to build trust and relationships
   - to establish a shared vision and plan
   - Long-term investment for real change

2. Trust and building relationships
   - of the community towards governments and agencies
   - between agencies
   - earned through open, transparent communication and consultation with the community
built on open, transparent, and regular communication between all stakeholders and a shared knowledge of who is doing what.

Staff who are able to listen, explain themselves to the community and build consensus.

3. Open communication,
- The casual nature of the meetings has a major impact ... the openness of the forum allows for community to sit in on the meetings, giving ownership back to the community.
- Being prepared to make the effort and working hard at understanding things from a different perspective.
- Working together as partners. The development of positive relationships across both the community and Government.
- Listen to the community and speak more truthfully.

4. Leadership
- Strong leadership at a local level and also a real commitment from the DG Champions, Government Coordinator, Indigenous Service Delivery and the Local Member to making agencies both accountable and responsible for delivering services in a more effective manner.
- Local agencies driving the project.
- Holistic, multi-agency approach driven by the DGC (Palm Island).
- Availability of Government Coordination Centre facility on Palm Island for cross-agency information sharing, office-sharing and networking.
- Coordination of this leadership, pro-active, interested in the well-being of the community.
- Assist community leaders to step up, be trained and then get on with.
- Leadership and mandate.
- Effective government leaders at a local level. Strong support at a regional and central office level.
- Consistency in the management and delivery of Government Coordination activities.
- Willingness to work together towards the big picture.
- Agencies preparing for their visits in advance and letting the community know, so that they don't arrive as a surprise.

5. Intent and commitment
- A willingness to work for the benefit of the whole community not just your organisation.
- Build effective partnerships and strong working relationships.
- Willingness from community and agencies to make Coordination a success.
- Preparedness to share resources, including people and facilities.
- Commitment of all agencies to contribute.

6. Effective planning.
- Established agreements around realistic objectives and what needs to be worked on, by who, when and how.
- One plan; one direction.
7. Capable, committed and well supported people

- Whole of government service delivery plan
- With good negotiation skills and influential networks.
- Effective at running meetings;
- Well supported by their district, regional and state management and appropriately remunerated
- Lower staff turnover through better pay, conditions and support

8. Resources

- Encouragement and financial incentives from funding bodies
- Sufficient resources to do the work.
- Capacity building of community.
- Inject some real money into initiatives
- Sufficient resources to deliver services

9. Coordination Structures, Processes and Procedures

- Coordination to be independent of service delivery
- Open and transparent communication; open and transparent decision making;
- Better communication about the general business and allowing for community interaction.
- Sustainability of Coordination, firm guidelines for whoever sits in position

10. Empowered partners

- More effective support of Council
- Build-up local NGOs rather than outside groups coming in
- Real communication – listening and hearing – with the community

10.3 Effective approaches to overcoming blockages to change

Further key success factors can be identified in participant’s responses to questioning about what they saw as the most effective approaches to overcoming blockages to change:

**True whole-of-government approach**

- The establishment of Place Based budgets and outcomes.
- Program Managers having performance measures related to place.
- Whole of Government outcomes for each community.
- More effective dialogue and cooperation with Australian Government at central office level
- Increased flexible funding pools for communities
- Tear down the silo mentality in Brisbane and Townsville and Mount Isa
- Government must be prepared to do things very differently—we must think outside the square; we seem to be afraid to do things in new ways
- Resources to deliver services – “There is no real money for this – give some real money to this”

**Devolved decision-making**
Regionalisation of decision-making and place-based budget
- delegated authority and flexibility of programme decisions
- more practically focused MOU or agreement with Australian Government about how to engage and work with DOGIT communities
- Director Government Coordination to have more delegation to reduce red tape blockages.
- GCO needs to work more strategically; stop interfering in local levels; work with DG champions and commonwealth

Community Ownership
- Community desire. Joined up community
- Developing community ownership
- Working in partnership with community organisations

Communication, consultation and engagement
- Community awareness of core business of specific agencies/departments.
- Clear accountability standards.
- Community engagement in the process - planned and Coordinated approaches
- Relationship building - between agencies and community

Leadership
- DG Champion intervention when required
- Building strong leaders Make sure there are mechanisms in place to provide long term sustainability

Supporting Staff “on the ground”
- Incentives to attract higher quality staff.
- Provide more support to the Director and GCC staff
- Give the staff in these communities’ appropriate debriefing and “time-out“ so that they can continue to strive for excellence“
- Sharing resources, Sharing information, Involve more local people in service delivery

11 Service gaps, overlaps and priorities

11.1 Service gaps
The most common response to survey and interview questions about service gaps was an exacerbated “everything” or “where do I start” - in essence, the gap is between the level of services available on the communities now and that which would be provided to urban, regional or even non-remote communities and individuals with a comparable set of issues and problems.

The following Table 14 samples the range of service gaps identified by participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14: Service Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doomadgee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't think that there is enough awareness about the Dullama Committee and I don't see the results of their work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Child Services/Safety are meant to be providing service from ISA but they seem to try, as much as possible, to be ineffective and thereby put the agencies, on the ground in DMD at risk due to their in-action*

PCYC

Mental Health

lack of infrastructure

Detox Rehab Centre - majority of clients in Mt Isa Centres are Doomadgee people when they go back to Doomadgee there is nothing for them to do but revert back to drinking.

Training for local community people to teach service delivery etc.

Capacity building.

### Mornington Island

- Lack of staff housing/infrastructure
- Alcohol/drug counselling on the Island permanently.
- Housing for Govt. workers to be built to a good standard.
- Rehab, counselling, more frequent barge supplies especially fruit & vegies.

### Palm Island

- Support for men
- Services for families
- Support for children
- Community infrastructure (water, sewerage, roads, streetlights etc)

### 11.2 Service overlaps

Service overlaps were not generally identified as a significant issue – service gaps were of much greater and more glaring importance.

Critical comments raised include:

- Counselling appears to be offered by many, but I am not sure who receives it and whether this is effective.
- Possibly: Allied Health / Community Health / Qld Health?
- Social & promotional well-being - Qld Health & RFDS Youth Workers do similar work to ATODS officer
- On paper there may be some service overlaps but, whether or not these services are actually being provided is another thing.
- Dept Ed & Training and Commonwealth - Commonwealth will not communicate their agenda so it is difficult to identify whether there is service overlap
- Too many NGOs doing similar or very similar roles

### 11.3 Priorities for improving service coordination

Four broad categories of priorities for improving service coordination were identified by participants:
Improved planning

- A development plan with community focused key vision. All activates to work to the common vision. All funding and support driven by meeting that single plan and leveraging off each other
- Set clear priorities and then advise the community. Agreed priorities and practices
- Joined up budgets; pooled funding
- WoG service delivery plan.
- Government Departments committing to LIPA priorities
- Common Vision
- Health Promotion and Chronic Disease Prevention - Integration of community health and community development structures and strategies
- Set achievable objectives at the beginning of each year. Clearly defined goals
- All on the same page, common purpose
- Clarity of accountabilities
- Government services - the various agencies need to get together to discuss the issues as the Negotiation Table process focus is on one key issue at a time and is at a higher strategic level.
- Better linkages between Government and NGOs

Coordinated engagement and consultation

- Establishment of effective local (Palm Island based) service providers' forums and meetings. Practically focussed.
- Promote/coerce involvement in joined up engagement and community consultation mechanisms such as Future Directions Group.
- open and transparent communication; community involvement in decision making
- Talk to all of us; Community consultation
- Install a permanent QGAP who can act as a focal point for delivery of services.
- Better communication Community and other agency awareness of all services available in each community. Regular coordinated meetings between regional and local managers of health, education and community support services
- Central point on Palm, Central Regional Hub in Townsville, Power from Council to drive activity

Structures and processes

- Understanding that one model does not fit all
- DG Champion support of model for their community
- Relationships and team building
- Base Director in Mt Isa with weekly visits to the community on set days. (Mornington Island)
- Base Project Officer in the community with set reporting mechanisms in place to report to Mt Isa (Mornington Island)
- Director of Government Coordination living and breathing in the community to see first hand the real issues, rather than fly in and out. (Doomadgee)
- Appoint a Proactive Director for Government Coordination (Doomadgee)
Council to allocate secretariat for stakeholder meetings to follow up on actions arising etc. this position can work closely with project officer. (Mornington Island)

Adopt a ‘One stop’ approach to coordination of services.

Follow up on decision making process.

Establish a permanent QGAP so there is a centralised point of reference.

Local Government managers having greater decision making ability

Coordinated approach to service delivery

Support, resource and encourage staff

Provide a safe place for people who choose to work in these areas and represent State Government Services Providers

Remunerate people appropriately for being denied access to resources that people in ISA, TSV and BNE have access to

Recognise and celebrate the excellent staff who are working on the front-line* to provide services in extremely difficult environments"*  

Skilled & retained staff. Suitable working and living accommodation.

Money and equipment to do what we are paid to do

Provide a safe work and lifestyle balance for the staff in these areas so that they can continue to be proactive participants in the provision of State Government Services

More staff on the ground is needed to support the Coordinator position. An actual office team needs to be implemented for better services to be implemented. At present the two positions are not working and there needs to be more in office infrastructure in order for the office to work efficiently.

More decision making at local level. Taking into account local Government employees’ opinions. Not fearing making an unpopular decision.

Respect the people who choose to work in these extraordinarily diverse and challenging places.

Good Leadership from regional and State level

More skilled staff

12 Coordination Structures & Processes

12.1 Improving communication and awareness about coordination

In response to questioning about what needed to be done to improve Communication and Awareness about the coordination of service provision, participants tended to focus on communications with the community as their first priority followed by improved communications between government agencies in particular and service providers more generally:

Improving Community engagement and awareness

Community Networking events

Allowing for community to become more involved in planning process.
- A consultative approach to service delivery.
- Better feedback of information to community.
- Regular Council open information sessions
- Establish a Community Consultative Committee to keep the community aware of what government is doing.
- Regular newsletter and use of local (indigenous) radio
- Stop operating from the premise that the whole community is a welfare case

It is worth noting that while community engagement was seen as a responsibility of all players, Councils were often singled out as having a particular responsibility for keeping communities better informed of events, initiatives and progress.

**Improving Government agency engagement and awareness**

- Consistent message required from all government agencies (backed up by behaviours) of need to work closely together from planning through to implementation and evaluation. (Perhaps next generation of LIPA can incorporate some stronger commitments about the how-to’s of working collaboratively.)
- In the initial year there was far too great a number of meetings (monthly) between relevant state and Commonwealth agencies. For the entire 2007, this has reduced to 2 meetings, which is far too infrequent.
- On-line site and Better telecommunications and IT services and training for staff
- A 'One-stop' point of contact.
- Put in a permanent full-time QGAP office
- Lower staff turn-over.
- Protocols to ensure all government access to the community is through the GC only.
- Introduce a Calendar of Events for Government agencies so they are aware of what dates Council have allocated for Government agencies to meet with them.
- Local community members who are employed with Dept. have the right to speak on behalf of their community instead of being afraid to lose their positions. Freedom of speech.
- Employees employed in these positions needs to be out there more in the community instead behind desks. Accessing those who don’t know

**Improving Service provider engagement and awareness**

- Formalised meetings with Specified outcomes rather than vague statements.
- The GCC should send out plain English information to agency staff explaining what government Coordination is about. In all honesty, agency staff are not interested in high level language glossy brochures that have little or no relevance to them
- Organisations need to be aware of how the community functions and provide their services accordingly.
- Organisations need to share information regarding the services they provide to the community i.e. statistics etc
- regular local meetings of locally based service providers with readily identifiable path for escalation of items
- Government and non-Government open day to promote community awareness.
Of course, better communications and awareness will not necessarily guarantee improved engagement – “Whilst all groups have been consulted and communicated with there are some members who choose to be obstructive and divisive ... because they can!”

12.2 Involvement of senior levels of government
Survey respondents were asked: “On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very negative and 5 is very positive, please rate the impact of the involvement of senior levels of government in efforts to improve government service coordination in this community?”

Chart 6 below illustrates an essentially negative rating. From interviews it would appear that this rating is coloured by:

- For Palm Island in particular, a apparently growing frustration/resentment at Central Office and ex-region stakeholders intervening on and visiting the island outside of established frameworks, structures, agreements and processes
- The personal style and practices of the individuals involved – particularly their capacity to take the time, to listen, explain and to build trust

![Chart 6: Impact of senior levels of Government](chart6.png)

12.3 Models of Coordination
Survey and interview participants were asked: “Considering the experience of this community over the last year, which of the following models do you consider would be most effective in achieving real coordination of government services:

- Director, Government Coordination position located in a Regional Centre with local support staff in the community with the Director occasionally travelling to the community
- Director, Government Coordination position located in the community with fewer support staff and occasional travel to the Regional Centre”

As shown in Chart 7 below, some 60% of respondents favoured the DGC being located in a Regional centre. Community members generally had a stronger preference for a locally based DGC.
Survey and interview participants provided a range of arguments in support of their choice:

**Community based DGC**
Community members in particular (but certainly not uniformly) and, to a lesser extent, community based workers tended to support the Community-based DGC option.

Importantly however, in most instances these stakeholders were arguing for:
- a local presence for the Coordination function rather than for the DGC function specifically
- a DGC with a deep understanding of the community and its circumstances

Comments in support of the community-based option included:

- Local representation creates a far better relationship with a local community. Otherwise the perception and attitude in the community could lead to fobbed off and forgotten again
- The officer needs to live in the community to truly experience the community issues and problems. Then change will occur as the officer will realise the problems experienced daily by locals.
- Local approach, better relationship with the local community
- The community can develop a sense of trust with government if there is a person in the community implementing strategies and in turn the person can develop build community ownership of strategies

**Region based DGC**
Service managers and staff, Councils and DGCs themselves generally argued strongly for the Region-based option. In discussing this option further, stakeholders invariably also underlined the importance in this model of having the “right person” in the community-based Project Officer support role.

Comments in support of the Region-based option included:
The Director needs to link with the key regional decision makers for Government and this is best achieved through being located in the regional centre. However quality Project staff on the community is essential.

My Department is based in Townsville and most Coordination meetings are in Townsville. This ensures that we can all attend and significant costs of flights and time are not incurred.

The most important sphere of influence where the Director needs to operate in is at the Regional level with other senior managers and where the bulk of service decisions (and in many cases service delivery) is located.

All the decision makers are in Mount Isa, all the Managers that the Director should be talking to and networking with for community outcomes are in Mount Isa - what is the point of having the Director in the communities. I think it is important and necessary to have support staff in the communities, but not the Director.

Everyone they need to speak to and meet with is not in the community, meaning the ATSIP Project Officers based in Mount Isa are picking up the load of what the Directors core role is. It is pointless and not effective the way the model is at the moment.

This way they can tap into other agencies at a higher level. Why doesn’t each agency have a Government coordination role attached to the region - sole purpose to help negotiate and coordinate services

All major stakeholders are based in Mt Isa the Director should be present at every RMCN & Doomadgee stakeholder meeting to improve Government Coordination.

12.4 Local coordination structures

Survey participants were asked to rate the performance of the local Coordination structure (Futures Directions Group on Palm Island, the Dullama Committee on Doomadgee and the Coordination Steering Committee on Mornington Island) in 5 areas on a 5-point scale, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good.

Of the results shown in Table 15 below, the Doomadgee score is not considered representative and certainly was not supported in interviews with stakeholders. From those discussions it is apparent that the initial structure of the Dullama Committee met significant resistance and even anger – principally because Council and a range of community organisations were not included in the structure or its processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee structure</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington Is</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The slightly negative scores in all areas for Palm and Mornington Islands (and more representative of the views of interviewee on Doomadgee) appears to arise from concerns about how these structures are mandated and how the engage the community.

From those discussions it is apparent that a two tiered structure/model is required:
A regular open community forum which discusses and agrees change priorities and processes

A regular representative and inclusive committee/group meeting that drives the agreed change priorities and reports progress to the community forum

This approach was also argued by respondents to the survey question “What do you consider the most important improvement that could be made to improve the effectiveness of the Future Directions Group / Dullama Committee / Coordination Steering Committee?”

- The community needs to come to the Future Directions Group having discussed issues amongst themselves. This is the purpose of the Mayor’s Vision Plan Meetings.
- Broader and more consistent attendance by community
- Better promotion of role of the FDG and more effective dissemination of information from the meetings
- Have the committee engage with the North West RMCN so senior managers are kept informed
- Recognition of all State Government Key Stakeholders who work and live in this community (not the district level). Ensure the committee remains focussed on core business and not get involved in local and state politics.
- Agenda items to have a strict time frame so that old issues are not continually revisited.
- A secretariat role given to someone, at present, it looks like the GCC staff are a secretary to the Council and I think the Director of GCC should be doing more than this.
- Each key member should submit a plan as their business and their goals for that month. This will provide a more co-ordinated approach and allow for members to see everyone’s work and to access their own achievements.
- More community participation and ownership

12.5 Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement

Awareness of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement for each community was high at 96% of survey respondents and in the order of 90% of those interviewed.

In interview it was also apparent that expectations of the LIPAs process are high – most saw it as a development that had real potential to establish a common agenda and priorities for the community.

That is not to say that all comments were positive:

- Community members and organisations responded much more sceptically to LIPAs than others: - “good start but we’ll see”; “Another plan! We’ve seen too many plans”
- Stakeholders particularly on Doomadgee and Palm island expressed concern about whether Councils had “over promised” and would be able to deliver some of the responsibilities they had signed up to
- Community members and organisations in particular and stakeholders as well questioned or expressed concerns about how the LIPA linked or integrated with existing community based plans (Palm Is. Vision Plan) and/or how the fitted into a strategic or vision framework for the community
For Doomadgee, a range of stakeholders were strongly of the view that limiting the signatories for the LIPA to the State and the Council and not including (buying-in) a range of other stakeholders as had been done elsewhere was an significant deficiency and would fail to have any community ownership.

Survey participants were also asked to rate the impact that the establishment of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement has made to the community on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is no impact and 5 is significant impact.

As shown in the chart below (and largely because of the comments cited above), responses were neutral overall but fairly divided at the individual community level.

Survey participants were also asked to nominate their priorities for improving the effectiveness of the LIPA for community. The range of comments included:

- Accountability to the community - Review and input processes.
- Achievements, Reporting, Flexibility
- Strong leadership and accountability by the Director GC
- Reporting and review by and to community on a regular basis
- Regular communication of LIPA goals and outcomes to all stakeholders.
- LIPA should ideally be signed off by state-wide, regional and local-level managers to militate against buck-passing and abdication of responsibilities
- All items discussed at Negotiation Table that are agreed on appear in LIPA.
- Strong leadership by GCO and Council
- Actioning agreed items within the given timeframes. Actioning all items
- Government Departments at a central and regional level committing to LIPA priorities.
- Commitment by government - needs resources to ensure that it delivers on its priorities.
- Needs community to work with government to deliver services in a shared way.
- Government will never be able to deliver on all of the outcomes without local involvement in at least some of the identified issues.
- Let DASC get on with it’s business; stop trying to speed them up all the time just to meet Government reporting timeframes.

Chart 8: Impact of Local Indigenous Partnership Agreements
## Appendix 1 – Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>Alcohol Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATODS</td>
<td>Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIT</td>
<td>Barrier Reef Institute of TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEPR</td>
<td>Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATSIP</td>
<td>Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>Director Government Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Education Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC</td>
<td>Government Coordination Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIPA</td>
<td>Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMC</td>
<td>Meeting Challenges, Making Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCYC</td>
<td>Police Citizens Youth Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Service Delivery Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 – Survey Response Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Community that the survey is being completed for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doomadgee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mornington Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Which best describes your position/role? (Only select one answer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community member</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>400%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council member</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organisation worker</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organisation manager...</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government worker</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government manager</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Government worker</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Government managers</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Champion</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Do you know who holds the position of Director, Government Coordination for this community? (Only select one answer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is totally incorrect, and 5 is totally correct, please rate the following statement as it applies to this community - “Services generally in the community are working together to a common goal / heading in a common direction”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is totally incorrect, and 5 is totally correct, please rate the following statement as it applies to this community - “Government services/agencies in the community are working together to a common goal / heading in a common direction”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is no improvement and 5 is significantly improved, how would you rate the coordination of services generally (Government, Non-government and community managed services) in the community over the past year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 14. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is *no improvement* and 5 is *significantly improved*, how would you rate the coordination of Government services in the community over the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is little *impact* and 5 is *significant impact*, how would you rate the impact of government coordination activities in the community over the last year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 18. Which of the following statements best describes how far have we gone towards *whole-of-government* planning and coordination of services in the community? *(Only select one answer)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level of Coordination between government agencies</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some coordination in place but it is ad-hoc</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination in place for priority issues</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole-of Govt Coordination in place but not yet fully effective</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole-of Govt Coordination in place and fully effective</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 20. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is *no involvement* and 5 is *fully involved*, how would you rate the level of involvement of the following groups in efforts to improve service coordination in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The community</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community managed services</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-government organisations</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Council</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Government</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 21. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is “not effective” and 5 is “very effective”, how effective has communication been in the community and in government agencies about the new approach to coordination of services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Not Effective</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Very Effective</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 22. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is *no awareness* and 5 is *fully aware*, what do you believe is the level of awareness about government coordination efforts among:
30 Reflecting on the past year, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not important and 5 is very important, please rate the importance of these factors in the effective coordination of services in the community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination structures</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes and procedures</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership agreements</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 At which level do you consider are the major blockages to the effective coordination of Government services for this community? (Only select one answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State management level</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local service delivery level</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional management level</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community level</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local service management level</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 Do you consider that the Director, Government Coordination can most effectively address these blockages by being located locally where the services are delivered or regionally from where the services are (generally) managed? (Only select one answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionally</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 For this community, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, please rate the current level coordination of government activities in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service planning &amp; design</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service funding / grants</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service management &amp; decision making</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, please rate the level of ownership of these groups in the effort to improve the coordination of government services in the community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The community generally</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community managed services at a management level</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community managed services staff level</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-government organisations at a local Management level</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-government organisations at a regional &amp; State level</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-government organisations at a staff</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 38 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very negative and 5 is very positive; please rate the impact of the involvement of senior levels of government in efforts to improve government service coordination in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Council at a management level</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Council at a staff level</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government agencies at a local</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government agencies at a regional &amp; State level</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government agencies at a staff level</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Government agencies at a</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Government agencies at a</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional &amp; State level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Government agencies at a</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - very negative 8% 14% 29% 18%
2 25% 29% 29% 27%
3 42% 43% 29% 36%
4 8% 14% 14% 12%
5 - very positive 17% 0% 0% 6%

### 42 Considering the experience of this community over the last year, which of the following models do you consider would be most effective in achieving real coordination of government services: (Only select one answer)

- DGC located in a Regional Centre 55% 67% 62% 60%
- DGC located in the community 45% 33% 38% 40%

### 45 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, rate the performance of the Government Coordination Steering Committee in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee structure</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 47 Are you aware of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement for the community?

- Yes 89% 100% 100% 96%
- No 11% 0% 0% 4%

### 48 On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is no impact and 5 is significant impact, how do you rate the impact that the establishment of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement has made to the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Doomadgee</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Palm Is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAKEHOLDER’S SURVEY

INTRODUCTION
This survey is being undertaken by an independent consultant as part of a Pre-Evaluation Study into Government Coordination and its Development in 3 Indigenous Communities (Mornington Island, Doomadgee and Palm Island.)

The Study will document what is and isn’t working with government coordination activities that have developed in these three locations to identify the learnings and insights gained from the experiences of the stakeholders involved.

While the Study has a particular focus on the coordination of Government services it is also examining the coordination of service delivery more generally in the community, including the provision of services to the community by government and non-government agencies and people - such as education and schooling services, training, health services, police, counselling, legal advice/support, child care, etc

From these learnings the Study will help inform the future design of government coordination in remote Indigenous communities across the State, including: the allocation of Government coordination resources; engagement strategies, and good practice in achieving coordination objectives.

The Study will be followed by a full review of the government coordination program across the State in mid-2008.

SECTION 1 – Background
1. Your Name___________________________________________________________
2. I agree to have my comments in this survey attributed to me in the Study’s final report.
   __ Yes __ No
3. I agree to the researchers contacting me should they need to follow-up any comments I make in this survey.
   __ Yes __ No
4. Please indicate the community that the survey is being completed for:
   __□Doomadgee __□Mornington Island __□Palm Island
5. Which bests describes your position/role? (Only select one answer)
   _ Community member _ State Government manager
   _ Council member _ Commonwealth Government worker
   _ Community organisation worker _ Commonwealth Government manager
   _ Community organisation manager _ Government Champion
   _ State Government worker

SECTION 2 – Reviewing the past year
6. Do you know who holds the position of Director, Government Coordination for this community? (Only select one answer)
   __ Yes __ No

7. What do you see as the main role of the Director, Government Coordination in the community?

8. What is the single most significant positive change you have seen in the community over the past year?
9. Who or what was the key person/people/organisation that made the change happen? (How did it come about?)

10. What is the single most significant negative change you have seen in the community over the past year?

11. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is totally incorrect, and 5 is totally correct, please rate the following statement as it applies to this community - "Services generally in the community are working together to a common goal / heading in a common direction"
   Rating .. ___

12. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is totally incorrect, and 5 is totally correct, please rate the following statement as it applies to this community - “Government services/agencies in the community are working together to a common goal / heading in a common direction"
   Rating .. ___

13. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is no improvement and 5 is significantly improved, how would you rate the coordination of services generally (Government, Non-government and community managed services) in the community over the past year?
   Rating .. ___

14. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is no improvement and 5 is significantly improved, how would you rate the coordination of Government services in the community over the past year?
   Rating .. ___

15. Can you give an example of where several agencies have coordinated the way they provide services and it is working well in the community?

16. What is the major factor contributing to this working well?

17. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is little impact and 5 is significant impact, how would you rate the impact of government coordination activities in the community over the last year?
   Rating .. ___

18. Which of the following statements best describes how far have we gone towards whole-of-government planning and coordination of services in the community? (Only select one answer)
   _ Low level of Coordination between government agencies
   _ Some coordination in place but it is ad-hoc
   _ Coordination in place for priority issues
   _ Whole-of Govt Coordination in place but not yet fully effective
   _ Whole-of Govt Coordination in place and fully effective

19. How would you describe good government coordination?

20. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is no involvement and 5 is fully involved, how would you rate the level of involvement of the following groups in efforts to improve service coordination in the community?
   The community .. ___
   Local Community managed services .. ___
   Other non-government organisations .. ___
   Local Council .. ___
   State Government .. ___
   Commonwealth Government .. ___

21. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is “not effective” and 5 is “very effective”, how effective has communication been in the community and in government agencies about the new approach to coordination of services?
   Rating .. ___

22. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is no awareness and 5 is fully aware, what do you believe is the level of awareness about government coordination efforts among:
23. Please list 3 things that need to be done to improve communication and awareness about coordination of the provision of services?

24. What isn’t changing with **service coordination generally** in the community, what are the 3 major **blockages** or resistance to change?

25. What isn’t changing with **Government service coordination** in the community, what are the 3 major **blockages** or resistance to change?

26. Can you identify any service delivery gaps in the community (missing services that the community needs)? *If no go, to Question 28.*

27. Why do you believe these problems haven’t been sorted out?

28. Can you identify any service overlaps in the community (several agencies doing the same things)? *If no go to Question 30.*

29. Why do you believe these problems haven’t been sorted out?

**SECTION 3 - What have we learnt over the past year**

30. Reflecting on the past year, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is *not important* and 5 is *very important*, please rate the importance of these factors in the effective coordination of services in the community:

| Leadership .......... | Coordination structures ...... |
| People ................. | Processes and procedures .. |
| Relationships .......... | Communication .............. |
| Partnership agreements ...... |

31. What do you see as the **3 key success factors** for effective coordination of **services generally** in this community?

32. What do you see as the **3 key success factors** for effective coordination of **government only services** in this community?

33. At which level do you consider are the **major blockages to the effective coordination** of **Government services** for this community? *(Only select one answer)*

| State management level | Local service delivery level |
| Regional management level | Local community level |
| Local service management level |

34. What do you see as the **3 most effective approaches** to addressing these blockages?

35. Do you consider that the Director, Government Coordination can most effectively address these blockages by being **located** locally where the services are delivered or regionally from where the services are (generally) managed? *(Only select one answer)*

| Locally | Don’t know/not sure |

36. For this community, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is *very poor* and 5 is *very good*, please rate the current level **coordination of government activities** in the following areas:

| Service planning & design .......... | |
| Service funding / grants ............... | |
| Service management & decision making .. | |
| Service delivery ......................... | |
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37. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, please rate the level of ownership of these groups in the effort to improve the coordination of government services in the community:

- The community generally .............................................................. __
- Local Community managed services at a management level ........ __
- Local Community managed services staff level .......................... __
- Other non-government organisations at a local Management level .. __
- Other non-government organisations at a regional & State level ..... __
- Other non-government organisations at a staff level ...................... __
- Local Council at a management level ........................................... __
- Local Council at a staff level ...................................................... __
- State Government agencies at a local management level .......... __
- State Government agencies at a regional & State level .............. __
- State Government agencies at a staff level ................................. __
- Commonwealth Government agencies at a management level __
- Commonwealth Government agencies at a regional & State level __
- Commonwealth Government agencies at a staff level __

38. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very negative and 5 is very positive, please rate the impact of the involvement of senior levels of government in efforts to improve government service coordination in this community?

Rating .. __

39. How could the involvement of senior levels of government in efforts to improve service coordination be made more effective?

SECTION 4 – How can we improve

40. What do you believe are the 3 priorities for improving the coordination of government services in this community?

41. What do you believe are the 3 things that would most improve the coordination of all services generally (Government, non-government and community owned/managed) in the community?

42. Considering the experience of this community over the last year, which of the following models do you consider would be most effective in achieving real coordination of government services? (Only select one answer)

- Director, Government Coordination position located in a Regional Centre with local support staff in the community with the Director occasionally travelling to the community
- Director, Government Coordination position located in the community with fewer support staff and occasional travel to the Regional Centre

43. Please give your reasons for your choice in Question 42

MORNINGTON ISLAND ONLY

45. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, rate the performance of the Government Coordination Steering Committee in the following areas:

- a) Committee structure - does it have enough mandate and report to the right people?
- b) Membership - does it include the right people, are they fully engaged?
- c) Role - does it have a clear role and it is pursuing it?
- d) Processes - does it work as a group, is it engaging all stakeholders?
- e) Supports - does it receive the right level of admin and other support?

46. What do you consider the most important improvement that could be made to improve the effectiveness of the Coordination Steering Committee?

47. Are you aware of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement for the community?

_ Yes  _ No
48. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is no impact and 5 is significant impact, how do you rate the impact that the establishment of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement has made to the community?
   Rating .. __

49. What do you consider are the 3 priorities for improving the effectiveness of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement for community?

PALM ISLAND ONLY

50. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, rate the performance of the Government Future Directions Group in the following areas:
   a) Committee structure - does it have enough mandate and report to the right people?
   b) Membership - does it include the right people, are they fully engaged?
   c) Role - does it have a clear role and it is pursuing it?
   d) Processes - does it work as a group, is it engaging all stakeholders?
   e) Supports - does it receive the right level of admin and other support?

51. What do you consider the most important improvement that could be made to improve the effectiveness of the Future Directions Group?

52. Are you aware of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement being negotiated for the community?
   __ Yes __ No

53. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is very negative and 5 is very positive, how do you rate your expectation of the impact that the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement will have on the community?
   Rating .. __

54. What do you consider are the 3 priorities for ensuring the effectiveness of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement for community?

DOOMADGEE ONLY

55. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very poor and 5 is very good, rate the performance of the Government Dullama Committee in the following areas:
   a) Committee structure - does it have enough mandate and report to the right people?
   b) Membership - does it include the right people, are they fully engaged?
   c) Role - does it have a clear role and it is pursuing it?
   d) Processes - does it work as a group, is it engaging all stakeholders?
   e) Supports - does it receive the right level of admin and other support?

56. What do you consider the most important improvement that could be made to improve the effectiveness of the Dullama Committee?

57. Are you aware of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement for the community?
   __ Yes __ No

58. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is no impact and 5 is significant impact, how do you rate the impact that the establishment of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement has made to the community?
   Rating .. __

59. What do you consider are the 3 priorities for improving the effectiveness of the Local Indigenous Partnership Agreement for community?
Appendix 4 – Integrated Case Management

The following overheads from presentations provided by the Author to service workers in Townsville and Mt Isa are provided as a brief introduction to the service model.

Integrated Case Management
Towards a model and inter-agency protocol for Townsville / Thuringowa

Workshop Planning Session #1, 30 March ‘06

Workshop Purpose:
To identify and agree the purpose and key features of an Integrated Case Management approach for itinerant and other homeless people with complex needs in Townsville/Thuringowa

Facilitated by: Chris Chappell
www.cichappell.com

What Is ICM

“A team approach to coordinating various services for a specific client through a cohesive and sensible plan”.

“All members of the team work together to provide assessment, planning, monitoring and evaluation.”

“The team includes all service providers who have a role in implementing the plan and wherever possible the client and / or their family.”

“Integrated case management is used when the client has complex and longer-term needs requiring clients and service providers to develop a single integrated service plan.”

Is there a more appropriate alternative definition?
See Resource # 1A & 1C

ICM – Moving From Collaboration to Integration

- Collaboration: Working or acting together
  Agencies are familiar with each other’s missions and roles, key staff work with each other at the client level, but retain separate systems, decision making powers and planning.

- Integration: Combine the parts into a whole
  Agencies are familiar with each other’s missions and roles, key staff work with each other at the client level, sharing decision making in a team format, producing a single plan that meets all system mandates and that is owned by the entire team (including the client &/or their family if possible).
Who are the clients of ICM

“Chronically homeless and itinerant people of Townville & Thuringowa”

“Homeless and itinerant people with complex needs”

Or is there a more appropriate definition?

Is there a shared understanding among all relevant agencies?

Who are the Key participating / stakeholder agencies?

Initial Intervention & Referral to ICM.

- PLOs & Police
- St Lukes
-Community Patrol
-RCHDC
-ATODS
-Who else?

ICM

- St Lukes
- Dept Housing
-Centrelink
- ATODS
- Who else?

Key Principles for ICM

- Client centred service
- Building on strengths
- Advocacy
- Recognising diversity
- Collaboration and teamwork
- Mutual respect
- Participation
- Accountability
- A holistic approach
- Continuity
- Transitions
- Others?

See Resource # 1B
Goals of ICM

- People work towards a common goal (i.e. client wellbeing)
- Clients get needed services and information
- Clients learn new skills
- Clients feel respected and supported
- Promotes understanding of the clients cultural context and way of doing things
- Leads to client’s involvement in decision making
- To provide information and services within the context of a coordinated, proactive, strengths based process
- To engage clients and their families
- To identify and access resources through cooperation, collaboration and creative team work
- To practice, model and improve problem solving strategies
- Others?

The ICM Process

ICM Process Components

- A holistic approach to working with clients
- Respectful and consistent involvement
- The development of trusting relationships
- Common language
- Shared decision making
- Clarity of roles
- Information sharing and frank communication
- Shared responsibility and accountability to other professionals and the clients
- A mechanism for resolving conflicts
- Others?

Resource # 1C
ICM Activity Components

- Integrated Case Conferences
- Proactive assessment, planning review and implementation of case plans
- Follow through and follow up
- Assignment of case co-ordinator / case manager
- Helpful documentation
- Others?

Can we agree on the Why, What and Who?

Workshop Session #2 will focus on the How and When of ICM.

Are we close to broad agreement on:
- What ICM is,
- Who the clients are,
- Who the key stakeholders agencies are,
- The broad principles to be applied
- The Goals of ICM
- The key stages, features and activities of the ICM Process

What is the process for finalising an inter-agency agreement or statement of commitment to the ICM initiative?

See Resource #1A
Integrated Case Management

Towards a model and inter-agency protocol for Townsville / Thuringowa

Planning Workshop Session #2.
30 March ‘06

Workshop Purpose:
To adapt and flesh-out the Generic Case Management process in light of:
- the circumstances of our clients,
- our experience and policy and program parameters, and
- the learnings of the Cairns and Sydney Street Based Outreach Services

Facilitated by: Chris Chappell
www.cichappell.com
Generic Case Management Process Map

1. System entry / Initial Screening

2. Assess client needs/strengths, identify support structure

3. Assist client to set goals & priorities
   - Develop an Action Plan
   - Decide who will do what by when

4. Provide direct service
   - Carry out your action

5. Does client need support to carry out action?
   - YES
     - Provide support
   - NO
     - Moniter & review

6. Have goals been achieved?
   - NO
     - Identify Barriers to achieving goals
     - Reassess client needs
   - YES
     - YES
     - Develop an exit plan
     - Case Closure
     - Obtain Client & Worker feedback
     - Reschedule for later review or Intervention
   - NO
     - YES
     - Provide follow-up
     - Case Closure
     - Obtain Client & Worker feedback

2. Assess Client’s needs, strengths & support structures

What do we need to agree on?
- Who does the Assessment
- Its purpose and how we know whether it is successful
- Who shares the information gathered
- The assessment model or tool we will use
- Any policy or protocols required
- Other?

Resources:
4. Cairns Social & Living Skills Checklist
5. SAAP Assessment Checklist
6. Example Information Sharing Consent Form

3. Assist Client to set goals and priorities & Develop an Action Plan

What do we need to agree on?
- Who assists the client in this stage
- Who’s involved in any case plan / action plan meeting
- The purpose of the Action Plan and how we know whether it is successful
- Who shares the information gathered
- The goal setting & action planning model or tool we will use
- Any policy or protocols required
- Other?

Resources:
6. Example Release of Information Consent Forms
7. Example Action Plan Templates
4. & 5. Provide Services, Carry out agreed actions, Support Client

What do we need to agree on?
- Who is case manager,
- How are they identified and when are they “engaged”,
- What are their responsibilities and authorities
- Templates, forms or other tools we will need
- Any policy or protocols required
- Other?

Resources:
- Example referral form

6 Monitor & Review

What do we need to agree on?
- At a case level:
  - What is being monitored
  - What cycle of case review meetings is envisaged
  - Who will need to be involved
  - What information will need to be shared & with whom
  - Templates, forms or other tools we will need
  - Any policy or protocols required
  - Other?

- At a system level:
  - What is being monitored & why
  - What data will need to be collected and collated, by whom and stored where
  - What review cycle is envisaged & who will need to be involved
  - What information will need to be shared & with whom
  - Templates, forms or other tools we will need
  - Any policy or protocols required
  - Other?

Resources:
- Example Review Report
- Example Service Tracking Report
7,8,9. Develop an Exit Plan, Close Case & Evaluate

What do we need to agree on?
- Independence from ICM as a goal
- Triggers for case closure
- Who decides
- What to evaluate, with who, how and when
- What information will need to be shared & with whom
- Templates, forms or other tools we will need
- Any policy or protocols required
- Other?

Resources
11. Example Case Closure Form
12. Example Client Feedback Record

Sources and Resources
- SAAP Case Management Resource Kit. Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs
  http://www.mcf.gov.bc.ca/publications/integ_manage.htm
- Carins Street Based Outreach Service
- Sydney Street Based Outreach Service