

**Community Affairs
Legislation Committee**

Examination of Additional Estimates 2003-2004

Additional Information Received

VOLUME 1

Centrelink &

FaCS Output Groups: Cross outputs, Output 1.1, 1.2, 1.3

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO

MAY 2004

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Note: Where published reports, etc. have been provided in response to questions, they have not been included in the Additional Information volume in order to conserve resources.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATING TO THE EXAMINATION OF
ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE FOR 2003-2004**

Included in this volume are answers to written and oral questions taken on notice and tabled papers relating to the additional estimates hearing on 19 February 2004

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO

| Senator | Quest. No. | Centrelink | Vol. 1 Page No. |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Tabled at hearing | Table of number of working credit eligible, non-activity tested, customers reporting each fortnight by payment type | 1 |
| Forshaw | 5 | Internal projects deferred in 2003-04 | 2 |
| Collins | 6 | Child care benefit – Centrelink media statement | 3-4 |
| McLucas | 7-10 | ABSTUDY | 5-8 |
| Forshaw | 13 | Compliance data-matching review activity | 9-10 |
| Collins | 14 | Debts – widening data-matching pilot | 11-13 |
| Collins | 15 | Debts – legal action | 14-15 |
| Collins | 16 | Prisoners | 16-22 |
| Collins | 18-20 | Working credit | 23-25 |
| Forshaw | 21-22 | Centrelink virtual college | 26-33 |
| Collins | 23 | Board of management | 34 |
| Collins | 24 | Annual report - website | 35 |
| Collins | 25 | Parliamentary library requests for data | 36 |
| Collins | 26 | More choice for families | 37 |
| Collins | 27 | Child Care Benefit (CCB) | 38-39 |
| Collins | 28 | Child Care Benefit (CCB) advance-quit system | 40 |
| Carr | 151-152 | Performance assessment mechanisms - Centrelink | 41-44 |
| Collins | 153 | Staffing | 45-46 |
| Collins | 154 | Guiding coalition costs | 47 |
| Cross outputs | | | |
| Collins | 59 | Public compliance campaign | 48 |
| Collins | 60 | Media campaigns | 49 |
| Collins | 61 | Allen Consulting | 50 |
| Carr | 119-120 | Performance assessment mechanisms - FaCS | 51-54 |
| Collins | 121, 122, 125, 129, 130, 132-134, 136, 137, 138 | Admin programs | 55-69 |
| Collins | 123 | SES pay rates | 70-71 |
| Collins | 124 | Management retreats/training | 72-76 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| Senator | Quest. No. | Cross outputs [contd] | Vol. 1 Page No. |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Collins | 126-128 | Four year forward estimates | 77 |
| Collins | 131 | Number of SES issues with vehicles - FaCS | 78 |
| Collins | 135 | Cost of domestic trips of staff | 79-80 |
| Collins | 139-140 | Surveys of attitudes towards programmes | 81-92 |
| Collins | 141, 143 | Advertising | 93-94 |
| Collins | 142 | Publications | 95 |
| Collins | 145-146 | Performance assessment mechanisms - CSA | 96-99 |
| Carr | 147-148 | Performance assessment mechanisms – Australian Institute of Family Studies | 100-102 |
| Carr | 149-150 | Performance assessment mechanisms – Social Security Appeals Tribunal | 103-107 |
| Collins | 144 | Orima Consulting research | 108 |
| Output Group 1.1 – Family Assistance | | | |
| | Letter from FaCS | Letter from FaCS dated Mar 04 clarifying evidence given at the hearing on 19 Feb 04 regarding the assessment of reportable fringe benefits for the purposes of the Family Tax Benefit (FTB) and Child Care Benefit (CCB) income tests and assessments of child support liabilities | 109-110 |
| Bishop | 160.3 160.4 | Family tax benefit [revised responses relating to June 03 budget estimates] | 111-114 |
| Harradine Collins | 12, 63, 64 | Family tax benefit | 115-120 |
| Collins | 29-30 | Family tax benefit and child care benefit | 121-122 |
| Collins | 31 | Playgroups | 123 |
| Collins | 62 | Playgroups announcement | 124-125 |
| Collins | 65 | High income earners receiving FTB | 126 |
| Output Group 1.2 – Youth and Student Support | | | |
| Collins | 34 | National Youth roundtable | 127 |
| Collins | 66, 67 | 2004-05 forward estimates | 128-129 |
| Collins | 68-69 | Youth Bureau policy and promotions branch | 130-131 |
| Collins | 32-33, 70-77 | Green Corps | 132-143 |
| Collins | 78 | Employment, education and training programs | 144-148 |
| Collins | 79 | Mentor marketplace | 149-154 |
| Collins | 97 | Customer numbers by payment type by postcode (15 to 24 yr olds) | 155 |
| Output Group 1.3 – Child Support | | | |
| Collins | 80 | Child custody report | 156 |
| Collins | 81 | Change of assessment trend data | 157-158 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

TABLE 1: NUMBER OF WORKING CREDIT ELIGIBLE, NON-ACTIVITY TESTED, CUSTOMERS REPORTING EACH FORTNIGHT BY PAYMENT TYPE.

| F/n ending | MAA | PA | SA | WA | PP(P) | CP | DSP | PP(S) | Wid B | Wife | Other | Total |
|------------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|--------|
| 3-Oct-03 | 4191 | 13366 | 863 | 3635 | 22989 | 3211 | 22277 | 53569 | 34 | 2849 | 10 | 126994 |
| 17-Oct-03 | 3926 | 12438 | 793 | 3691 | 27327 | 3792 | 25837 | 64345 | 45 | 3156 | 18 | 145368 |
| 31-Oct-03 | 3844 | 12242 | 800 | 3757 | 28830 | 3925 | 27055 | 68224 | 50 | 3233 | 16 | 151976 |
| 14-Nov-03 | 3790 | 12316 | 824 | 3830 | 30348 | 4115 | 28383 | 71164 | 54 | 3349 | 21 | 158194 |
| 28-Nov-03 | 3833 | 12168 | 835 | 3867 | 32029 | 4299 | 29850 | 75171 | 54 | 3432 | 25 | 165563 |
| 12-Dec-03 | 3694 | 10977 | 836 | 3852 | 33214 | 4425 | 30789 | 78578 | 58 | 3488 | 30 | 169941 |
| 26-Dec-03 | 3814 | 11336 | 845 | 3915 | 35630 | 4842 | 33907 | 84620 | 63 | 3903 | 47 | 182922 |
| 9-Jan-04 | 3300 | 9883 | 801 | 3668 | 33340 | 4256 | 29117 | 75307 | 44 | 3115 | 50 | 162881 |
| 23-Jan-04 | 3788 | 11329 | 925 | 3996 | 38898 | 5031 | 35404 | 88189 | 58 | 4044 | 73 | 191735 |
| 6-Feb-04 | 3122 | 8717 | 832 | 3500 | 34202 | 4144 | 28580 | 68598 | 38 | 2976 | 60 | 154769 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 5

Topic: Internal Projects deferred in 2003-04

Hansard Page: CA24

Senator Forshaw asked:

As a follow up to question number 1 asked at the Supplementary Estimates Hearing of 6 November 2003. Senator Bishop asked what projects were deferred and what the impact on the organisation was. This was with regard to Centrelink internal projects deferred in 2003-04. Can you give us more detail than was provided in that answer? For instance, in the answer there is a just a heading, 'other projects'. Can you be more specific about that response?

Answer:

Other Projects

Accreditation of Technical Training: A project to accredit technical training in Centrelink.

An alternative means of staff access to the training material was rescheduled. Material can still be accessed via the Intranet site.

Business Information Strategies: Enhanced suite of Business Information (BI) products.

This project was reviewed as part of an overall review of management information and the project has continued in that context.

Business Process Redesign: Achievement of organizational improvements in terms of process, cost and quality of service. Incorporates the design of e-business processes.

Analysis identified minor overlaps with other projects, and scope was altered accordingly.

Enterprise Portfolio Management: Aimed at implementing Portfolio Management of projects into the organisation and the implementation of a new project management tool to gain greater efficiencies in project management.

Change of scope for this financial year to allow staged implementation with some deliverables rescheduled to next financial year.

Provision of Centrelink Workload and Workforce Management System Part A

(Customer Service Centres): Provision of easily accessible information on current and future workloads in Customer Service Centres.

Some elements of the project have been rescheduled to 04/05 financial year, providing an opportunity to consider work being undertaken in a similar call centre project.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 6

Topic: Child Care Benefit – Centrelink Media Statement

Hansard Page: CA31

Senator Jacinta Collins asked:

Senator Collins asked for a copy of a media statement issued by Centrelink on 6th January 2004 in response to a statement by Senator Collins about Child Care Benefit.

Answer:

A copy of the Media Release issued by Centrelink is at Attachment A.

During the Estimates Hearings, Senator Collins also raised an issue regarding the distribution method of the Centrelink media release, specifically, whether the media release had been issued through the Minister's Office.

The media release was distributed by Centrelink, through AAP MediaNet, a media release distribution service, used regularly by Centrelink for distribution of media releases.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

ATTACHMENT A



Media Release

For immediate release

Tuesday, 6 January 2004

Child Care Benefit claims cause undue alarm

Centrelink today assured Child Care Benefit customers that their benefits would continue if they met eligibility requirements.

Spokesman Bevan Hannan said comments made by Senator Jacinta Collins had caused undue alarm and wrongly claimed that Centrelink was experiencing technical glitches with its computer system.

“The real story is a small number of Child Care Benefit Customers were recently asked to provide further information to ensure they meet Australian residential rules,” Mr Hannan said.

“Once the information is obtained, their records are updated and Child Care Benefit continues if they satisfy eligibility requirements.

“Centrelink was advised today that as a result of this process, some people may have inadvertently received correspondence that they are no longer entitled to receive Child Care Benefit. We are in the process of thoroughly investigating these claims but it is clear the impact is minimal.

“If customers have received incorrect notice, we genuinely apologise and advise them to contact the Family Assistance Office on 13 6150. Centrelink staff will gladly resolve their situation.”

Child Care Benefit is a payment to help people with the costs of child care. Customers using approved child care can choose to receive Child Care Benefit either as reduced child care fees throughout the year or as a lump sum payment at the end of the financial year.

Contact: Shamus Gonella, Centrelink National Media,

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

02 6284 6442 or 0411 762 067

Output Group: Centrelink
Topic: ABSTUDY

Question No: 7

Hansard Page: CA39

Senator McLucas asked:

I remember last year people told me that Centrelink would employ local people.

- a. Did that occur?
- b. In what locations were these local people employed for that work

Answer:

- a. No.
- b. In most locations local Centrelink agents, community people and staff from community schools (Education QLD) were utilised to assist with claim completion, gathering and coordination of travel.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 8

Topic: ABSTUDY

Hansard Page: CA40

Senator McLucas asked:

Part of the other strategy was not only getting children to school but also improving retention at school.

- a. Can you tell me what was done in order to do that and how successful that was for last year?
- b. The key performance indicator is the number of children at school on day one of the changed approach. Do you have any data on what has occurred on 27 January, or whenever it was, this year as compared to last year? I would also like to compare that with the year before.
- c. Please provide the number of children who receive ABSTUDY eventually compared with the number who were receiving ABSTUDY on their school's first day.

Answer:

- a. Centrelink does not have any data on retention to show how successful it was. However part of our strategy was to engage boarding schools and Education QLD community schools in the Cape to look at issues that affect boarding students. Centrelink ran a number of workshops to discuss issues and raise awareness of ABSTUDY policy provisions that could assist schools with students experiencing difficulties.
- b. Centrelink is not able to provide statistical data on the number of children who were at school on 27 January, as this data is not collected by Centrelink. We can however advise that between 1 January to 6 February, 424 (Cape) students were approved for ABSTUDY payment of which 207 were approved for boarding and travelling entitlements prior to 27 January.
- c. We are unable to provide the specific data however as at 6 February there were 900 secondary students from the Cape and Torres Strait who were receiving ABSTUDY. This is made up of 424 (Cape) and 476 (Torres Strait – including northern peninsula communities of Seisia, Bamaga, Injinoo and Umagico).

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 9

Topic: ABSTUDY

Hansard Page: CA40

Senator McLucas asked:

Please provide a copy of the ABSTUDY Guidelines.

Answer:

A copy of the ABSTUDY Guide is attached.

The Guide may be accessed at:

[http://www.centrelink.gov.au/internet/internet.nsf/filestores/pr789_0311/\\$file/pr789_0311en.pdf](http://www.centrelink.gov.au/internet/internet.nsf/filestores/pr789_0311/$file/pr789_0311en.pdf)

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 10

Topic: ABSTUDY

Hansard Page: CA40-41

Senator McLucas asked:

- a. I was advised that the form required for enrolment at a school was different for the form required for enrolment at a residential institution.
- b. Has consideration been given to trying to meld those forms so that people will fill one form in?

Answer:

- a. Yes this is correct, for students who are under 16 and attending their local high school they are required to complete a Schooling A Claim (Form A), this form asks basic questions on the student and their carer.

If the student is going to a boarding school/residential institution, they are required to complete a Claim for ABSTUDY (Form B), this form is comprehensive and asks a range of questions on the student and parents/guardians.

- b. This issue is being investigated as part of the Joint Centrelink/DEST ABSTUDY Project.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink.....Question No: 13

Topic: Compliance data-matching review activity

Hansard Page: CA49

Senator Forshaw asked:

Provide the number of reviews that are undertaken in each data matching type and the returns that we get as a result of those reviews.

Answer:

The attached table provides details of review activity as a result of data-matching projects for the 2003-04 financial year to 29 February 2004 and the outcomes from those reviews.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Centrelink Compliance Data-matching Review Activity of FaCS Payments
2003-04 Financial Year to 29 February 2004

| Data-matching type | Completed Reviews | | Cancellations | | Decreases in Payment [1] | | Reductions [2] | | Fortnightly Savings [3] | Upward Variations | | | Debts | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------|--|
| | No | No | % | No | % | No | % | \$ | No | % | \$ | No | % | \$ | |
| Compliance | 481,872 | 35,242 | 7.31 | 52,935 | 10.99 | 88,177 | 18.30 | 20,714,399 | 13,910 | 2.89 | 883,397 | 192,207 | 39.89 | 226,255,714 | |
| Address Rent Details | 105,579 | 2,574 | 2.44 | 24,229 | 22.95 | 26,803 | 25.39 | 3,037,497 | 8,990 | 8.51 | 432,668 | 11,214 | 10.62 | 2,924,651 | |
| Australian Business Number | 861 | 107 | 12.43 | 126 | 14.63 | 233 | 27.06 | 48,864 | 62 | 7.20 | 948 | 337 | 39.14 | 535,886 | |
| Corrective Services Matching | 9,967 | 2,795 | 28.04 | 3,375 | 33.86 | 6,170 | 61.90 | 2,399,329 | 309 | 3.10 | 25,138 | 4,522 | 45.37 | 1,520,340 | |
| Data-matching Program | 45,440 | 739 | 1.63 | 3,666 | 8.07 | 4,405 | 9.69 | 499,488 | 798 | 1.76 | 39,446 | 29,617 | 65.18 | 76,869,207 | |
| Defence Housing | 481 | 50 | 10.40 | 40 | 8.32 | 90 | 18.71 | 28,979 | 5 | 1.04 | 513 | 61 | 12.68 | 267,458 | |
| DEWR Matching | 39,750 | 1,752 | 4.41 | 1,108 | 2.79 | 2,860 | 7.19 | 914,032 | 210 | 0.53 | 22,302 | 13,512 | 33.99 | 9,493,151 | |
| DIMIA Matching | 13,929 | 1,404 | 10.08 | 1,152 | 8.27 | 2,556 | 18.35 | 796,388 | 122 | 0.88 | 13,979 | 9,578 | 68.76 | 7,103,816 | |
| Enrolment Checking | 36,884 | 2,658 | 7.21 | 2,504 | 6.79 | 5,162 | 14.00 | 1,344,173 | 697 | 1.89 | 77,760 | 18,920 | 51.30 | 47,677,984 | |
| Investment Property | 696 | 92 | 13.22 | 218 | 31.32 | 310 | 44.54 | 48,806 | 59 | 8.48 | 1,125 | 205 | 29.45 | 1,274,455 | |
| Pay As You Go matching | 3,564 | 111 | 3.11 | 214 | 6.00 | 325 | 9.12 | 79,866 | 57 | 1.60 | 2,590 | 2,172 | 60.94 | 4,679,149 | |
| Registrar-General's Office | 2,292 | 740 | 32.29 | 43 | 1.88 | 783 | 34.16 | 328,803 | 68 | 2.97 | 6,373 | 434 | 18.94 | 477,047 | |
| Superannuation Matching | 847 | 9 | 1.06 | 602 | 71.07 | 611 | 72.14 | 34,154 | 30 | 3.54 | 686 | 665 | 78.51 | 890,844 | |
| Tax File No. Declaration Forms | 220,447 | 22,095 | 10.02 | 15,403 | 6.99 | 37,498 | 17.01 | 11,085,714 | 2,436 | 1.11 | 256,894 | 100,134 | 45.42 | 68,424,711 | |
| Trusts and Companies | 1,135 | 116 | 10.22 | 255 | 22.47 | 371 | 32.69 | 68,306 | 67 | 5.90 | 2,975 | 836 | 73.66 | 4,117,015 | |
| Research & Development | 758 | 5 | 0.66 | 537 | 70.84 | 542 | 71.50 | 11,657 | 55 | 7.26 | 579 | 605 | 79.82 | 1,443,945 | |
| Health Insurance Commission | 25 | 0 | n/a | 0 | n/a | 0 | n/a | 0 | 0 | n/a | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 417 | |
| International Data-matching | 733 | 5 | 0.68 | 537 | 73.26 | 542 | 73.94 | 11,657 | 55 | 7.50 | 579 | 604 | 82.40 | 1,443,528 | |
| Total | 482,630 | 35,247 | 7.30 | 53,472 | 11.08 | 88,719 | 18.38 | 20,726,056 | 13,965 | 2.89 | 883,976 | 192,812 | 39.95 | 227,699,659 | |

Notes:

[1] Decreases in Payment includes payment Downward Variations, Suspensions and Rejections.

[2] Reductions is the sum of the two preceding columns, i.e. the sum of Cancellations and Decreases in Payment.

[3] Fortnightly Savings is the sum of the value of all fortnightly rate reductions.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 14

Topic: Debts – Widening Data-matching Pilot

Hansard Page: CA50

Senator Collins asked:

- a) Can we have a breakdown of reviews by payment type, debts raised and money recovered for each year of the pilot?
- b) Can you also give us a breakdown of the age of debts? By that, I mean a profile of how many debts relate to overpayments in, say, 1996-97 et cetera?
- c) Does the debt collection process provide information on the extent to which debts have been pursued and whether such remedies have been sought?

Answer:

- a) Table 1 provides a breakdown of payment type by number of debts raised for the pilot period 2002/03. Table 2 provides a breakdown of payment type by number of debts recovered for the pilot period 2002/2003.

Table 1

| 2002/2003 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Payment Type | Number of Reviews | Numbers of Debts raised | Debt Amount |
| Age Pension | 3,529 | 2,003 | \$9,173,721 |
| Carer Payment | 1,415 | 770 | \$2,867,713 |
| Disability Support Pension | 8,439 | 4,573 | \$20,353,620 |
| Family Tax Benefit | 50 | 14 | \$8,040 |
| Newstart Allowance | 4,286 | 1,476 | \$1,239,629 |
| Parenting Payment Partnered | 17,267 | 6,076 | \$4,949,397 |
| Parenting Payment Single | 867 | 185 | \$118,241 |
| Partner Allowance | 953 | 229 | \$170,256 |
| Sickness Allowance | 133 | 49 | \$32,353 |
| Special Benefit | 98 | 46 | \$43,779 |
| TOTAL | 37,037 | 15,421 | \$38,956,749 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Table 2

| 2002/2003 | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Payment Type | Debts Recovered \$ |
| Age Pension | 2,377,372.99 |
| Austudy (Centrelink) | 2,330.25 |
| Carer Pension (Other) | 157,545.47 |
| Carer (Age) | 130,198.99 |
| Carer (Disability Support) | 197,058.84 |
| Carers Allowance (Adult) | 615.11 |
| Carers Allowance (Child) | 297.52 |
| Ceased Customer Partner | 7,431.74 |
| Disability Support Pension | 3,062,537.40 |
| Family Payment | 3,307.02 |
| Family Tax Benefit | 1,915.38 |
| Job Search Allowance (FaCS) | 353.10 |
| Mature Age Allowance | 2,439.32 |
| Newstart Allowance (FaCS) | 415,737.48 |
| Newstart Mature Age Allowance | 8,615.69 |
| Newstart Partner Allowance | 53,711.00 |
| Parenting Payment - Single | 4,717.54 |
| Parenting Payment Partnered | 1,691,279.69 |
| Partner Allowance Mature Age | 110.60 |
| Pensioner Partner Allowance | 3,902.51 |
| PGA Low Income Customer | 1,252.82 |
| PGA Non Benefit Customer | 78.05 |
| Sickness Allowance | 12,586.44 |
| Sickness Partner Allowance | 150.00 |
| Special Benefit (FaCS) | 12,822.16 |
| Special Partner Allowance | 95.98 |
| Wife's Pension (Age) | 143.02 |
| Wife's Pension (Disability Support) | 234.50 |
| Youth Allowance | 5,029.05 |
| TOTAL | 8,153,869.66 |

Please note that two different systems are used to extract the data for 'debts raised' (table 1) and 'debts recovered' (table 2) and a more detailed breakdown of payment type is available from the system used to extract 'debts recovered'.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

b) The following table provides a list of age of debts identified from commencement of pilot.

| Year of Debt | No. of Debts |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 2002/2003 | 5,831 |
| 2001/2002 | 3,755 |
| 2000/2001 | 1,430 |
| 1999/2000 | 2,112 |
| 1998/1999 | 641 |
| 1997/1998 | 408 |
| 1996/1997 | 266 |
| Pre1995/96 | 978 |
| TOTAL | 15,421 |

c) All debt recovery processes are recorded for persual of debts.

- Customer debt details are recorded on the Debt Management Information System (DMIS). DMIS is a national database specifically designed for the recording, and management of Centrelink debts. It covers all aspects of the raising, recovering and management information requirements for Centrelink debts. The system provides advice such as:
 - the debt amount
 - debt reason
 - recovery means eg full cash refund, recovery by instalments, garnishee and withholdings
 - repayment history
 - contact with customer.

Centrelink uses the services of a mercantile agent to recover debts from people who are no longer customers and when the debts are no longer cost effective for Centrelink to pursue or where the debtor cannot be located.

The mercantile agent is required to provide a status report on these customer debts. The report advises:

Debt owed

Debt repaid (receipt no., date of repayment, amount, debtor location and repayment agreement).

Rates of recovery

Potential disputes

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink
Topic: Debts – Legal action

Question No: 15

Hansard Page: CA51

Senator Collins asked:

- a) Has any legal action been initiated to recover overpayments? If the answer is yes, 'How frequently and what is the nature of it'.
- b) Have any of the debts been referred to debt collectors? I would like a description of how many cases, the nature of those cases and the outcome of those cases.
- c) Approximately four per cent of debt is paid back by credit card. What does that represent in dollar values?

Answer:

- a) Centrelink has sought legal (civil) action to recover overpayments. For the period 1 May 2003 to 30 April 2004 a total of 478 cases (82 compensation recovery and 396 debt recovery) were pursued. Centrelink only takes legal action when a customer has a large debt and has, either:
 - failed to enter into a suitable arrangement to repay the debt; or
 - failed to adhere to a previously agreed arrangement.

In cases where a criminal offence may have been committed, Centrelink can refer the case to the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions (CDPP) to consider criminal prosecution action. Prosecution action may be considered even if the debt is being repaid or has been repaid in full. During the period 1 July 2003 to 30 April 2004, Centrelink has referred 3,623 cases to the CDPP for such consideration.

Whilst criminal proceedings are not undertaken in order to recover debts, where an offence is found proven, the CDPP will seek a reparation order for the outstanding amount of the debt arising from the charges, in addition to any sentence imposed by the court. Once the reparation order is made, it operates as a civil judgement in favour of Centrelink that can be enforced in the courts.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

b) The following table advises debts that have been referred to a mercantile agent. The data covers a 20 month period (2002/03 to 29/2/04).

| REASON FOR REFERRAL | AUTOMATIC REFERRAL | NOT COST EFFECTIVE | WHERE ABOUTS UNKNOWN | TOTAL | Debt Raised | O/S Balance up to 29/2/04 | Recovered |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| | | | | | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| OUTCOME | | | | | | | |
| BULK RECALL | 81 | 504 | 97 | 682 | \$818,570 | \$668,521 | \$150,049 |
| DEBTOR BANKRUPT | 8 | 9 | 3 | 20 | \$121,298 | \$120,389 | \$909 |
| DEBTOR DECEASED | 1 | 5 | 2 | 8 | \$8,361 | \$7,278 | \$1,083 |
| DEBTOR OVERSEAS | 8 | 30 | 10 | 48 | \$40,577 | \$35,868 | \$4,710 |
| CENTRELINK WITHHOLDING | 14,970 | 26,118 | 1,413 | 42,501 | \$30,524,697 | \$19,654,821 | \$10,869,876 |
| OTHER | 24,636 | 30,562 | 3,137 | 58,335 | \$67,388,102 | \$61,720,252 | \$5,667,850 |
| DEBT FINALISED | 6,343 | 26,517 | 269 | 33,129 | \$12,306,464 | \$18,029 | \$12,288,435 |
| DEBTOR IN PRISON | 22 | 33 | 1 | 56 | \$95,555 | \$87,320 | \$8,234 |
| REVIEW | 6,611 | 8,570 | 560 | 15,741 | \$18,466,143 | \$11,777,785 | \$6,688,357 |
| REFUSED TO NEGOTIATE | 5 | 14 | 2 | 21 | \$15,025 | \$11,769 | \$3,256 |
| RECOVERY PERIOD ENDED | 19,620 | 63,888 | 7,837 | 91,345 | \$73,328,216 | \$67,317,008 | \$6,011,208 |
| UNLOCATABLE | 5 | 8 | 9 | 22 | \$21,456 | \$19,824 | \$1,632 |
| TOTAL | 72,310 | 156,258 | 13,340 | 241,908 | \$203,134,463 | \$161,438,864 | \$41,695,599 |

c) Of 4% of debt repaid by credit card in 2002-03 this resulted in \$49.49m recovered.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 16

Topic: Prisoners

Hansard Page: CA59

Senator Collins asked:

Could we be provided with a copy of the current MOUs in relation to exchange of data with State and Territories and a copy of the letter you were detailing before which I presume details the model which Mr Richardson was talking about?

Answer:

Centrelink currently has Program Protocol Agreements with the majority of State and Territory organisations responsible for prisons and juvenile justice centres or is awaiting the formal signing of these Agreements. The purpose of these Protocols is to develop services that ensure the best possible outcomes for both the community and ex-offenders due for release. The following table highlights the status of the Agreement process:

| State or Territory | Organisation | Status of Program Protocol Agreement |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| New South Wales | Prisons (Attachment A) | In place |
| | Juvenile Justice Centres (Attachment B) | In place |
| Victoria | Prisons | Awaiting formal signing |
| | Juvenile Justice Centres | Under negotiation |
| Queensland | Prisons (Attachment C) | In place |
| | Juvenile Justice Centres (Attachment D) | In place |
| South Australia | Prisons | Awaiting formal signing |
| | Juvenile Justice Centres | Under negotiation |
| Western Australia | Prisons (Attachment E) | In place |
| | Juvenile Justice Centres (Attachment E) | In place |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Tasmania | Prisons | Under negotiation |
| | Juvenile Justice Centres (Attachment F) | In place |
| Northern Territory | Prisons (Attachment G) | In place |
| | Juvenile Justice Centres (Attachment G) | In place |
| Australian Capital Territory | Prisons (Attachment H) | In place |
| | Juvenile Justice Centres | Not yet commenced |

These Agreements provide, in part, the ability for the correctional services institutions to provide Centrelink with a list of offenders due for release, in say 4 weeks time, to enable a pre-release service to be provided.

In addition, Centrelink has progressively introduced data matching arrangements with all State and Territory Departments of Corrective Services/ Ministries of Justice. The legal authority to collect the information is contained in Section 192 of the Social Security (Administration) Act 1999 and all data matching adheres to the *Privacy Commissioner's Guidelines for Data Matching in Commonwealth Administration*.

Computer matching of prisoner records of State and Territory Departments of Corrective Services / Justice (DCS) enables Centrelink to address the risk of incorrect payments where a customer held in custody is not reported to Centrelink. It also addresses the risk of a person assuming the identity of a customer in custody claiming a Centrelink payment.

Current or suspended Centrelink customer records are matched with data provided by each State and Territory DCS relating to persons registered as in custody on a regular basis. The data matching cycle for each jurisdiction is as follows:

| State or Territory | Data Matching Cycle |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| New South Wales | Weekly |
| Victoria | Twice Monthly |
| Queensland | Weekly |
| South Australia | Weekly |
| Western Australia | Weekly |
| Tasmania | Weekly |
| Northern Territory | Twice Monthly |
| Australian Capital Territory | Monthly |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

The two sets of data are matched, using specific sets of match criteria, business rules and refinement criteria to identify Centrelink customers whose payment(s) may be continuing inappropriately if the matched person is now in custody.

The DCS data Centrelink receives contains the list of prisoners including in and out dates for all prisons in each state or territory over the period of data provided. WA and SA also provide escapee data.

Attachment I is a copy of the letter from the CEO of Centrelink to the West Australian Police Commissioner regarding proposed new data matching procedures and protocols in relation to prison admissions, releases and escapes. A similar letter was provided to all other Police Commissioners on 9 February 2004. An example of this letter is at Attachment J.

[Note: The Protocol Agreements have not been included in electronic format. Attachments I and J follow]

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Question 16: Attachment I

Mr Barry Matthews
WA Police Service Commissioner
2 Adelaide Terrace
East Perth WA 6004

Dear Mr Matthews

You would be aware that your Attorney General has recently raised the issue of prison escapees being able to access Centrelink benefits with a particular concern about those who have moved across borders into other States.

As Centrelink is prevented under social security law from paying benefits to prisoners (whether in custody or escaped) it is important that we have timely access to information about prison admissions, releases and escapes. Where an individual was receiving a Centrelink payment prior to imprisonment and we receive advice from a corrections authority that the person has been gaoled, it is a simple process to mark their electronic record so that we know the person has no eligibility for payment until such time as we are given advice of release. However, where the person has no previous history with Centrelink or was not receiving payments at the time of his or her imprisonment, we would have no information that would enable us to know the person is at large and therefore ineligible.

Another way in which we exchange information with law enforcement authorities is under the public interest provisions of the *Social Security Act*. All State and Territory law enforcement authorities are aware that we can assist in this way and are familiar with our protocols. Last financial year we met approximately 13,000 request of this kind including a number relating to prison escapees.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Our expectation upon releasing this information is that police action will follow and we have generally not intervened so as not to jeopardize police action. However, we had not allowed for the possibility that in a number of instances police may decide not to pursue these cases or would not consider their recapture or extradition an immediate priority.

I am therefore proposing new data matching procedures and protocols which will enable current information regarding the prisoner population as well the details of people who have escaped, to be regularly matched against the Centrelink customer database along with protocols that will enable Centrelink to take action to remove these individuals from payments within a limited period of time.

Ideally, the data matching should occur weekly or fortnightly and include the names of all persons who have been imprisoned during the period as well as the names of those who have escaped. In relation to escapees the list would show at each reporting date the names of all escapees, regardless of when they escaped, until such time as they have been recaptured. This would identify any escapees who are receiving payments in their own name. Centrelink would then pass relevant information on escapees to each jurisdiction to enable the authorities to take appropriate action.

Escapees from gaol are not entitled to Centrelink payments. However, before undertaking a review of such cases, with a view to cancellation of payment, Centrelink will wait for 28 days before taking any action. This would allow time for your officers to let Centrelink know of any cases you wish to pursue which might be jeopardised by Centrelink action. In these cases Centrelink will delay its review processes pending police action.

To enable these new arrangements to be put in place I would be grateful if you would nominate a contact officer in your police service. The Centrelink contact is Ms Linda Rossiter, Manager, Data Matching on (02) 6208 8686. In the meantime the present locally based reporting arrangements providing admission and release information should continue.

Yours sincerely

Sue Vardon

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Question 16: Attachment J

Mr Richard McCreadie
Tasmanian Commissioner of Police
GPO Box 308
HOBART Tasmania 7001

Dear Mr McCreadie

You may be aware that the Western Australian Attorney General has recently raised the issue of prison escapees being able to access Centrelink benefits with a particular concern about those who have moved across borders into other States.

As Centrelink is prevented under social security law from paying benefits to prisoners (whether in custody or escaped) it is important that we have timely access to information about prison admissions, releases and escapes. Where an individual was receiving a Centrelink payment prior to imprisonment and we receive advice from a corrections authority that the person has been goaled, it is a simple process to mark their electronic record so that we know the person has no eligibility for payment until such time as we are given advice of release. However, where the person has no previous history with Centrelink or was not receiving payments at the time of his or her imprisonment, we would have no information that would enable us to know the person is at large and therefore ineligible.

Another way in which we exchange information with law enforcement authorities is under the public interest provisions of the *Social Security Act*. All State and Territory law enforcement authorities are aware that we can assist in this way and are familiar with our protocols. Last financial year we met approximately 13,000 request of this kind including a number relating to prison escapees.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Our expectation upon releasing this information is that police action will follow and we have generally not intervened so as not to jeopardize police action. However, we had not allowed for the possibility that in a number of instances police may decide not to pursue these cases or would not consider their recapture or extradition an immediate priority.

I am therefore proposing new data matching procedures and protocols which will enable current information regarding the prisoner population as well the details of people who have escaped, to be regularly matched against the Centrelink customer database along with protocols that will enable Centrelink to take action to remove these individuals from payments within a limited period of time.

Ideally, the data matching should occur weekly or fortnightly and include the names of all persons who have been imprisoned during the period as well as the names of those who have escaped. In relation to escapees the list would show at each reporting date the names of all escapees, regardless of when they escaped, until such time as they have been recaptured. This would identify any escapees who are receiving payments in their own name. Centrelink would then pass relevant information on escapees to each jurisdiction to enable the authorities to take appropriate action.

Escapees from gaol are not entitled to Centrelink payments. However, before undertaking a review of such cases, with a view to cancellation of payment, Centrelink will wait for 28 days before taking any action. This would allow time for your officers to let Centrelink know of any cases you wish to pursue which might be jeopardised by Centrelink action. In these cases Centrelink will delay its review processes pending police action.

To enable these new arrangements to be put in place I would be grateful if you would nominate a contact officer in your police service. The Centrelink contact is Ms Linda Rossiter, Manager, Data Matching on (02) 6208 8686. In the meantime the present locally based reporting arrangements providing admission and release information should continue.

Yours sincerely

Sue Vardon

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 18

Topic: Working Credit

Hansard Page: CA68

Senator Jacinta Collins asked:

Can you provide figures for the number of people who have utilised the working credit to date by payment type with some detail on the average amount of money banked or the dollar benefit per person per payment?

Answer:

According to their individual circumstances, each customer would receive different benefits from the Working Credit initiative. Therefore, it is not possible to provide information in the terms requested.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 19

Topic: Working Credit

Hansard Page: CA69

Senator JACINTA COLLINS—I might have misunderstood you. I thought you indicated that if the system identifies that they have been in the system but they have had a flat pattern of earnings for a period of time, then you give them the option to opt out of it.

Mr Wadeson—There is a number of weeks, but I cannot remember what that is.

Senator JACINTA COLLINS—Could you provide us with that?

Answer:

The reporting cycle is determined by reviewing earnings income over a 12 weekly period. If a customer has two or more instances within the preceding 12 weeks where their income varies then they will remain on a 2 weekly reporting arrangement.

However, Customer Service Officers have the discretion to adjust a customer's reporting arrangements at any time. For example, if a customer informs Centrelink that their income will be stable because of new arrangements with an employer, then that customer can be transferred to a notification regime. Under this arrangement customers must notify us within 14 days of changes occurring to their earnings pattern.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 20

Topic: Working Credit

Hansard Page: CA69

Senator Jacinta Collins asked:

Can you provide a breakdown of the budgeted cost of administering the working credit and the new income reporting arrangements?

Answer:

For the first full year of operation (2004/05 financial year), Centrelink will receive \$26.5m to administer Working Credit.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink.....Question No: 21

Topic: Centrelink Virtual College

Hansard Page: CA70-71

Senator Forshaw asked:

- a) What is the staffing structure of the college, the number of people who work in it and also the numbers in each of the levels?
- b) What is the college's budget? Has it met its budget, has it overrun its budget; if so by how much?
- c) Could you give us details of the qualifications of the teaching staff in the college? Do they all have tertiary or training qualifications?

Answer:

- a) Centrelink Virtual College staffing structure is contained in Attachment A.
- b) The College Budget

| Financial Year | Allocated Budget | Expenditure | Operating Result |
|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 2003-2004 | \$2,473,684 | \$1,786,418 (YTD -29.02.2004) | N/A |

- c) Qualifications of staff in the Centrelink Virtual College are listed in Attachment B.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Attachment A

CENTRELINK VIRTUAL COLLEGE STAFFING

| Area | Position | Classification |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Dean | SES |
| | Deputy Dean | C4 EL2 |
| Business Services | Business Manager | C4 EL2 |
| | Business Support | C4 EL1 |
| | Finance Officer | C3 APS 6 |
| | Executive Assistant | C2 APS 3 |
| Learning | Business Manager | C4 EL2 |
| Projects | Project Manager | C4 EL1 |
| Learning Consultancy | Learning Consultant | C4 EL1 |
| | Learning Consultant | C3 APS 6 |
| Accredited Learning and Assessment | Team Leader | C4 EL1 |
| | Learning Developer | C3 APS 6 |
| | Learning Developer | C3 APS 6 |
| | Learning Developer | C3 APS 6 |
| | Learning Developer | C3 APS 6 |
| | Learning Developer | C3 APS 6 |
| | Learning Developer | C3 APS 6 |
| Learning Networks | Business Manager | C4 EL2 |
| Leadership | | C3 APS 6 |
| | | C3 APS 6 |
| Flexible Learning | Team Leader | C4 EL1 |
| | | C3 APS 6 |
| Indigenous Programs | Coordinator | C3 APS 6 |
| | | C3 APS 5 |
| Satellite Delivery | Team Leader | C4 EL1 |
| | Account Manager/Presenter | C3 APS 6 |
| | Account Manager/Presenter | C3 APS 6 |
| | Account Manager/Presenter | C3 APS 6 |
| Planning and Review | Business Manager | C4 EL2 |
| | Projects Officer | C3 APS 6 |
| | Projects Officer | C3 APS 6 |
| | Projects Officer | C3 APS 6 |
| | NAIS Coordinator | C3 APS 6 |

TOTAL STAFF: 33 comprising

- 1 x SES
- 11 x C4 (5 x EL2, 6 x EL1)
- 20 x C3 (19 x APS 6, 1 x APS 5)
- 1 x C2 (1 x APS 3)

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Attachment B

CENTRELINK VIRTUAL COLLEGE STAFF QUALIFICATIONS

| | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Andy Evans | N/A |
| Annette Adams | Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training |
| Anthony Tyrrel | Bachelor of Arts in Technical and Further Education, Degree of Master of Education Leadership, Certificate IV in Front Line Management, Certificate in Horticulture |
| Catherine Hayman | Bachelor of Arts, Graduate Dip Certificate IV in Procurement, Diploma of Front Line Management |
| Cathy Blunden | Bachelor of Adult and Vocational Education, Graduate Certificate in Computer Education, Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training, ANTA course in Professional Development for Training Package Developer |
| Cheryl Edwards | Bachelor of Education in Adult Education, Certificate IV in Workplace Assessment and Training, Diploma of Training and Assessment Systems, Certificate III in Government Contracts and Procurement |
| Cindy Blacker | Associate Diploma in Communication and Media - Public Relations |
| Craig Moore | N/A |
| David Hardy | Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training, Diploma of Training and Assessment Systems (BSZ50198), Diploma of Frontline Management (BSXFMI) |
| Deborah Harrison | Graduate Certificate in Management, Diploma in Project Management |
| Geoff Izzard | Graduate Certificate in Public Sector Management, Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training |
| John Churchill | Bachelor of Science (Honors), Graduate Diploma of Education, Electronics and Communication Certificate |
| Joni Ahern | Bachelor of Arts, Diploma of Education, Associate Diploma in Expressive and Performing Arts, Graduate Certificate in Adult Learning and Development, Certificate IV in Workplace Assessment and Training, Certificate I in Signed English. |
| Lisa Wilson | N/A |
| Lynn Callcut | Diploma of Training and Assessment Systems, Bachelor of Adult and Vocational Teaching, Certificate IV in Workplace Training, Advanced Certificate in Human Resource Development, Associate Diploma of Human Resource Development, Certificate of Interpersonal Skills Instruction Methods |
| Matt Jeppesen | Train the Trainer |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Marcia Tolley | Bachelor of Education, Grad Certificate in Education, Certificate III in Procurement |
| Margaret Hamilton | Bachelor of Arts (Economics), Graduate Diploma in Continuing Education |
| Maria Vukelic | N/A |
| Michele Stansfield | Bachelor of Social Science in Community Service, NAATI Accredited Spanish Interpreter, Workplace Assessor |
| Nicola Butchers | Associate Diploma of Education |
| Nikki Tran | Bachelor of Economics, Certificate II in Business Administration, Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training |
| Peter Geddes | Unavailable at the time. |
| Rachael Russell | Bachelor of Arts (Honours), Diploma of Education |
| Rachel Manning | Graduate Diploma of Education, Bachelor of Arts, Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training |
| Rebecca Nicol | Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Early Childhood Education |
| Ros Roberts | N/A |
| Ross Davidson | Bachelor of Training & Development, Diploma in Business (Administration), Diploma in Frontline Management, Diploma in Training & Assessment Systems, Associate Diploma of Applied Science, Certificate IV in Risk Management, Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training, Certificate IV Workplace Training (Category II), Certificate IV in Business |
| Sandra Stopher | Bachelor of Arts, Graduate Diploma in Adult Education, Certificate IV in Assessment & Workplace Training, Diploma of Training & Assessment Systems |
| Sangeeta Pilger | Bachelor of Arts, Graduate Diploma in Human Resource Management, Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training |
| Shonna Robertson | Bachelor of Education, Diploma of Training and Assessment Systems, Cert IV in Assessment and Workplace Training |
| Simone Chrysochoides | Bachelor Of Social Science (Psychology), Diploma of Project Management |
| Siobhan Palmieri | N/A |
| Sue Jellis | Diploma of Business (Frontline Management), Certificate IV Assessment and Workplace Training, Diploma of Training and Assessment Systems, Bachelor of Education |
| Tanya Jones | Bachelor of Arts, Graduate Diploma Education, Cert IV in Assessment & Workplace Training |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 22

Topic: Centrelink Virtual College

Hansard Page: CA73

Senator Forshaw asked:

- a) Who was responsible for contracting John Mitchell and Associates?
- b) How was the project tendered?
- c) Could we be supplied with a copy of the advertisement for the tender and a copy of the brief for the tender?

Answer:

- a) The contract between the Commonwealth of Australia, represented by Centrelink and JG Mitchell and Associates was arranged by the Centrelink Virtual College utilizing the expertise of the National Purchasing and Contracts Unit.
- b) Expert advice was sought from the president of the Australian Vocational Education and Training Research Association (AVERTA) to determine who were the leading researchers in the field of evaluation and return on investment of training. This advice identified that the two lead researchers were Mr. John Mitchell of JG Mitchell and Associates and Associate Professor Andrew Smith, Head of the School of Management at Charles Stuart University.

Both were approached. They decided to submit a joint proposal. On this basis, the contract was awarded to JG Mitchell and Associates as Project Manager and Principle Consultant with Professor Smith acting as Advisor and Principle Consultant. The contract was approved pursuant to FMA Regulations 8 and 9.

- c) A copy of the advertisement is not available, as the project was not advertised. A copy of the project proposal is at Attachment A.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

ATTACHMENT A

Project to prepare a strategy and propose models to measure learning effectiveness and return on investment (ROI) for the Centrelink Virtual College (CVC)

Background

The Centrelink Virtual College assists Centrelink to conduct a large number of learning programs across the Centrelink network. These programs deliver technical as well as nationally accredited learning to Centrelink staff.

In the current Centrelink National Learning Strategy the CVC identified the need to develop ways to evaluate:

- the effectiveness of these learning programs and
- the return on investment of these programs.

Centrelink needs models for measuring whether or not learning has been transferred and applied in the workplace and models to measure ROI.

The Centrelink National Learning Strategy states:

The evaluation of learning activities is a key priority for Centrelink. All learning in Centrelink should include an evaluation of the effectiveness of that learning in terms of its impact on performance. Over the period of this current Strategy, a national learning evaluation model will be developed to assess the quality and effectiveness of programs, determine national issues and give an indication of return on investment

The project will review existing procedures and models to evaluate effectiveness of learning and ROI and propose models suitable for the CVC.

Objectives

The objectives for the project are to:

1. Review and document existing procedures and models to measure training effectiveness and ROI, related to the context of Centrelink.
2. Evaluate and propose models on measuring training effectiveness and ROI in training that could be applied in the Centrelink context.
3. To present the results of the project to Centrelink management committees as appropriate.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Methodologies

It is assumed that the following methodologies will be used:

1. Visit to Canberra for briefing and to meet with key staff.
2. Visit to Sydney Area Office of Centrelink to meet with key staff.
3. Research and document existing processes and models, aligning them to the Centrelink context.
4. Preparation of a final paper incorporating the review of possible processes and their possible application to the Centrelink context.
5. Presentations in Canberra to Centrelink management committees as appropriate.

Deliverables

1. Interim report, following the site visits, summarising issues that may need to be incorporated into models.
2. Final paper including the review of possible models and recommendations to meet the needs in regard to evaluation of learning and ROI.
3. PowerPoint Presentation to Centrelink management committees as appropriate.

Consortium development

To facilitate this process, the Centrelink Virtual College has held discussions with the Berwyn Clayton, the President of the Australian Vocational Education and Training Research Association (AVETRA). On her advice the CVC approached the two lead researchers John Mitchell from John Mitchell and Associates and Andrew Smith from Charles Sturt University. After initial consultation both researchers suggested they would like to cooperate on the project rather than separately submitting proposals.

On the basis of these discussions the consortium will consist of John Mitchell & Associates, and Charles Sturt University.

1. Project Manager and Principal Consultant: John Mitchell, Managing Director, John Mitchell & Associates
2. Adviser and Principal Consultant: Assoc Prof Andrew Smith, Head, School of Management, Charles Sturt University
3. Economist: Sam Mitchell, John Mitchell & Associates.
4. Business applications of ROI: Dennis Macnamara, John Mitchell & Associates,

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Project timeframes and costs.

| Date | Milestone | Activity | Costs (Inc GST) |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| April 2002 | Initial discussion, researchers approached | Discussions held with AVETRA and proposed researchers | |
| May 2002 | Initial contract developed and signed | Development of initial contact brief and agreement from consortium and CVC on project deliverables | \$2500 paid at contract signing |
| May to June 2002 | Research and documentation of existing processes that could meet Centrelink's needs, and familiarisation visits complete | Visit to Canberra for briefing and to meet with key staff. Visit to Sydney Area Office of Centrelink to meet with key staff. Preparation of documentation of existing processes that could suit the Centrelink context. | \$2500 paid on delivery of interim report. |
| June 2002 | Final paper completed and submitted for review | Preparation of a final paper proposing models to suit Centrelink needs.. | \$5000 paid at final paper review |
| July 2002 | Presentation of final paper and direction for next stage. | Presentations to management committees as appropriate. | \$5000 paid at project completion. |

Project costs.

Total project cost of \$15,000 (Inclusive of GST)

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 23

Topic: Board of Management

Hansard Page: CA75

Senator Collins asked:

What are the overall annual costs of getting the board together monthly?

Answer:

The overall annual cost of getting the board together monthly for the 2002-03 financial year is \$93,090.89.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 24

Topic: Annual Report - Website

Hansard Page: CA76

Senator Collins asked:

- a) Can you provide information on the award won for the effectiveness of the annual report site.
- b) What was the cost of setting up the annual report site?

Answer:

a) Centrelink received the Institute of Public Administration Australia (IPAA) Award in the Financial Management and Accountability (FMA) Act Category for our 2001/2002 Online Annual Report. The following is an extract from the IPAA site:

‘Centrelink has forged ahead this year with innovation. They bring to their online version of the report 'quick-keys', which reflect a reader's use of the keyboard to access key content in online documents. They also refine the ability of readers to manipulate the text display size on the screen and the display colours. Centrelink has a succinct Guide to the Report to help readers orient themselves in the document, and also a dedicated Features and Welcome page that explain their innovations - all wrapped up in a visual design that works well for this report.’

<http://www.act.ipaa.org.au/annualreportsawards/annualreportsawards/200102awards/onlinereportcategorywinnersin20012002>

b) The Online Annual Report site is part of the existing www.centrelink.gov.au website. As such there was no cost in setting up the site.

When we created the original Online Annual Report template in 2001/2002, it was consciously designed for ease of re-use and further development. In producing the 2002/2003 Online Annual Report, we made some improvements to how the report is presented. This work was done entirely within Centrelink and the total costs were:

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Internet Site Architecture & Development (1 day) | \$308.70 |
| HTML Mark-up & Testing (58 days – 4 staff for approx 3 weeks) | \$17904.60 |
| Project Management (6 days) | \$1852.20 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 25

Topic: Parliamentary Library requests for data

Hansard Page: CA77

Senator Collins asked:

Has Centrelink ever been able to provide data in accurate terms by electorate to the Parliamentary Library?

Answer:

In 1998, Centrelink detected a trend in information requests for benefit, postcode and electoral data. To expedite information requests, Centrelink prepared this information for all electorates on Compact Disc (CD). A copy of this CD was provided to both the Minister's Office and to the Parliamentary Library as a 'one-off' product to enable ease of access to population/benefits data.

Generally, "electoral" data is provided by postcode because of the structure of Centrelink's databases and the relative ease of obtaining reports derived from those sources. In some exceptional cases, such as isolated and specific requests from Members of Parliament, Centrelink has tried to provide data on an electoral basis. However, to provide that type of data requires far more resource intensive activity and would not be sustainable for a higher volume of requests. Centrelink is also not able to guarantee the veracity of information in these circumstances because of the potential for electoral boundaries to dissect the same postcode or even streets.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink.....Question No: 26

Topic: More Choice for Families

Hansard Page: CA94/95

Senator Collins asked: Could we have an update on the number of families taking up the More Choice for Families payment option for the March quarter?

Answer:

The following table is updated information, as at 26 March 2004, on the number of FTB customers who have chosen one or more of the new payment arrangements.

| Choice Group | Number of Customers |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Adjustment & Child Deferral | 4,705 |
| Adjustment & Deferral | 42,585 |
| Adjustment & Deferral & Child Deferral | 1,207 |
| Adjustment only | 345,850 |
| Child Deferral only | 18,526 |
| Deferral & Child Deferral | 3,210 |
| Deferral only | 68,861 |
| TOTAL | 484,944 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 27

Topic: Child Care Benefit (CCB)

Hansard Page: CA122

Senator Collins asked: I am seeking to understand the nature of the amount of adjustment that needs to occur:

- a) whether there are any particular peaks in the cycle, for instance;
- b) whether there are particular stages of vulnerability for services in terms of this adjustment process;
- c) the level of the adjustments that we are talking about;
- d) the extent to which adjustment needs to occur for different types of operators.

Answer:

- a) Adjustments are largely driven by demand and supply for child care and the level of CCB advances passed on to the provider. Adjustments that may appear in a cycle would differ from one service provider to the next. The amount advanced is dependent on the number of CCB eligible children in care in a specific period and the percentages of CCB that these families are eligible for. Long day care centres and Family Day Care, for example, tend to experience changes to demand during the January to March period when children leave the service to start school with new families coming in to fill vacancies. Some service providers experience peaks and troughs as a result of seasonal work, eg, increased tourism during summer months which translates into increased child care needs during this period.
- b) There should at no point be particular stages of vulnerability for services in terms of the adjustment process for CCB. Advances can only be used by services to pass on reduced child care fees to families. Therefore, a service that has been provided with an over-advance for a particular period should not be subject to financial constraints when future advances are adjusted accordingly. The FAO works closely with individual providers to ensure adjustments are closely monitored and that adjustments of over-advances are not impacting upon the viability of a provider.
- c) The level of adjustment depends on the amount of the over-advance and the amount of a provider's advance. Generally providers with an over-advance, that represents more than 25% of their next advance, are contacted to ascertain the level of adjustment required to reduce the over-advance and ensure that the provider is not placed under financial hardship. The adjustment amount should be at least 25%, but can be negotiated at a lower rate once justification for financial hardship can be established.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

- d) Generally, adjustments are driven by local demand and supply for child care. Long day care centres and Family Day Care, for example, may experience more adjustments as a result of reduced operation and reduced child care numbers during the January to March period. Outside School Hours Care (OSHC) tend to run to capacity during the terms. Adjustments for vacation care are calculated on one period prior and the FAO takes into account the differing State/Territory vacation periods. Some vacation care operators do not operate during all holiday periods.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 28

Topic: Child Care Benefit (CCB) Advance-quit system

Hansard Page: CA122

Senator Collins asked:

Please describe how the process is operating and how many centres have large adjustments that impact on their viability.

Answer:

CCB is paid to providers each period as an advance. These advances are based on fee reductions given in the statement period before last, with the exception of vacation care, which is calculated on the previous advance period. Four statement periods form the basis of the CCB advance-acquit payment cycle. These periods are:

1. July to September
 2. October to December
 3. January to March
 4. April to June
- e) The total advance amount for each period is split over the three months and is paid at a rate of 40% for the first month, 30% for the second month and 30% for the third month. After the end of each period the amount of Child Care Benefit passed on to families is compared to the advance when services provide their statement of child care usage. Where the provider passes on more Child Care Benefit than they were advanced the difference is paid as a top-up.

Where a provider passes on less Child Care Benefit than they were advanced, future advances are adjusted to take into account the funds kept in reserve by the provider. Providers should not at any time experience adjustments that impact on their viability.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink Question No: 151

Topic: Performance Assessment Mechanisms - Centrelink

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Carr asked:

For each agency within the Department, please provide full details of each of the performance assessment mechanisms linked to the pay outcomes or other financial reward of individual employees, including:

- a) What are the current process/es of performance assessment within the portfolio agency? If more than one, please provide details of each, and the employee category it applies to;
- b) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), please list the range of outcome results an employee can achieve from each of the performance assessment processes identified in (a);
- c) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), what pay or other financial change is linked to each outcome or result for the employee from the performance assessment [ie, the pay increase or one-off bonus or classification or level change];
- d) For each of the performance assessments identified in (a), what is the classification level of employees subject to this performance assessment (eg SES, EL1, EL2 or APS and equivalent);
- e) What is the principal industrial or other instrument governing each of the performance assessment mechanism/s (eg, the certified agreement or AWA); and
- f) Does the performance assessment operate over a common cycle? Please provide the commencement and end dates of the most recent full cycle of each of the assessment processes.

Answer:

- a) All Centrelink employees are subject to a performance assessment process.

Non-SES employees have a 12 monthly performance assessment cycle and are assessed annually on their regular assessment date (RAD). Each employee has a personal performance plan in place that is developed by the individual employee and their team leader/manager. Employees are assessed against work objectives that relate to the employee's duties, and performance descriptors that are standard throughout Centrelink and relate to the employee's behaviour. During the cycle, performance reviews are undertaken at least twice.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

SES employees have their performance assessed by the CEO and a member of the Centrelink Executive. Assessment in relation to the payment of performance pay is undertaken during the year on an informal basis.

- b) For non-SES employees there are three different performance assessment ratings. The ratings and the subsequent outcomes are as follows:
- If the employee is assessed as ‘meeting expectations’, their salary is advanced by one pay point within their substantive classification level;
 - If the employee is assessed as ‘exceeding expectations’:
 - their salary is advanced by two pay points within their substantive classification level; or
 - if there is a performance pay point at the top of the particular classification level, the employee is advanced to this pay point (Note: performance pay points are additional pay points at the top of some classifications that can only be attained if the employee is assessed as ‘exceeding expectations’).
 - If the employee is assessed as ‘performance improvement required’, their salary is not advanced. However, the employee is entitled to be re-assessed within three months and, if subsequently assessed as meeting expectations, their salary is advanced by one pay point within their substantive classification level.

The current Centrelink Development Agreement provides for future links between accredited learning and remuneration. The details of implementation are still to be worked out with the CPSU.

For SES employees there are two performance assessment ratings and outcomes:

- If, in the CEO’s opinion, the employee is assessed as performing at the required level, they receive performance pay and their salary may be increased in line with the SES AWA classification framework ie. within their substantive SES classification level; and
- If, in the CEO’s opinion, the employee is not performing at the required level, the CEO will notify the employee that the performance pay may not be payable in respect of the next period of three months unless the employee’s performance improves to the required level. In this situation, a review is undertaken at the end of the quarter. The employee’s substantive salary may, or may not, be increased as a result.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

- c) Please refer to answer b) above.

- d) Non-SES employee classification levels are APS 1-6 and APS Executive 1-2.
SES employee classification levels are Band 1-3.

- e) The Centrelink Development Agreement 2003-2005 is the principal industrial instrument governing the performance assessment process for non-SES employees. SES employees are covered by individual AWAs.

- f) The performance assessment cycle does not operate over a common cycle. Each employee - non-SES and SES - has a different cycle and a different assessment date.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 152

Topic: Performance Assessment Mechanisms - Centrelink

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Carr asked:

For each performance assessment mechanism described in (1), advise the number of male and the number of female employees at each possible outcome, by classification level for the most recent full cycle (if the performance mechanism does not operate over a common cycle – aggregate outcomes using the 2002-03 financial year).

Answer:

The detailed information required to answer the question is not readily available.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 153

Topic: Staffing

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

- a) Can you provide us with an updated table of Centrelink staffing levels for each year of its existence and for the forward estimates period?
- b) How many temporary and/or casual positions have been added or lost in the years 2001-02, 2002-03 and 2003-04 to date?
- c) How many temporary and/or casual positions have been terminated or not continued as a result of the 1.5% across the board cut to running costs?

Answer:

a) Table 1 below shows the average staffing level for the years 1997-98 to 2002-03, as well as the total estimated ASL for the period 2003-04 to 2006-07.

Table 1. Average Staffing Level 1997-98 to 2006-07

| Year | Average Staffing Level (ASL) | Total Estimated ASL |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1997-98 | 23,745 | |
| 1998-99 | 22,329 | |
| 1999-00 | 20,416 | |
| 2000-01 | 21,086 | |
| 2001-02 | 22,488 | |
| 2002-03 | 24,115 | |
| 2003-04 | | 24,251 |
| 2004-05 | | 23,112 |
| 2005-06 | | 22,374 |
| 2006-07 | | 21,663 |

Forward estimates are based on current known revenue and do not include revenue assumptions for future Federal Budget measures, other new business or unearned revenue that may go forward into 2004-05.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

b) Tables 2 and 3 below show the number of commencements and separations for non-ongoing employees during this period.

Table 2. Non-Ongoing Commencements 2001-02 to 2003-04 (year-to-date)

| Year | Non-Ongoing Term/Task ¹ | Non-Ongoing Irregular/Intermittent ² |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 2001-02 | 2322 | 38 |
| 2002-03 | 3805 | 50 |
| 2003-04 (as at 31/01/04) | 619 | 44 |

1. Non-Ongoing Term/Task – these are temporary positions
2. Non-Ongoing Irregular/Intermittent – these are casual positions

Table 3. Non-Ongoing Separations 2001-02 to 2003-04 (year-to-date)

| Year | Separation Reason | Non-Ongoing Term/Task | Non-Ongoing Irregular/Intermittent |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| 2001-02 | Non-Ongoing End of Engagement ¹ | 1605 | 13 |
| | Employee-Initiated ² | 258 | 2 |
| | Organisation-Initiated ^{3s} | 170 | 0 |
| | Other | 0 | 10 |
| | Total | 2033 | 25 |
| 2002-03 | Non-Ongoing End of Engagement | 1833 | 19 |
| | Employee-Initiated | 419 | 2 |
| | Organisation-Initiated | 164 | 1 |
| | Other | 23 | 1 |
| | Total | 2439 | 23 |
| 2003-04 (as at 31/01/04) | Non-Ongoing End of Engagement | 1259 | 23 |
| | Employee-Initiated | 237 | 1 |
| | Organisation-Initiated | 74 | 5 |
| | Other | 6 | 1 |
| | Total | 1576 | 30 |

1. Non-Ongoing End of Engagement – the contract has expired.
2. Employee-Initiated Separations – these include resignations, retirements and deaths, in line with the definition used by HRM Consulting (Centrelink's HR benchmarking partner).
3. Organisation-Initiated Separations – these include terminations owing to breaches of the code of conduct, unsatisfactory performance, non-performance of duties, incapacity etc, as well as early termination of a non-ongoing contract.

Table 3 above shows that most non-ongoing separations were as a result of contract expiry.

c) Nil.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Centrelink

Question No: 154

Topic: Guiding Coalition costs

Hansard Page: CA75

Senator Collins asked:

Could you give us a breakdown of airfares, accommodation and other expenses for these meetings?

Answer:

A breakdown of approximate costs per meeting for airfares, accommodation and other expenses is as follows:

Airfares: **\$12,000**

Accommodation: **\$8,000**

Other expenses: **\$20,000**

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4 Cross Outcomes

Question No: 59

Topic: Public Compliance Campaign

Hansard Page: CA44/Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

1. Please provide the report from the focus groups; and
2. How many people did the focus groups cover?

Answer:

1. The report is presently under deliberation and is not available for release.
2. See answer to (1) above.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4 Cross Outcomes

Question No: 60

Topic: Media Campaigns

Hansard Page: CA45/Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

3. In terms of the impacts of the media campaigns, were they similar to those that were reported in the UK and New Zealand?
 - a. If so, how?
 - b. If not, what were the differences?
 - c. What were the differences in terms of outcomes?

Answer:

3. In terms of the impact of the voluntary compliance communication campaign:
 - a. It was similar to UK and New Zealand campaigns in that it used multi-media to target segments in order to promote reporting of circumstances that might affect income support payments;
 - b. Differences tend to be in the intent and creative execution of the advertisements. Both UK and New Zealand television advertisements were more confronting than the Australian advertisements which were designed to appeal to a person's desire to "do the right thing";
 - c. All campaigns were considered successful.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4 – Cross Outcomes **Question No: 61**

Topic: Allen Consulting

Hansard Page: CA54/Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

In relation to Allen Consulting:

- a. How many other potential tenderers had been selected?
- b. How many of these chose to tender?

Answer:

In response to the questions above:

- a. One other potential tenderer was selected.
- b. Both potential tenderers submitted applications to perform the task.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes

Question No: 119

Topic: Performance Assessment Mechanisms – FaCS

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Carr asked:

For each agency within the Department, please provide full details of each of the performance assessment mechanisms linked to the pay outcomes or other financial reward of individual employees, including;

- a) What are the current process/es of performance assessment within the portfolio agency? If more than one, please provide details of each, and the employee category it applies to.
- b) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), please list the range of outcome results an employee can achieve from each of the performance assessment processes identified in (a);
- c) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), what pay or other financial change is linked to each outcome or result for the employee from the performance assessment [ie, the pay increase or one-off bonus or classification or level change];
- d) For each of the performance assessments identified in (a), what is the classification level of employees subject to this performance assessment (eg SES, EL1, EL2 or APS and equivalent);
- e) What is the principal industrial or other instrument governing each of the performance assessment mechanism/s (eg, the certified agreement or AWA);
- f) Does the performance assessment operate over a common cycle? Please provide the commencement and end dates of the most recent full cycle of each of the assessment processes.

Answer:

- a) All employees of the Department of Family and Community Services are required to develop a performance agreement and to have their performance assessed under the Individual Performance Management Scheme (IPMS). This applies to staff on AWAs and those covered by the certified agreement. Employees are required to revise agreements when and if they change areas or their duties change. While regular feedback is encouraged, formal processes are in place for both mid-term and end of cycle reviews.
- b) **Salary advancement:** Employees who have not achieved the maximum salary for their particular classification may advance one salary point on achieving at least a fully effective rating at their end of cycle review. Within broadbanded classifications employees are required to complete stretching objectives to progress between broadbanded APS classifications.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Performance Improvement Plan: Employees who do not achieve a fully effective rating at either mid-term or end of cycle review will be required to undertake a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). Employees failing to achieve a fully effective rating after a PIP will have their performance monitored under the Underperformance guidelines which may result in reduction in classification or termination.

Performance pay: 101 employees have Australian Workplace Agreements (AWAs) which provide access to performance based pay where they achieve at least a fully effective rating.

- c) See point b.
- d) All classifications are subject to the same performance assessment process.
- e) The FaCS Certified Agreement 2002-2005. Individual AWAs also include this requirement.
- f) The performance assessment operates over a common cycle from 1 August to 31 July each year.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes

Question No: 120

Topic: Performance Assessment Mechanisms – FaCS

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Carr asked: For each performance assessment mechanism described in (1), advise the number of male and the number of female employees at each possible outcome, by classification level for the most recent full cycle (if the performance mechanism does not operate over a common cycle - aggregate outcomes using the 2002-03 financial year).

Answer:

FaCS has a single performance assessment mechanism. The following tables outline the outcomes available to staff under FaCS' Individual Performance Management Scheme.

Staff eligible for salary advancement subject to full effective performance rating (Note: advancement is limited to a single salary point each cycle).

| Classification | Male | Female |
|-----------------|------------|------------|
| FaCS B1 | 14 | 38 |
| FaCS B2 | 38 | 149 |
| FaCS B3 | 168 | 417 |
| FaCS EL1 | 46 | 108 |
| FaCS EL2 | 22 | 32 |
| SES 1 | 0 | 0 |
| SES 2 | 0 | 0 |
| SES 3 | 0 | 0 |

Staff not eligible for salary advancement as already on maximum for classification.

| Classification | Male | Female |
|-----------------|------------|------------|
| FaCS B1 | 9 | 21 |
| FaCS B2 | 34 | 86 |
| FaCS B3 | 96 | 146 |
| FaCS EL1 | 133 | 203 |
| FaCS EL2 | 62 | 72 |
| SES 1 | 18 | 14 |
| SES 2 | 2 | 8 |
| SES 3 | 2 | 0 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Staff eligible for performance pay subject to fully effective performance rating.

| Classification | Male | Female |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| FaCS B1 | 0 | 0 |
| FaCS B2 | 0 | 0 |
| FaCS B3 | 0 | 1 |
| FaCS EL1 | 11 | 7 |
| FaCS EL2 | 10 | 28 |
| SES 1 | 18 | 14 |
| SES 2 | 2 | 8 |
| SES 3 | 2 | 0 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes

Question No: 121

Topic: Admin Programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

How many Senior Executive Officers (or equivalent) were employed in the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04.

Answer:

| | Family & Community Services | Social Security Appeals Tribunal (c) | Australian Institute of Family Studies | Centrelink |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1996-97 | (a) | 9 | 2 | not applicable |
| 1997-98 | (a) | 9 | 2 | 53 |
| 1998-99 | 44 | 9 | 3 | 62 |
| 1999-00 | 45 | 9 | 2 | 59 |
| 2000-01 | 50 | 9 | 2 | 71 |
| 2001-02 | 54 | 6 | 2 | 82 |
| 2002-03 | 56 | 6 | 2 | 86 |
| 2003-04* | 60 (b) | 6 (b) | 2 (b) | 85 (d) |

(a) Not available, as FaCS did not exist prior to 1998-99.

(b) Data is as at 1 January 2004.

(c) Social Security Appeals Tribunal Senior Executive equivalents (Executive Director and Directors) are appointed by the Governor General and remunerated through the Remunerations Tribunal.

(d) Data is at March 2004.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes

Question No: 122

Topic: Admin Programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

What was the base and top (including performance pay) wages of APS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (or equivalent), Executive Level 1 and 2 (or equivalent), and SES band 1, band 2 and band 3 (or equivalent) in the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04.

Answer:

Information about remuneration of staff in the Department of Family and Community Services and Centrelink can be found in the relevant Annual Reports. The FaCS Annual Reports include information for the Social Security Appeals Tribunal.

Information for the Australian Institute of Family Studies follows.

| Australian Institute of Family Studies, Rates of Pay 1998-2004 | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Jun-98 | Jun-99 | Jun-00 | Jun-01 | Jun-02 | Jun-03 | Jun-04 |
| APS 1 Base | 23,938 | 25,149 | 25,149 | 25,904 | 26,682 | 26,682 | 29,138 |
| APS 1 Top | 26,457 | 27,796 | 27,796 | 28,630 | 29,489 | 29,489 | 32,204 |
| With Performance Pay | | 29,186 | 29,186 | | | | |
| APS 2 Base | 27,091 | 28,462 | 28,462 | 29,316 | 30,196 | 30,196 | 33,885 |
| APS 2 Top | 30,042 | 31,562 | 31,562 | 32,509 | 33,485 | 33,485 | 36,567 |
| With Performance Pay | | 33,140 | 33,140 | | | | |
| APS 3 Base | 28,890 | 32,418 | 32,418 | 33,391 | 34,393 | 34,393 | 37,559 |
| APS 3 Top | 33,914 | 35,630 | 35,630 | 36,699 | 37,800 | 37,800 | 41,279 |
| With Performance Pay | | 37,412 | 37,412 | | | | |
| APS 4 Base | 34,491 | 36,131 | 36,131 | 37,215 | 38,332 | 38,332 | 41,860 |
| APS 4 Top | 37,341 | 39,230 | 39,230 | 40,407 | 41,620 | 41,620 | 45,451 |
| With Performance Pay | | 41,192 | 41,192 | | | | |
| APS 5 Base | 38,359 | 40,565 | 40,565 | 41,782 | 43,036 | 43,036 | 46,997 |
| APS 5 Top | 40,675 | 42,733 | 42,733 | 44,015 | 44,336 | 44,336 | 49,509 |
| With Performance Pay | | 44,870 | 44,870 | | | | |
| APS 6 Base | 41,430 | 43,526 | 43,526 | 44,832 | 46,177 | 46,177 | 50,427 |
| APS 6 Top | 47,591 | 49,999 | 49,999 | 51,499 | 53,044 | 53,044 | 57,926 |
| With Performance Pay | | 52,499 | 52,499 | | | | |
| Exec 1 Base | 50,931 | 55,799 | 55,799 | 57,473 | 59,198 | 59,198 | 64,646 |
| Exec 1 Top | 55,170 | 60,253 | 60,253 | 62,061 | 63,923 | 63,923 | 71,391 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| With Performance Pay | | 63,266 | 63,266 | | | | |
| Exec 2 Base | 57,983 | 64,357 | 64,357 | 66,288 | 68,277 | 68,277 | 74,561 |
| Exec 2 Top | 69,719 | 76,686 | 76,686 | 78,987 | 81,357 | 81,357 | 88,845 |
| With Performance Pay | | 80,520 | 80,520 | 90,835 | 93,561 | 93,561 | 102,172 |
| SES 1 Base | 68,228 | 68,228 | 68,228 | 75,036 | 75,036 | 80,664 | 84,294 |
| SES 1 Top | 82,120 | 89,533 | 89,533 | 89,774 | 89,774 | 96,507 | 100,850 |
| With Performance Pay | | | | | | | |
| SES 3 (PEO) | 106,550 | 115,800 | 119,600 | 129,892 | 129,892 | 129,892 | 129,892 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes....

Question No: 125

Topic: Admin Programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

Could you provide a list of all administered programmes in the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies, including:

- a) A description of the programme;
- b) number of people directly receiving funds/assistance under the programme;
- c) a breakdown on those receiving funds/assistance under the programme by electorate;
- d) the policy objective of the programme;
- e) whether the programme is ongoing;
- f) the funding in each financial year of the forward estimates for the programme (with a breakdown of administered and departmental expenses), including:
 - how much funding was allocated for the programme;
 - how much is committed to the programme; and
 - how much is unspent.
- g) indication of whether an evaluation of the programme effectiveness has been conducted:
 - if so, when that evaluation occurred; and
 - if so, the conclusion of that evaluation.

Answer:

- (a) This information is available in the PBS and FaCS Annual Report
- (b) Where available this information is included in the PBS and FaCS Annual Report
- (c) This would require significant resources which FaCS is not prepared to commit at this time
- (d) This information is available in the PBS and FaCS Annual Report
- (e) This information is available in the PBS and FaCS Annual Report
- (f) Refer to question 126. Further breakdown would require significant resources and FaCS is not prepared to commit at this time
- (g) Where available this information is included in the PBS and FaCS Annual Report

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink
Topic: Admin Programs

Question No: 129

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: How many staff had mobile phones issued by the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date;

Answer: Staff numbers within Department of Family and Community Service, Social Security Appeals Tribunal, Child Support Agency and the Australian Institute of Family Studies with mobile phones:

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2003-04 (at Feb 2004) | 647 |
| 2002-03 | 690 |
| 2001-02 | 706 |
| 2000-01 | 600 |
| 1999-00 | 170 |
| 1998-99 | 7 (information relates to AIFS. No central data collection point for FaCS during this time.) |
| 1997-98 | Department formed October 1998 |
| 1996-97 | Department formed October 1998 |

It is not possible to provide a breakdown by branch due to staff movements between different branches of the department. The totals include figures for Disability Services Reforms, Office of Disability and National Disabilities Service (refer to QON 104).

Centrelink

For Centrelink, prior to 2001-02, the information is not available as the management and purchasing of mobile phones was decentralised and there is no repository of information.

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| 2001-02: | 2973 |
| 2002-03: | 3312 |
| 2003-04 (at Feb 2004) | 3581 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink

Question No: 130

Topic: Admin Programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: What was the total mobile phone bill for the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date;

Answer: The total mobile phone bill for the Department of Family and Community Services; Social Security and Appeals Tribunal; Child Support Agency and the Australian Institute of Family Studies:

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2003-04 (at Feb 2004) | \$221,319 |
| 2002-03 | \$373,751 |
| 2001-02 | \$560,275 |
| 2000-01 | \$475,518 |
| 1999-00 | \$351,688 |
| 1998-99 | \$357 (information relates to AIFS. No central data collection point for FaCS) |
| 1997-98 | Department formed October 1998 |
| 1996-97 | Department formed October 1998 |

It is not possible to provide a breakdown by branch due to staff movements between different branches of the department. The totals include figures for Disability Services Reforms, Office of Disability and National Disabilities Service (refer to QON 105).

Centrelink

The total mobile phone bill for Centrelink for the above-mentioned years is listed below. The following information has been obtained from General Ledger codes.

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 1996-97: | No information available |
| 1997-98: | \$43,752 |
| 1998-99: | \$1,236,034 |
| 1999-00: | \$1,249,490 |
| 2000-01: | \$1,221,133 |
| 2001-02: | \$1,344,822 |
| 2002-03: | \$1,486,461 |
| 2003-04 (at Feb 2004) | \$934,284 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink

Question No: 132

Topic: Admin Programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

How many overseas trips were taken by employees in your agency/department in 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date.

Answer:

The total overseas trips for the Department of Family and Community Services; Social Security Appeals Tribunal; Child Support Agency; Centrelink; Commonwealth Rehabilitation Service and Australian Institute of Family Studies.

| | FaCS | AIFS | SSAT | Centrelink | Total by Year |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1998/99 | 55 | 0 | 0 | N/A | 55 |
| 1999/00 | 74 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 103 |
| 2000/01 | 103 | 11 | 0 | 51 | 165 |
| 2001/02 | 70 | 4 | 0 | 54 | 128 |
| 2002/03 | 105 | 8 | 0 | 66 | 179 |
| 2003/04 | 48 | 7 | 0 | 52 | 107 |

Unable to provide breakdown by branch. This total includes figures for Disability Service Reforms, Office of Disability and National Disabilities Service (refer to QON 108).

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink

Question No: 133

Topic: Admin Programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

What were the destinations of each of these overseas trips?

Answer:

Department of Family and Community Services

1998-99

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Canada | USA |
| China | New Zealand |
| Chile | UK |
| Portugal | Singapore |
| Yugoslavia | Brazil |
| Croatia | France |
| Italy | Finland |
| Romania | Russia |
| Bulgaria | Morocco |
| India | Switzerland |
| Thailand | Japan |
| Malaysia | Papua New Guinea |
| Fiji | Germany |
| Philippines | |
| Pacific Islands | |

1999-00

| | |
|-------------|----------------|
| UK | South Korea |
| France | Mongolia |
| Germany | Czechoslovakia |
| USA | Indonesia |
| Philippines | Spain |
| Romania | Hong Kong |
| China | Canada |
| New Zealand | Denmark |
| Singapore | India |
| Netherlands | Malaysia |
| Bulgaria | Italy |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

2000-01

| | |
|-------------|--------------|
| China | Canada |
| Finland | France |
| Netherlands | Spain |
| Sweden | Romania |
| Denmark | Germany |
| USA | Ireland |
| Thailand | Indonesia |
| Hong Kong | Philippines |
| New Zealand | Vietnam |
| Japan | India |
| Taiwan | Tajikistan |
| Singapore | South Africa |
| UK | Italy |

2001-02

| | |
|-------------|-------------|
| USA | Austria |
| Canada | Malaysia |
| Vietnam | East Timor |
| Switzerland | Thailand |
| India | Indonesia |
| Korea | Belgium |
| France | Croatia |
| China | Norway |
| Hong Kong | Philippines |
| New Zealand | Singapore |
| Netherlands | Italy |
| Sweden | |

2002-03

| | | |
|-------------|------------|----------------|
| Vietnam | Mongolia | Czechoslovakia |
| China | Singapore | Denmark |
| USA | Mexico | Canada |
| UK | Korea | Germany |
| Netherlands | Ireland | India |
| Fiji | France | Sweden |
| Malaysia | East Timor | Norway |
| New Zealand | Japan | Italy |
| Indonesia | Austria | Greece |
| Noumea | Bosnia | Botswana |
| Thailand | Belgium | |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

2003-04

| | |
|-------------|-------------|
| USA | China |
| UK | Vietnam |
| East Timor | Brunei |
| Azerbaijan | Korea |
| Indonesia | Japan |
| Vietnam | Singapore |
| New Zealand | Philippines |
| Slovakia | France |
| Nigeria | Italy |
| Mongolia | Kuwait |
| Canada | Netherlands |

Centrelink

The destinations for each Centrelink overseas trip is as follows:

| | |
|----------|--------------------------|
| 1996-97: | Not applicable |
| 1997-98: | No information available |
| 1998-99: | No information available |

1999-00:

- USA/CANADA
- NEW ZEALAND
- SINGAPORE
- CHINA
- EUROPE

2000-01:

- USA/CANADA
- NEW ZEALAND
- SINGAPORE
- CHINA
- EUROPE
- JAPAN
- **SOUTH AFRICA**

2001-02:

- USA/CANADA
- NEW ZEALAND
- SINGAPORE
- EUROPE

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

2002-03:

- USA/CANADA
- NEW ZEALAND
- SINGAPORE
- CHINA
- EUROPE
- BALI
- *VIETNAM*
- *INDIA*

2003-04 to date:

- USA/CANADA
- NEW ZEALAND
- SINGAPORE
- EUROPE
- BALI
- BRUNEI

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink

Question No: 134

Topic: Admin Programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

What was the total costs of overseas trips of staff by the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date.

- With a breakdown on the cost of accommodation allowances, food allowances and airflights.

Answer:

This answer relates to Department of Family and Community Services, including AIFS, CSA, SSAT and CRS (up until 2000-01 when they moved to Department of Health and Ageing).

Providing a breakdown of costs into the components requested requires extensive manual processing and is unavailable at this point in time. The totals below include figures for Disability Service Reforms, Office of Disability and National Disabilities Service (refer to QON 109).

| Department of Family and Community Services | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| | 1998-99 | 1999-00 | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 to date |
| Airfares | \$179,914 | \$326,900 | \$496,478 | \$377,747 | \$667,371 | \$224,938 |
| Meals/Accomm | \$241,294 | \$281,070 | \$329,883 | \$232,716 | \$469,161 | \$148,478 |
| Total | \$421,208 | \$607,970 | \$826,361 | \$610,463 | \$1,136,532 | \$373,416 |

Centrelink

For Centrelink, the following information is provided:

1996-97: No information available
 1997-98: No information available
 1998-99: No information available

| Financial Year | Airfares | Meals, incidentals, other allowances | Accommodation | Total |
|----------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1999-00 | \$106,390.45 | \$43,517.42 | \$39,087.30 | \$188,995.17 |
| 2000-01 | \$258,705.64 | \$158,554.95 | \$64,697.17 | \$481,957.76 |
| 2001-02 | \$241,159.68 | \$72,559.69 | \$77,615.78 | \$391,335.15 |
| 2002-03 | \$461,757.93 | \$159,489.90 | \$212,326.26 | \$833,574.09 |
| 2003-04 | \$263,152.04 | \$94,263.78 | \$85,497.90 | \$442,913.72 |
| Total | \$1,3312,165.74 | \$528,385.74 | \$479,224.41 | \$2,338,775.89 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink

Question No: 136

Topic: Admin Programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

How many overseas trips of Ministerial Staff were paid for by the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date.

Answer:

Overseas travel by Ministerial staff is the responsibility of the Department of Finance and Administration.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink

Question No: 137

Topic: Admin Programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

What was the total cost of overseas trips of Ministerial Staff paid for by the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date.

Answer:

Overseas travel by Ministerial staff is the responsibility of the Department of Finance and Administration.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink.....

Question No: 138

Topic: Admin Programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

How much was spent on consultancies by the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date.

Answer:

Department of Family and Community Services (FaCS)

FaCS was established in October 1998. The following are the amounts for succeeding years for FaCS, the Child Support Agency and the Social Security Appeals Tribunal, except for the current financial year (2003-04).

| 1998/99 | 1999/00 | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| \$9.2M | \$18.6M | \$15.9M | \$12.2M | \$16.9M |

The amount spent on consultancies from 1 July 2003 to 30 April 2004 is \$13,975,687.

Centrelink

The following Table indicates how much was spent by Centrelink on consultancies in the financial years ended 30 June 1997 to 30 June 2003:

| 1998/99 | 1999/2000 | 2000/2001 | 2001/2002 | 2002/2003 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| \$7.0M | \$9.31 | \$5.6M | \$8.1M | \$10.0M |

The amount spent on consultancies by Centrelink from 1 July 2003 to 23 March 2004 is \$4.7M.

Australian Institute of Family Studies

| 1998-99 | 1999-00 | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 to date. |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|
| \$142,735 | \$82,368 | \$42,164 | \$121,195 | \$577,253 | \$1,384,976 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes.....

Question No: 123

Topic: SES Pay Rates

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

What was the average salary for and SES (or equivalent) in the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04.

Answer:

Department of Family and Community Services

| Financial Year | SES Average Remuneration |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1998-99 | \$92,922(a) |
| 1999-00 | \$96,082 |
| 2000-01 | \$98,200 |
| 2001-02 | \$99,364 |
| 2002-03 | \$110,069 |
| 2003-04 | \$113,553 |

(a) Excludes CSA as data not readily available from Australian Taxation Office legacy system for 1998-99.

Note:

- These figures are based on SES salary only and excludes cars and performance pay.
- Remuneration for SSAT Senior Executive equivalents is determined by the Remuneration Tribunal and is not included.

Centrelink

Centrelink average SES salary is as follows:

| Financial Year | Average Salary for SES |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1996-97 | Not applicable |
| 1997-98 | \$85,888pa |
| 1998-99 | \$89,293pa |
| 1999-00 | \$94,348pa |
| 2000-01 | \$93,886pa |
| 2001-02 | \$105,958pa |
| 2002-03 | \$113,588pa |
| 2003-04 (as at March 04) | \$128,165pa |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| Australian Institute of Family Studies | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Average SES Salary 1996-2004 | |
| Year | Average Salary |
| 1996-97 | \$87,389 |
| 1997-98 | \$94,335 |
| 1998-99 | \$98,289 |
| 1999-2000 | \$104,567 |
| 2000-01 | \$109,833 |
| 2001-02 | \$109,833 |
| 2002-03 | \$109,833 |
| 2003-04 | \$115,371 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcome

Question No: 124

Topic: Management retreats/training

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Could you please list all “management retreats/training” conducted by the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies which were attended by employees during 2000-01, 20001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date.

For such meetings held off-site (from the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies). Could you please indicate:

- a) where (location and hotel) and when they were held;
- b) how much was spent in total;
- c) how much was spent on accommodation;
- d) how much was spent on food;
- e) how much was spent alcohol/drinks; and
- f) how much was spent on transport.

Answer:

Department of Family and Community Services

To the best of our records the information is as follows.

| Fin. Year | Retreat/training | a. location | b. total cost | c. accom- modation | d. food | e. drinks | f. transport |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------|-----------|--------------|
| 00/01 | 2 x Surviving and thriving in the APS | In-house | | | | | |
| | 5 x Managing Performance & coaching in the new workplace | In-house | | | | | |
| | 1 x Leadership in the new APS environment | In-house | | | | | |
| 01/02 | 5 x Partnership & Relationship management | In-house | | | | | |
| | 5 x Surviving and Thriving in APS | In-house | | | | | |
| | 1x SES Leadership | 26/03/02 University | \$27,828 | - | \$1,597 | - | |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| | Workshop | House | | | | | |
| | 1x SES Senior Leadership Program Workshop | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 1x SES Senior Leadership Program Workshop | 17/-18/10/02 National Convention Centre | \$38,696 | - | \$10,303 (includes e)) | - | |
| | 1x SES Orientation | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 55x SES (One-on-one) Coaching Workshop | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 4 x Managing performance & coaching in the new workplace | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 1 x Managing underperformance | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 1 x Personal leadership & teamwork skills | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| 02/03 | 1 x Seminar – R. Spillane | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 1 x Leadership & Emotional Intelligence | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 1x Leadership & Emotional Intelligence | 31/3/03 Bungendore The Carrington | \$47,000 (includes c-f) | | | | |
| | 7 x Partnering & Relationship management | In-house | | | | | |
| | 8 x Leading Change | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 10 x Healthy FaCS training for managers | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 12 x Surviving and Thriving in the APS | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 1 x Mng over-performance | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 4 x Results through people | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 1 x Supervision & | In-house | - | - | - | - | |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------|--|
| | leadership for workgroups | | | | | | |
| | 2 x Managing performance issues | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 2 x Leading with innovation & participation | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| 03/04 to date | 21 x IPMS stretching | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 1 x Managing performance issues | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 1x Leading change | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 25 x InfoHRM | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 2 x Leadership & Emotional Intelligence | 21/5/03 2/7/03 Bungendore The Carrington | \$94,000 (includes c-f) | | | | |
| | 2 x Leadership & Emotional Intelligence | 8/9/03 17/11/03 Bungendore The Carrington | \$86,000 (includes c-f) | | | | |
| | 3 x Recall day - Leadership & Emotional Intelligence | Hume Hill Station 14/10/03 23/02/04 /5/04 | \$23,400 (includes c-f) | | | | |
| | 21 x IPMS – Performance development for managers | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | 2 x Surviving & thriving in APS | In-house | - | - | - | - | |
| | SES workshop | Old Parliament House 2-3/4/03 | \$30,809 | | \$10,809 (includes e) | | |
| | SES workshop | National Museum And Federal Golf Club 10-11/12/03 | \$47,540 | | \$8,520 | \$690 | |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Australian Institute of Family Studies

No such activities were undertaken by the Australian Institute of Family Studies during 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date.

Social Security Appeals Tribunal

No such activities were undertaken by the Social Security Appeals Tribunal during 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date.

Child Support Agency

The CSA has Business and Learning Forums for SES and EL2 staff.

| Date | Held | Cost Centre | Accom. Costs | Consultant Fees | Food Costs | Alcohol / Drinks Costs | Transport Costs | \$ PER EVENT | No. of Staff |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| 2000 / 2001 | | | | | | | | | |
| May 2/3 2001 | Carlton Crest Hotel, Melbourne | 9530* | N/A | \$5,500.00 | \$7,340.40 | \$1,613.70 | \$198.80 | \$14,652.90 | 66 |
| 2001/ 2002 | | | | | | | | | |
| Oct 30/31, 2001 | National Museum, Canberra | 9530* | N/A | \$4,000 | \$13,377.50 | \$2,850.00 | N/A | \$20,227.50 | 90 |
| April 11/12, 2002 | Old Parliament House, Canberra | 9530* | N/A | \$11,105.00 | \$12,499.25 | \$3,060.00 | \$120.00 | \$26,784.25 | 85 |
| 2002 / 2003 | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov 25/27, 2002 | Peppers Hotel, Leura, NSW | 9660** | \$20,650.00 | \$33,653.40 | \$16,220.50 | \$3,648.00 | \$2,910.00 | \$77,081.90 | 72 |
| 2003 / 2004 | | | | | | | | | |
| Nov 6/7, 2003 | Bradman Pavillion, Canberra | 9660 | N/A | \$27,343.20 | \$11,130.00 | \$1,899.90 | \$3,516.50 | \$43,889.60 | 78 |
| TOTAL | | | \$20,650.00 | \$81,601.60 | \$60,567.65 | \$13,071.60 | \$6,745.30 | \$182,636.15 | |
| *Team formerly called SPMU and OIT **Budget code for team changed Note: Information as at 17 March 2004 | | | | | | | | | |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Centrelink

The response covers management training for National Support Office arranged programs only. It does not include any management training that might be undertaken at the individual Area Office level, the details of which are not available in consolidated form.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

The following table breaks down the additional information specifically requested.

| Program | (a) Where/When | (b) Total Cost (GST inclusive) | (c) Accommodation | (d) Food | (e) Alcohol | (f) Transport |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SELP Pilot | 31/3-4/4/03 Berida Manor, Bowral | \$16,600 | | | Nil for all programs. | A significant number of participants reside in Canberra and make their own travel arrangements at no additional cost to Centrelink. Interstate participants have individual travel arrangements, the details of which are not available in consolidated form. |
| SELP 2 | 28/7-1/8/03 Goolabri Country Resort Canberra | \$14,110 | | | | |
| SELP 3 | 8/9-12/9/03 Goolabri Country Resort Canberra | \$13,280 | | | | |
| SELP 4 | 24/11-28/11/03 Goolabri Country Resort Canberra | \$14,090 | | | | |
| CMLP Pilot | 2/6-6/6/03 Goolabri Country Resort Canberra | \$15,770 | | | | |
| CMLP 2 | 29/9-3/10/03 Goolabri Country Resort Canberra | \$13,280 | | | | |
| CMLP 3 | 27/10-31/10/03 Goolabri Country Resort Canberra | \$18,260 | | | | |
| SELP HELP | 2/12/03 Tuggeranong Homestead Canberra | \$1,850 | | | | |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes

Question No: 126, 127, 128

Topic: Four year forward estimates

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

126. Please provide the latest detailed four year forward estimates expenditure for all administered appropriations across all output groups (including final estimates for 2002-2003)?

127. Please provide the latest detailed four year forward estimates of customer numbers for each administered payment across all output groups (including final estimates for 2002-2003)?

128. Please provide the latest detailed four year forward estimates of average payment rates for each administered payment across all output groups (including final estimates for 2002-2003)?

Answer:

Estimates of future years' administered expenses (other than those published) and the assumptions underlying them are confidential. The latest estimates for 2003-04 are available in the FaCS Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements for that year. Updated information for that year and for 2004-05 are available in the FaCS Portfolio Budget Statements for 2004-05. Forward estimates of customer numbers and average payment rates are not available.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink

Question No: 131

Topic: Number of SES issued with vehicles - FaCS

Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

How many SES (or equivalent) were issued with cars in the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04

Answer:

The table shows the total number of Senior Executives and equivalents within the Department of Family and Community Services (FaCS); Social Security and Appeals Tribunal (SSAT); Child Support Agency (CSA); Australian Institute of Family Studies; and Commonwealth Rehabilitation Service with leased cars.

FaCS was formed in October 1998 and information prior to that date is not available.

| Senior Executive (or equivalent) staff in FaCS and portfolio agencies with leased cars, 1998-2004 | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 1998-99 | 1999-2000 | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 |
| FaCS | 49 | 60 | 58 | 63 | 60 | 60 |

Centrelink

The following figures have been compiled from data supplied by the Fleet Monitoring Body in The Department of Finance and Administration in their capacity as overarching Contract Managers of the whole-of-government Fleet Provision Contract.

The Fleet Monitoring Body retain comprehensive leasing records relating to the Tied Contract and the Amended Tied Contract dating to 1997.

| Senior Executive (or equivalent) staff in Centrelink with leased cars, 1996-2004 | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | Dec 97 | Dec 98 | Dec 99 | Dec 00 | Dec 01 | Dec 02 | Dec 03 | March 04 |
| Centrelink | 50 | 49 | 57 | 60 | 59 | 72 | 76 | 62 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcome and Centrelink

Question No: 135

Topic: Cost of domestic trips of staff

Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

What was the total cost of domestic trips of staff for by the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date.

- With a breakdown on the cost of accommodation allowances, food allowances and airflights.

Answer:

The table below shows total domestic trips for the Department of Family and Community Services (FaCS); Social Security Appeals Tribunal (SSAT) and Australian Institute of Family Studies (AIFS). FaCS figures include Child Support Agency except where indicated otherwise.

It is not possible to provide a breakdown of costs into the components requested because of the extensive manual processing required. Also it is not possible to provide breakdown by branch. This total includes figures for Disability Service Reforms, Office of Disability and National Disabilities Service (refer to QON 110).

| | 1998-99 | 1999-2000 | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04(1) |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | (a) | | \$7,074,50 | | |
| FaCS | \$1,636,000 | \$6,248,944 | \$6,924,709 | 0 | \$8,041,030 | \$5,080,946 |
| SSAT | NA | \$442,178 | \$333,821 | \$303,835 | \$373,994 | \$199,838 |
| AIFS | \$113,798 | \$94,238 | \$104,985 | \$101,448 | \$261,156 | \$111,457 |
| | | | | \$7,479,78 | | |
| TOTAL | \$1,749,798 | \$6,785,360 | \$7,363,515 | 3 | \$8,676,180 | \$5,392,241 |

Notes:

(a) Excludes Child Support Agency. Part-year figure only, as FaCS not formed until October 1998.

(1) 2003-04 data is for year to February 2004.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Centrelink

The total cost of domestic trips for Centrelink staff for the above-mentioned years is as follows:

1996-97: No information available
 1997-98: No information available
 1998-99: No information available

| Financial Year | Airfares | * Meals, incidentals, other allowances | Accommodation | Total |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 1999-00 | \$2,659,961.92 Jan –Jun 00 only | \$13,266,201.96 | Not available separately | \$15,926,163.88 |
| 2000-01 | \$6,813,131.57 | \$12,287,925.98 | Not available separately | \$19,101,057.55 |
| 2001-02 | \$6,128,973.98 | \$7,436,174.00 | \$5,665,508.54 | \$19,230,656.52 |
| 2002-03 | \$10,690,053.96 | \$7,401,095.70 | \$6,560,722.70 | \$24,651,872.36 |
| 2003-04 | \$3,459,949.00 | \$10,633,804.00 | \$9,396,234.90 | \$23,489,987.90 |
| Total | \$29,752,070.43 | \$51,025,201.64 | \$21,622,466.14 | \$102,399,738.21 |

* Note: This component of Travel Allowance comprises a number of aggregated elements which Centrelink cannot separately identify.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes

Question No: 139

Topic: Surveys of attitudes towards programmes

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

Did the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies conduct any surveys of attitudes towards programmes run by their department in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date.

Answer:

For:

- Department of Family and Community Services - YES
- Centrelink - YES
- Social Security Appeals Tribunal - NO
- Australian Institute of Family Studies - NO
-

Details are provided in the answer to Question on Notice 140.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross

Question No: 140

Topic: Surveys of attitudes towards programmes

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

- a) On what programmes administered by the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies were surveys conducted.
- b) What were the findings of these surveys?

Answers:

FaCS (other than Child Support Agency):

- a) Survey topics covered: Job Search Allowance, Parenting Payment, Newstart, the Activity Test, individualised assistance, employment for people with disabilities, the Pensioner Bonus Scheme, payment portability, child care services, Child Care Benefit, Family Tax Benefit, the Family Assistance Office, Housing, the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program, Green Corps and Rent Assistance.
- b) **1996 Survey of New Job Search Allowance Claimants** focused on the labour force participation of new clients in the 12 months before they claimed Job Search Allowance in April 1996. When interviewed in August 1996, close to all (97 per cent) survey respondents indicated that they were aware that there were obligations involved in receiving Job Search Allowance. However, some (18 per cent) respondents felt that they had received an inadequate amount of information from the then Department of Social Security for their needs.

1996 AGB McNair JET customer survey- examined workforce participation of JET customers (incl. current study and training, current employment, use of CES services (Job Network) and child care outcomes). Findings: 41% of JET customers were attracted to the program because it would improve their job prospects, the sustainability of employment for JET customers 12 months after participation in the program is good with over 50% in paid work.

1996 - Post Program Monitoring Survey examined the labour market and employment status of former JET customers. Findings: 81% of JET customers as of June 1996 with additional income to their Centrelink payments earned enough to reduce their dependence on income support payments

1996-97 to date the Green Corps Program. The surveys reveal that around 89% of participants were satisfied with the organisation, supervision, skills development and training aspects of the program.

1996, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003 Census of Child Care Services - The census is the most comprehensive child care data available in Australia. The findings for the Census of Child Care Services are published in hard copy and are available on the FaCS website. The reports generally contain findings across a broad range of child care service, staff,

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

and customer issues and are in excess of 250 pages. Copies of all reports are available on request.

1996-99 Parenting Payment Longitudinal Survey (PPLS) was a survey of partnered Parenting Payment recipients, conducted in three phases from 1996 to 1999. Partnered Parenting Payment recipients were asked some questions regarding knowledge of and attitudes towards partnered Parenting Payment. Findings indicated that recipients generally did not have a good understanding of the payment or how the income test worked. Around 60 per cent said that they did not calculate how paid-work affected their entitlements. The survey also indicated that most partnered recipients were aware that they could 'role swap' with their partner if they found work and their partner was unemployed, but barely half had considered the possibility of role swapping.

Under the **1996 and 1999 Commonwealth State Housing Agreements surveys** regarding satisfaction with the State Housing authorities have been conducted annually. Surveys for community housing were conducted in 2000-01 and 2001-02. In 2002-03, 68 per cent of public housing tenants surveyed were satisfied with the quality of services provided. In 2001-02, for community housing tenants the result was 77 per cent.

1997 Survey of New Newstart Allowance Claimants: Attitudes to Job Search Obligations was applied to people receiving Newstart Allowance. The survey findings indicated a high level of acceptance and compliance with job search obligations. Nine in ten respondents rated the job search requirements as either 'reasonable' or 'very reasonable'. Although only 42 per cent of respondents were required to look for more than two jobs per fortnight, 73 per cent of jobseekers had applied for more than two jobs in the previous fortnight.

Among the respondents, younger new claimants appeared less successful in meeting their job search obligations than older people. Twenty-four per cent of respondents under 25 years reported that their Newstart Allowance payments had been cancelled at some stage since April 1997, compared to only seven per cent of respondents aged over 40.

1997 - Factors assisting the employment of people with disabilities. This study drew on two surveys of income support customers. The first surveyed Disability Support Pension (DSP) customers on factors assisting employment and the second surveyed DSP and Mobility Allowance customers on their needs. The study found a small proportion of DSP recipients surveyed were in employment, with a low proportion indicating that they wanted more work. Customers who accessed available Government assistance to find employment reported that these programs were helpful in improving their work prospects and/or earnings.

1997 - Survey of Childcare Assistance & Childcare Cash Rebate Recipients. Findings: Majority in favour of assistance being paid direct to childcare provider. Support for the idea of a one-stop-shop for family assistance.

1998 Survey of Rent Assistance recipients. The survey provided new information about the living arrangements of Rent Assistance recipients and their satisfaction with

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

the quality and location of accommodation.

1999 Youth Allowance and Rent Assistance. The survey was conducted between August and September 1999 to assess the impact of the extension of Rent Assistance to students on young people's decisions about study, jobsearch and accommodation.

Rent Assistance was seen as important in improving their housing situation and facilitating study or job search activities. Availability of Rent Assistance was a major factor in the decision to continue study for both younger students and those from rural and remote areas.

1999 Parenting Payment Intervention Pilot (PPIP) was conducted to inform policy on the impact of active interventions on Parenting Payment recipients, such as the Jobs Education and Training (JET) Program and the Australians Working Together (AWT) measure, Helping Parents Return to Work.

Parents were asked about their awareness and participation in the JET program, and those who were current customers were asked to rate how helpful the program was. Of the small number who were current customers over half rated the program as very helpful.

Parenting Payment recipients were also asked about their attitudes to the type of interventions later introduced under AWT. The majority supported the concept of compulsory interviews and activity requirements to assist recipients to plan and prepare for economic participation.

1999-2000 - research was conducted to evaluate policy related to the **continuation of social security payments during a recipient's absence from Australia (portability policy)**. As part of the research, Roy Morgan Research conducted a contingent value survey of 1009 respondents representing the general population in April 1999.

The results of the research were published as FaCS Policy Research Paper No.16, *Cost-Benefit Analysis of Portability Policy* by Kruno Kukoc and Norbert Zmijewski.

The 'Cost/Benefit Analysis of Portability Policy' concludes that portability policy is of net benefit to Australian society. Costs produced by short-term portability are small and significantly outweighed by the high social value that the community attaches to short-term portability. Conversely, long-term portability attracts a lower level of public support but produces significant savings in public sector outlays, mainly in the areas of health and welfare costs.

1999-2000 Survey of customer service delivery preferences for Family Tax Benefit (FTB) and Child Care Benefit (CCB). This research was undertaken prior to the implementation of the family tax reforms and the Family Assistance Office (FAO), and collected information about customers' anticipated choice of payment option and service delivery agency for the new family payments. Findings were that choices of payment options were primarily for fortnightly payments through Centrelink.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

2000 Survey of Community Attitudes towards Unemployed People of Workforce Age examined community views on activity test requirements placed on people receiving Newstart and Youth Allowance (other).

Survey findings showed strong community support for activity testing strategies and the need for unemployed people to do more than look for work in return for payments. Ninety-two per cent of community respondents expected unemployed people to undertake work-related activities to improve their chances of finding work. Over three quarters expected unemployed people to do something of benefit to the community in return for their payment.

2000 Quality in Family Day Care Survey - conducted to explore views on what constitutes "quality" in Family Day Care, how well it is being delivered, and what are the priorities as well as ideas for improvement. The research was required to provide input to the development of a model for Quality Assurance in Family Day Care. Findings: General favour among stakeholders of introducing Quality Guidelines and/or a Quality Assurance System.

2000 Child Care Utilisation Survey. Findings: From April 2000 to October 2000 the rate of utilisation in Long Day Care centres increased from 74% to 87%. In Before School hours care the rate of utilisation fell from 52% to 49%. In After School Hours Care the rate of utilisation remained static at about 60%.

2000 - Post CCB Implementation Survey. Findings: 41% of Long Day Care centres, 32% of Family Day Care schemes and about 15% of Outside School Hours Care services reported that the amount of hours of care for children already using their service increased since 1 July 2000. 59% of Long Day Care centres, 53% of Family Day Care schemes and about 38% of Outside School Hours Care services reported that the number of children using their centre increased since 1 July 2000. For Long Day Care Centres surveyed there was an average fee increase of 2%. For Family Day Care schemes there was an average fee increase of 4%. In Outside School Hours Care services there was an average fee increase of less than 1%.

2001 Activity Test Evaluation Customer Survey assessed the attitudes of Newstart and Youth Allowance (other) customers to the Activity Test.

The survey found that people receiving unemployment payments supported activity test provisions and the principle of mutual obligation. Eighty-two per cent of customers agreed that unemployed people should undertake work-related activities to improve their chances of finding work. Sixty-two per cent agreed that unemployed people should do something of benefit to the community in return for their payment. The majority of customers thought that the existing penalty regime for non-compliance with the activity test was reasonable.

2001-02 Pension Bonus Scheme. The survey of clients, non-clients and stakeholders was undertaken by Orima Research Pty Ltd. The research forms part of an evaluation of the Pension Bonus Scheme. The results of this evaluation will contribute to the policy deliberation process. The evaluation is ongoing.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

2001 Child Care Fees Survey. Findings: From 1999 to 2001 the mean fee charged in Community Long Day Care centres increased from \$170.63 to \$182.91 (7.2%). For Private Long Day Care centres the mean fee charged increased from \$161.31 to \$174.43 (8.1%). For Family Day Care the mean fee charged increased from \$139.23 to \$160.88 (15.6%). For Outside School Hours Care the mean fee charged increased from \$8.23 to \$9.04 (9.8%).

2002 Communication Needs of Families Using Child Care. Findings: Information provided by the Government was seen to be more factual and objective than the promotional information and material developed by private organisations.

2002 Survey of user needs for the Family Assistance Office Website. Findings: With some modification the website has the potential to meet communication and information needs of recipients and potential recipients of FAO payments.

2002-04 Parenting Payment New Claims Survey was conducted to increase understanding of the characteristics, circumstances and needs of new claimants of Parenting Payments in comparison to existing recipients.

The qualitative component of Cohort 1, involving focus group interviews, explored attitudes towards being on Parenting Payment. Recipients reported feeling stigmatised within the general community for being on Parenting Payment, but were nevertheless grateful to be receiving it. They reported they would be really struggling without it and would be forced to either rely on charity or to work full time (and were concerned that working full time would have detrimental effects on children).

Cohort 2 respondents were asked in the quantitative component whether they had received interventions under the Helping Parents Return to Work measure and how helpful these interventions had been. Results from Cohort 2 have not yet been analysed.

2003 Child Care Fees Survey. Findings: From 2002 to 2003 the mean fee charged in Community Long Day Care centres increased from \$188.43 to \$195.29 (3.6%). For Private Long Day care centres the mean fee charged increased from \$184.49 to \$192.62 (4.4%). For Family Day Care the mean fee charged increased from \$163.35 to \$174.68 (6.9%). For Outside School Hours Care the mean fee charged increased from \$9.33 to \$10.10 (8.25%).

2003-2004 Family assistance customers' preferences for service delivery channels. This research measured customers' actual use of different service delivery channels for undertaking various family payment transactions. It also collected information on customers' access to the internet and their use of the internet for other purposes, as an indicator of the potential to make more use of the internet as a service delivery option. Findings were that customers' preferred method of communicating with the FAO was by telephone.

2003-04 the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP). The report found that 91 per cent of clients accessing SAAP services rated the support they received

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

during their stay positively, with 66 per cent rating the overall support received as 'really good' and a further 25 per cent rating the help received as 'good'.

Under the **Commonwealth State Territory Disability Agreement**, each jurisdiction is required to provide a minimum data set each year to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) for analysis and inclusion in AIHW publications and the annual publication 'Report on Government Services'. The Department of Family and Community Services collects its minimum data set through an annual Census of all its funded disability service outlets including employment, advocacy, respite, print disability and caption and translation services. Basic information about service outlet operations is collected from all service types, and employment services also complete a survey for each person supported during the year. The Commonwealth Disability Services Census is conducted annually. The latest Report was published in January 2003 contains data for all consumers who accessed disability employment services during the 2000-2001 financial year and is the seventh in the series.

Child Support Agency:

(a) Survey topics covered: client satisfaction, client expectations and needs, satisfaction of Community Service Providers, community perceptions of CSA and the Child Support Scheme and client segmentation.

(b) 1996 - 97

Client Satisfaction Research - Reark

Survey to benchmark the level of satisfaction CSA's clients have with the level of service they receive from Agency staff. The results showed significant differences in opinion between payer and payee clients, agency and private collect clients and regional differences in the levels of satisfaction.

1997 - 98

Community Perception Survey (June 1998)

Research into community perceptions and expectations, with the aim of building community ownership and involvement in CSA's strategic direction. The major findings indicate that Australians:

- Strongly support the basic principles of the Child Support Scheme
- Strongly support intervention by government where compliance is an issue
- Are equivocal about no government involvement at all, but slightly more supportive of no government involvement where compliance is 100%
- Encourage friends and relatives to pay child support
- Believe that money paid in child support benefits the children
- Consider that payment of child support should not be contingent on contact with children
- Have mixed views about the amount of child support being too high.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Professionalism Index (May 1998)

The Professionalism Index is the model CSA's uses to measure client satisfaction. The results enable CSA to benchmark results over time. For Clients Overall, the result for the Professionalism Index was 3.6 (on a 5 point scale, with a target of 3.7 representing approximately 70% of clients being satisfied or very satisfied). The results for the four elements that comprise the Professionalism Index were generally average to good. The personal characteristics of staff (honest, polite etc.) scored best, while the quality of the outcomes of client interactions with CSA (client needs understood, matter handled fairly etc.) scored lowest. The results for payers and payees vary from the bottom end to the top end of the 'average' range. The amount of variation between the two groups in the professionalism study is also similar to that found in earlier client satisfaction research.

Client Satisfaction Research

The objective was to re-analyse 3 years of client research in order to contribute to the development of an evaluation framework for CSA. Findings: (1) the survey needed to be rebuilt, (2) a 'process map' of how clients interact with the Agency needed to be developed, and (3) the development of an evaluation framework which links CSA's Business Plan and KPIs to the Client Charter and to industry standard modelling of organisational performance needed to be developed.

1998 - 99

Community Perception Survey (June 1999)

This research was to monitor community perceptions and needs against the previous year's results. The initial analysis indicated that the results were overwhelming similar to the previous year. For this reason a decision was made not to produce and publish a final report.

Professionalism Index (Oct 1998)

The Professionalism Index is the model CSA's uses to measure client satisfaction. Results are benchmarked over time. The results showed that as with previous studies, there is a marked difference in opinion between payees and payers, with payees being much more satisfied with the performance of CSA than payers. While the overall result is very close to the target of 3.7, the result for payers only falls within the 'average to good' category. The overall Professionalism Index did not change between May 1998 and October 1998.

Professionalism Index (May 1999)

The Professionalism Index is the model CSA's uses to measure client satisfaction. Results are benchmarked over time. The results showed that for Clients Overall, the average score achieved increased marginally from 3.56 in May 1998 to 3.68 in May 1999. When the four separate elements of professionalism were examined, the average scores for 2 increased significantly – those for the 'professional characteristics of staff' and the 'outcomes of the interaction'.

Client Satisfaction Index

This is a measure of client satisfaction which is linked to CSA's evaluation framework. Seven indices are examined: Centrelink CSI, First client contact CSI, Client Service CSI., Information CSI, CSA Charter CSI, Performance CSI and Loyalty CSI. The findings showed that the Centrelink CSI achieved the highest rating (although it comprises payee opinions

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

only), while First Contact CSI for CSA achieved the second highest result. Each of the Client Service, CSA Charter and Information CSIs achieved ratings of 3.5.

1999 - 00

Community Perception Survey (December 2000)

This research was intended as exploratory research providing new information, with the possibility of benchmarking current attitudes towards CSA and the Child Support Scheme. The results show that there was been little movement across the survey periods for most periods.

Community Service Providers research

This research was conducted to assist with the evaluation of CSA's performance against Challenge 2: *Building a Community Focus*. Participants agreed that a focus on the child was the common theme running through all of the services they provided. Participant suggestions for improving CSA's relationship with CSPs:

1. Improve client referrals to community service providers;
2. Develop the community service providers database;
3. Develop the community information sessions;
4. Develop a community service provider consultation and feedback strategy;
5. Develop site based one on one relationships with community service providers;
6. Develop a joint training strategy with community service providers for CSA and CSP staff;
7. Develop a community service provider communications strategy; and
8. Routinely communicate the findings of CSA client research.

Professionalism Index (Nov 1999)

The Professionalism Index is the model CSA's uses to measure client satisfaction. Results are benchmarked over time. The results showed that overall, there has been an increase in the Professionalism Index since October 1998 survey: staff have continued to maintain and surpass their previous professionalism. This improvement is contributed to by slight increases among payers and payees.

Professionalism Index (May 2000)

The Professionalism Index is the model CSA's uses to measure client satisfaction. Results are benchmarked over time. For clients overall, all 4 elements have remained fairly consistent across the five surveys. Staff can be said to be consistently performing best in the area of 'personal characteristics', with average score around 3.8. As in previous surveys, the most potential for improvement is in the area of 'outcome of the interaction': the average score is consistently around 3.4.

Client Satisfaction Index (March 2000)

A measure of client satisfaction, with the aim of benchmarking the results over time. The key finding from the two-year benchmarking was that very little changed between the 1998 and 2000 surveys. The overall scores for the six CSIs in 2000 ranged from 3.0 to 3.6. While none of these scores reached the target of 3.7, only the Performance CSI was considered to be in the 'poor' performance zone. Components of the Performance CSI include perceptions of whether CSA is committed to meeting client needs, overall satisfaction with CSA, CSA's

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

general management of case and ability to handle problems. This is a common finding in CSA client surveys; the areas that involve direct interaction with staff and measure staff behaviour are more positively rated than the areas that deal with the system of child support itself and the overall view of CSA's performance.

2000 – 01

Community Service Providers research

The two main objectives of this research were (1) to scope and understand the main elements of CSA's relationship with CSPs; and (2) to measure CSP satisfaction. The findings showed that in general, CSPs have relatively good levels of satisfaction with the professional services provided by CSA staff and with the information provided by CSA. Specific areas that needed to be improved related to access to CSA staff and access to information. In addition, the distribution of communications to CSPs and the need for a well-managed and maintained database was highlighted as an area for improvement.

Professionalism Index (Nov 2000)

The Professionalism Index is the model CSA's uses to measure client satisfaction. Results are benchmarked over time. The results found that client satisfaction with most attributes of CSA staff professionalism had remained stable or slightly declined from May 2000. However, results in November 2000 showed a general decline in client satisfaction since 1999, particularly for payees. Since May 2000, the gap between payee and payer satisfaction ratings of CSA staff professionalism has widened.

Professionalism Index (May 2001)

The Professionalism Index is the model CSA's uses to measure client satisfaction. The results are benchmarked over time. The findings were that in May 2001, client satisfaction with most attributes of CSA staff professionalism remained stable or slightly declined since November 2000. Of the 4 elements of professionalism, client opinions about '*the outcomes of the interaction*', although comparatively low (varying from 3.2 for payers up to 3.5 for payees) remain relatively stable across the 7 survey periods. The other 3 elements of the model showed declines since November 1999 largely due to declines in the satisfaction of payees.

2001 - 02

Qualitative research into client satisfaction

The objective of the research was to (1) uncover the layers of client opinion revealed in the Professionalism Index and (2) to evaluate the validity of the Professionalism Model in its ability to provide a realistic indication of clients' attitudes towards the service that CSA provides. The findings showed that, for many clients the real issue in accounting for their feelings about the CSA was not in relation to staff. For them, the real issue was in relation to policy and legislation that CSA staff are required to enact.

Overall staff were seen to perform well in relation to personal characteristics such as politeness, honesty, and keeping calm in the face of very emotional clients. However, clients emphasised that while being treated politely and with respect is naturally desired, it means little if the underlying process is perceived as unsound.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

The Professionalism Model was generally found to reflect those areas identified by clients as important in customer service, although there were slight differences in emphasis and clients were sometimes more specific in their requirements.

Professionalism Index (Feb 2002)

The Professionalism Index is the model CSA's uses to measure client satisfaction. Results are benchmarked over time. The results showed that the satisfaction levels for payees and clients overall remained the same in February 2002 as they were in May 2001, while payers showed a slight decline. The results for Payers showed a slight decrease (although not statistically significant) from May 2001 to February 2002.

2002 - 03

Professionalism Index (May 2003)

The Professionalism Index is the model CSA's uses to measure client satisfaction. Results are benchmarked over time. Findings: The total overall professionalism index remained similar in May 2003 to the previous survey with a mean score of 3.52 (compared to 3.5 in February 2002). While the professionalism index for payees remained similar to February 2002, (3.77 versus 3.7) the professionalism index score for payers remained significantly below this at 3.23. The professional and personal qualities of staff that were rated most highly were 'Acted with integrity', 'Were polite and helpful' and 'Were able to listen'. Payees rated each attribute significantly higher than payers.

Community Perception research

This research showed that there was great variation in the levels of awareness and understanding of the Child Support Scheme in the general community. Payees had the perception that the Government has an extra role to provide emotional support to single mums in recognition of their situation. Payer perception of the Government's role was that the Government was first a facilitator and, secondly, a safety net. Both parents were significantly more positive regarding CSA service delivery as opposed to the issues associated with the Scheme.

Client Satisfaction research (validation survey)

The purpose of this research was to test the new point of service model with CSA's clients. The model was found to be statistically valid and relevant. It is currently being implemented nationally.

2003 - 04 to date

Client Satisfaction research (point of service using CSA's telephony system).

This new approach aims to provide CSA with timely (i.e. monthly), relevant and detailed service data, at the team level, that will enable CSA to better understand the needs of clients and to improve the service provided with real time feedback.

CSA has recently completed its pilot of a new, innovative way of gathering feedback from our clients. This new approach uses CSA's Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system to randomly select clients for inclusion in an automated client satisfaction survey. Results from the pilot show that clients are willing to participate in the survey

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

and that the feedback will be valuable in driving service improvements. We expect to implement nationally by June 30, 2004.

Centrelink

- a) The table below outlines the titles of projects which appear to be in scope.
- b) The findings of these surveys should be sought from the client department (FaCS).

| Year | Number of relevant surveys | Programmes covered | Client Department Stakeholders |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1998-99 | Two | Parent Support Group Pilot Findings of Research of Mutual Obligations Policy | FaCS |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcome and Centrelink

Question No: 141

Topic: Advertising

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: How much was spent on advertising by the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date?

Answer: Details for 1996-97 and 1997-98 are not available as the Department of Family and Community Services was formed in October 1998. Details for 2003-04 to date are not available.

FaCS

Refer Department of Family and Community Services Annual Report 1998-99 p317
Refer Department of Family and Community Services Annual Report 1999-2000 p377
Refer Department of Family and Community Services Annual Report 2000-01 pp373-376
Refer Department of Family and Community Services Annual Report 2001-02 pp297-301
Refer Department of Family and Community Services Annual Report 2002-03 Part 2 pp265-268

AIFS 1998-99 = \$8,043, 1999-2000 = \$2,598, 2000-01 = \$15,861, 2001-02 = \$22,060,
2002-03 = \$21,201

SSAT 1998-99 = \$0, 1999-2000 = \$431, 2000-01 = \$1,081, 2001-02 = \$230,
2002-03 = \$985

CENTRELINK

Refer Centrelink Annual Report 1997-98 p181
Refer Centrelink Annual Report 1998-99 pp183-184
Refer Centrelink Annual Report 1999-00 p209
Refer Centrelink Annual Report 2000-01 p173
Refer Centrelink Annual Report 2001-02 p210

Refer Centrelink Annual Report 2002-03 pp213-214
Expenditure for the 2003-04 year to date (March 2004) is \$872,080

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink

Question No: 143

Topic: Advertising

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: How much was spent on advertising which provided electorate breakdowns of spending by the government on programmes within the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date?

Answer:

The Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies do not spend money on advertising that provide electorate breakdowns of spending on government programmes.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes and Centrelink

Question No: 142

Topic: Publications

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Did the Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies produce publications that provided electorate breakdowns on spending on government programmes in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 to date?

Answer:

The Department of Family and Community Services and other portfolio agencies do not produce any publications that provide electorate breakdowns on spending on government programmes.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcome

Question No: 145

Topic: Performance Assessment Mechanisms - CSA

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Carr asked:

For each agency within the Department, please provide full details of each of the performance assessment mechanisms linked to the pay outcomes or other financial reward of individual employees, including;

- a) What are the current process/es of performance assessment within the portfolio agency? If more than one, please provide details of each, and the employee category it applies to.
- b) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), please list the range of outcome results an employee can achieve from each of the performance assessment processes identified in (a).
- c) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), what pay or other financial change is linked to each outcome or result for the employee from the performance assessment [ie, the pay increase or one-off bonus or classification or level change];
- d) For each of the performance assessments identified in (a), what is the classification level of employees subject to this performance assessment (eg SES, EL1, EL2 or APS and equivalent);
- e) What is the principal industrial or other instrument governing each of the performance assessment mechanism/s (eg, the certified agreement or AWA);
- f) Does the performance assessment operate over a common cycle? Please provide the commencement and end dates of the most recent full cycle of each of the assessment processes.

Answer:

- a) For the Child Support Agency (CSA) the performance assessment mechanisms are:
 1. Employee Portfolio (The performance agreement system in place in the CSA)
 - Performance assessment tool
 - Applies to all employees from APS 1 – EL 1
 - Work level standards covering 4 core capabilities that are consistent across the agency.
 - Reviewed every 6 months
 2. Executive Level Performance Agreement
 - Performance assessment tool including the Employee Portfolio element applicable to the executive level.
 - Employee and manager agree to performance measures and outcomes to be achieved over the following 12 month period.
 - Applies to EL 1 staff on an AWA and EL 2 employees
 - Annual cycle with a review after 6 months

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

3. SES Performance Agreement
 - Performance assessment tool based around the 5 SES Leadership Capabilities (APSC)
 - Employee and manager agree to performance measures and outcomes to be achieved over the following 12 months period.
 - Applies to SES Band 1 employees
 - Annual cycle with a review after 6 months
4. Corporate Outcomes
 - Determined through the Agency Agreement
 - Whole of agency achievement
 - Reported progress every 3 months with annual achievements linked to pay rises as determined by the Agency Agreement
 - Applies to all staff under the Agency Agreement.
Generally APS 1 – EL 1

b)

1. Employee Portfolio linked to;
 - a. Advancement opportunities
 - b. Development opportunities
 - c. Assignment of duties at higher level
 - d. Pay point progression
2. Executive Level Performance Agreement linked to;
 - a. (All those detailed in 1).
 - b. One off bonus paid at the end of each assessment cycle
3. SES Performance Agreement linked to;
 - a. Development opportunities
 - b. Deferred salary payment
4. Achievement of Corporate Outcomes linked to;
 - a. Salary increases as determined by the Agency Agreement

c)

1. Employee Portfolio –
 - a. pay point increases within classification
 - b. forms part of advancement application for progression within Broadband and/or towards an internal job application.
2. Executive Level Performance Agreement
 - a. Non cumulative annual performance bonus.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

3. SES Performance Agreement
 - a. Non cumulative annual deferred salary payment.
4. Corporate Outcomes
 - a. General Pay Rises in accordance with the Agency Agreement

d)

1. Employee Portfolio – APS 1 – EL 1
2. Executive Level Performance Agreement – EL 1 – EL 2
3. SES Performance Agreement – SES Band 1
4. Corporate Outcomes – APS 1 – EL 1 and through AWAs - EL's and SES band 1

e)

1. Employee Portfolio – Child Support Agency (General Employees) Agreement 2002
2. Executive Level Performance Agreement – Australian Workplace Agreement
3. SES Performance Agreement – Australian Workplace Agreement
4. Corporate Outcomes - Child Support Agency (General Employees) Agreement 2002.

f)

1. Employment Portfolio – no common cycle, reviewed every 6 months
2. Executive Level Performance Agreement – 1 July 2002 – 30 June 2003
3. SES Performance Agreement – 1 July 2002 – 30 June 2003
4. Corporate Outcomes – measured every 3 months with most recent annual pay rise payable from 1 July 2003.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcome

Question No: 146

Topic: Performance Assessment Mechanisms - CSA

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Carr asked:

For each performance assessment mechanism described in (1), advise the number of male and the number of female employees at each possible outcome, by classification level for the most recent full cycle (if the performance mechanism does not operate over a common cycle – aggregate outcomes using the 2002 – 03 financial year).

Answer:

- 1) Employee Portfolio
 - a. Male 793
 - b. Female 2144

- 2) Executive Level Performance Agreement
 - a. Male 20
 - b. Female 22

- 3) SES Performance Agreement
 - a. Male 2
 - b. Female 3

- 4) Corporate Outcomes
 - a. Male 815
 - b. Female 2169

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcome

Question No: 147

Topic: Performance Assessment Mechanisms - Australian Institute of Family Studies

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Carr asked:

For each agency within the Department, please provide full details of each of the performance assessment mechanisms linked to the pay outcomes or other financial reward of individual employees, including;

- a) What are the current process/es of performance assessment within the portfolio agency? If more than one, please provide details of each, and the employee category it applies to.
- b) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), please list the range of outcome results an employee can achieve from each of the performance assessment processes identified in (a);
- c) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), what pay or other financial change is linked to each outcome or result for the employee from the performance assessment [ie, the pay increase or one-off bonus or classification or level change];
- d) For each of the performance assessments identified in (a), what is the classification level of employees subject to this performance assessment (eg SES, EL1, EL2 or APS and equivalent);
- e) What is the principal industrial or other instrument governing each of the performance assessment mechanism/s (eg, the certified agreement or AWA);
- f) Does the performance assessment operate over a common cycle? Please provide the commencement and end dates of the most recent full cycle of each of the assessment processes.

Answer:

- a) All ongoing employees and non-ongoing of 6 months or more must participate in the Institute's Performance Appraisal Scheme.
- b) Those employed under the Certified Agreement receive annual pay increases and pay point advancement, depending on their end of year assessment. Those on AWAs may also receive a performance bonus.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

c)

| AIFS Pay Point | Rating | Effect | Rating | Effect | Rating | Effect |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.1-1.3 (APS 1) 2.1-2.3 (APS 3) 3.1-3.3 (APS 5) | Superior or Fully effective | Pay rise & Advance two pay points | Satisfactory | Pay Rise & Advance one pay point | Unsatisfactory | Possibly deferred pay rise. No salary advancement. Remedial action |
| 1.4-1.7 (APS 2) 2.4-2.7 (APS 4) 3.4-3.7 (APS 6) Exec 1.1-1.2; Exec 2.1-2.3 | Superior, fully effective | Pay rise & Advance one pay point | Satisfactory | Pay rise only. No salary advancement. | Unsatisfactory | Possibly deferred pay rise. No salary advancement. Remedial action |

| Performance Pay for Exec 2s on AWA's | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Unsatisfactory | Deferred pay rise, remedial action as per Certified Agreement. |
| Satisfactory | Pay rise, advance one pay point (if available) as per Certified Agreement. |
| Fully effective | Pay rise, advance one pay point (if available) as per Certified Agreement and performance pay. |
| Superior | Pay rise, advance one pay point (if available) as per Certified Agreement and performance pay. |
| Outstanding | Pay rise, advance one pay point (if available) as per Certified Agreement and performance pay. |

- d) APS1-SES1.
- e) Australian Institute of Family Studies Certified Agreement 2003-05; and Australian Workplace Agreements.
- f) Operates over a calendar year. Most recently completed cycle 1 January – 31 December 2003.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcome

Question No: 148

Topic: Performance Assessment Mechanisms - Australian Institute of Family Studies

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Carr asked:

For each performance assessment mechanism described in (1), advise the number of male and the number of female employees at each possible outcome, by classification level for the most recent full cycle (if the performance mechanism does not operate over a common cycle - aggregate outcomes using the 2002-03 financial year).

Answer:

| Performance Measurement Mechanisms - Australia Institute of Family Studies | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------|--------------|--------|-----------------|--------|----------|--------|-------------|--------|
| Outcomes of 2003 Year-end Assessment, by gender and APS Level | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Unsatisfactory | | Satisfactory | | Fully Effective | | Superior | | Outstanding | |
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| APS 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| APS 2 | | | | | | 3 | | | | |
| APS 3 | | | | 2 | | 3 | | | | |
| APS 4 | | | | 1 | 1 | 6 | | 1 | | |
| APS 5 | | | | | 1 | 4 | | 1 | | |
| APS 6 | | | | | 2 | 13 | | 2 | | |
| Exec 1 | | | | | | 4 | 2 | 1 | | |
| Exec 2 | | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes

Question No: 149

Topic: Performance Assessment Mechanisms - Social Security Appeals Tribunal

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Carr asked:

For each agency within the Department, please provide full details of each of the performance assessment mechanisms linked to the pay outcomes or other financial reward of individual employees, including;

- a) What are the current process/es of performance assessment within the portfolio agency? If more than one, please provide details of each, and the employee category it applies to.
- b) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), please list the range of outcome results an employee can achieve from each of the performance assessment processes identified in (a);
- c) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), what pay or other financial change is linked to each outcome or result for the employee from the performance assessment [ie, the pay increase or one-off bonus or classification or level change];
- d) For each of the performance assessments identified in (a), what is the classification level of employees subject to this performance assessment (eg SES, EL1, EL2 or APS and equivalent);
- e) What is the principal industrial or other instrument governing each of the performance assessment mechanism/s (eg, the certified agreement or AWA);
- f) Does the performance assessment operate over a common cycle? Please provide the commencement and end dates of the most recent full cycle of each of the assessment processes.

Answer:

The SSAT has two categories of employees, those appointed under the *Public Service Act 1999* and those appointed to the Tribunal by the Governor-General as either full time or part time members. The performance assessment scheme for Tribunal members is not linked to pay outcomes as the Remuneration Tribunal determines the remuneration of members. Therefore the following responses relate only to those employed by the SSAT under the *Public Service Act*.

- a) Performance assessment is undertaken through individual performance management agreements. Agreements are negotiated between the individual employee and their supervisor at the commencement of the performance cycle. A mid-cycle assessment is conducted at the 6 month point and the final assessment is conducted at the conclusion of the 12 month cycle. The mechanism for assessing performance of employees on AWAs is as determined between those employees and their supervisor.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

- b) Employees may be assessed as 'exceeded', 'met', 'partially met', or 'not met'.
- c) Employees achieving a final assessment of 'met' or 'exceeded' are rewarded with a pay increase commensurate with the schedule of performance pay increases negotiated in the Certified Agreement process. Employees with AWAs may also be eligible for bonus payments if negotiated as part of the AWA process.
- d) The performance assessment scheme applies to all APS staff employed by the Tribunal, except for those on AWAs.
- e) The SSAT Certified Agreement 2003-2006 is the instrument governing the performance assessment mechanism. Staff on AWAs negotiate an individual performance assessment mechanism.
- f) The SSAT does not have a common cycle for performance assessments. Rather, the performance cycle is linked to the employee's anniversary date.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross Outcomes

Question No: 150

Topic: Performance Assessment Mechanisms - Social Security Appeals Tribunal

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Carr asked:

For each performance assessment mechanism described in (1), advise the number of male and the number of female employees at each possible outcome, by classification level for the most recent full cycle (if the performance mechanism does not operate over a common cycle - aggregate outcomes using the 2002-03 financial year).

Answer:

| Rating | Level and Gender | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|---|--------|----|
| Exceeded | SSAT 1 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 0 |
| | SSAT 2 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 1 |
| | SSAT 3 | | | |
| | Male | 3 | Female | 1 |
| Met | SSAT 4 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 0 |
| | SSAT 5 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 0 |
| | SSAT 1 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 3 |
| Partially Met | SSAT 2 | | | |
| | Male | 1 | Female | 19 |
| | SSAT 3 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 4 |
| | SSAT 4 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 1 |
| | SSAT 5 | | | |
| | Male | 1 | Female | 0 |
| | SSAT 1 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 0 |
| | SSAT 2 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 3 |
| | SSAT 3 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 0 |
| | SSAT 4 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 0 |
| | SSAT 5 | | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female | 0 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| | | | |
|---------|--------|---|----------|
| Not Met | SSAT 1 | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female 0 |
| | SSAT 2 | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female 0 |
| | SSAT 3 | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female 0 |
| | SSAT 4 | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female 0 |
| | SSAT 5 | | |
| | Male | 0 | Female 0 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: Cross

Question No: 144

Topic: Orima Consulting Research

Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

Please provide a copy of the Orima Consulting research into biometrics which was detailed in the September 2003 edition of FaCS Research News?

Answer:

A copy of the report of the research is attached.

{Note the report is not available electronically}

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004
Department of Family and Community Services

Mr Elton Humphery
Secretary
Community Affairs Committee
The Senate
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA

Dear Mr Humphery

CLARIFICATION OF RESPOSE AT SENATE ESTIMATES

In his absence overseas, I am writing to clarify a response Mr David Kalisch gave at the Senate Additional Estimates hearing on Thursday 19 February (CA 90), regarding the assessment of reportable fringe benefits for the purposes of the Family Tax Benefit (FTB) and Child Care Benefit (CCB) income tests and assessments of child support liabilities. Additionally, I am requesting that the record be amended.

At the hearing Senator Jacinta Collins asked how salary sacrificing impacted on FTB and CCB. Further to this she asked if the treatment of fringe benefits differed from that which applied to the Child Support Agency assessments of child support.

Mr Kalisch advised Senator Collins that questions regarding the Child Support Agency's income test should be directed to them. After some further questioning he informed the Senate that 'we had just received advice from the Child Support Agency that the systems were identical' and that the Child Support Agency also took reportable fringe benefits into account.

I would like to provide some further detail to clarify this issue and request the record show that:

- Reportable fringe benefits (shown on a person's payment summary) are taken into account by both the Family Assistance Office, in the income test for FTB and CCB, and in the Child Support Agency's assessment of child support liabilities. Fringe benefits are taken into account in both systems and the definitions used in these assessments are identical.
- There is, however, a difference between the calculation methods applied to determine the value of a person's FTB and CCB entitlement and the value of child support liabilities. In both instances a person is required to declare the amount of reportable fringe benefits shown on their payment summary. The Family Assistance Office then

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

uses the non-grossed up amount of a person's reportable fringe benefits when calculating their entitlement to FTB and CCB while the Child Support Agency uses the grossed-up amount for determining child support liabilities. The non-grossed up value is the actual dollar value of the benefit. The 'grossed-up' value of an employee's fringe benefit is the value of the benefit plus the notional amount of income tax that would be paid by the employee if the benefit was paid in cash salary, rather than in fringe benefits.

I trust that you will inform the committee of this amendment.

Yours sincerely

Lynne Curran
A/g Executive Director

March 2004
Telephone: (02) 6212 9218

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.1 Family Assistance

Question No: 160.3

Topic: Family Tax Benefit

Revised response

Written question on notice

Senator Bishop asked:

In respect to FTB-A families who receive payments fortnightly what is the actual average Adjusted Taxable Income (ATI) for:

- i) Families who receive the maximum rate (with income support payment)?
- ii) Families who receive the maximum rate (without income support payment)?
- iii) Families who receive a broken rate?
- iv) Families who receive the base rate?
- v) Families who receive below the base rate?

Answer:

As at 20 June 2003 the actual average Adjusted Taxable Income (ATI) for customers who were in receipt of FTB Part A on 28 June 2002 was:

- i) Customers who receive the maximum rate (with income support) : \$21,509.88
- ii) Customers who receive the maximum rate (without income support) : \$26,208.44
- iii) Customers who receive a broken rate : \$34,033.15
- iv) Customers who receive a base rate : \$58,022.88
- v) Customers who receive below the base rate (tapered base) : \$84,436.84

Averages provided exclude customers with a zero income.

The figures above are based on a snapshot of FTB Part A fortnightly instalment customers as at 28 June 2002. Customers who were no longer eligible for FTB Part A after reconciliation and those who had not yet been reconciled are excluded from the table.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.1 Family Assistance

Question No: 160.4

Topic: Family Tax Benefit

Revised response

Written question on notice

Senator Bishop asked:

In respect to each of the customer groups in Q 3 (above) please provide the distribution of families with ATI's in \$2,500 bands?

Answer:

The table is a snapshot of FTB Part A fortnightly instalment customers as at 28 June 2002. The table shows the distribution of customers' actual FTB Part A entitlement based on reconciled ATI for the 2001-02 financial year as at 20 June 2003. Customers who were no longer eligible for FTB Part A after reconciliation and those who had not yet been reconciled are excluded from the table.

| Taxable income | Broken rate | Base rate | Maximum rate on income support | Maximum rate not on income support | Taper rate | Total |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| \$0 | 58456 | 10984 | 130973 | 5010 | 0 | 205423 |
| More than \$0-\$ 2500 | 2369 | 753 | 3382 | 2083 | 0 | 8587 |
| More than \$2500-\$5000 | 2122 | 788 | 4263 | 2554 | 0 | 9727 |
| More than \$5000-\$7500 | 2147 | 910 | 6595 | 3484 | 0 | 13136 |
| More than \$7500-\$10000 | 5185 | 1972 | 25362 | 4167 | 0 | 36686 |
| More than \$10000-\$12500 | 11647 | 2947 | 28566 | 5331 | 0 | 48491 |
| More than \$12500-\$15000 | 9370 | 2084 | 22725 | 6446 | 0 | 40625 |
| More than \$15000-\$17500 | 9977 | 2187 | 46575 | 7392 | 0 | 66131 |
| More than \$17500-\$20000 | 10183 | 2256 | 44199 | 9350 | 0 | 65988 |
| More than \$20000-\$22500 | 9429 | 2280 | 29854 | 11678 | 0 | 53241 |
| More than \$22500-\$25000 | 8835 | 2233 | 26344 | 15370 | 0 | 52782 |
| More than \$25000-\$27500 | 8149 | 2034 | 23223 | 21763 | 0 | 55169 |
| More than \$27500-\$30000 | 9090 | 1989 | 16536 | 27076 | 0 | 54691 |
| More than \$30000-\$32500 | 35027 | 2872 | 10817 | 357 | 0 | 49073 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| Taxable income | Broken rate | Base rate | Maximum rate on income support | Maximum rate not on income support | Taper rate | Total |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| More than \$32500-\$35000 | 35505 | 3577 | 8181 | 473 | 0 | 47736 |
| More than \$35000-\$37500 | 33948 | 5405 | 6356 | 486 | 0 | 46195 |
| More than \$37500-\$40000 | 28537 | 12056 | 5009 | 579 | 0 | 46181 |
| More than \$40000-\$42500 | 25845 | 15507 | 3931 | 768 | 0 | 46051 |
| More than \$42500-\$45000 | 22357 | 19434 | 3205 | 861 | 0 | 45857 |
| More than \$45000-\$47500 | 13445 | 28685 | 2567 | 1017 | 0 | 45714 |
| More than \$47500-\$50000 | 10514 | 33166 | 2087 | 1167 | 0 | 46934 |
| More than \$50000-\$52500 | 8069 | 36283 | 1686 | 1262 | 0 | 47300 |
| More than \$52500-\$55000 | 4775 | 39863 | 1444 | 1398 | 0 | 47480 |
| More than \$55000-\$57500 | 3073 | 40605 | 1137 | 1350 | 0 | 46165 |
| More than \$57500-\$60000 | 2270 | 41000 | 918 | 1314 | 0 | 45502 |
| More than \$60000-\$62500 | 1550 | 39995 | 790 | 1284 | 0 | 43619 |
| More than \$62500-\$65000 | 1143 | 38968 | 616 | 1290 | 0 | 42017 |
| More than \$65000-\$67500 | 875 | 37018 | 516 | 1236 | 0 | 39645 |
| More than \$67500-\$70000 | 654 | 34885 | 439 | 1156 | 0 | 37134 |
| More than \$70000-\$72500 | 522 | 32044 | 365 | 1092 | 0 | 34023 |
| More than \$72500-\$75000 | 436 | 28965 | 328 | 862 | 0 | 30591 |
| More than \$75000-\$77500 | 363 | 24513 | 259 | 643 | 610 | 26388 |
| More than \$77500-\$80000 | 300 | 16463 | 243 | 129 | 4891 | 22026 |
| More than \$80000-\$82500 | 222 | 6781 | 177 | 33 | 8064 | 15277 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| Taxable income | Broken rate | Base rate | Maximum rate on income support | Maximum rate not on income support | Taper rate | Total |
|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| More than \$82500-\$85000 | 174 | 2717 | 174 | 15 | 7961 | 11041 |
| More than \$85000-\$87500 | 154 | 867 | 126 | 13 | 6784 | 7944 |
| More than \$87500-\$90000 | 109 | 296 | 119 | 9 | 2763 | 3296 |
| More than \$90000-\$92500 | 94 | 179 | 96 | 14 | 2082 | 2465 |
| More than \$92500-\$95000 | 70 | 169 | 80 | 7 | 1165 | 1491 |
| More than \$95000-\$97500 | 44 | 141 | 77 | 4 | 396 | 662 |
| More than \$97500-\$100000 | 50 | 114 | 75 | 4 | 368 | 611 |
| More than \$100000-\$200000 | 204 | 934 | 562 | 28 | 284 | 2012 |
| More than \$200000-\$300000 | 9 | 79 | 31 | 4 | 0 | 123 |
| More than \$300000-\$400000 | 2 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 25 |
| More than \$400000-\$500000 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| More than \$500000-\$600000 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| More than \$600000-\$700000 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| More than \$700000-\$800000 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| More than \$800000-\$900000 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| More than \$900000-\$1000000 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| More than \$1,000,000 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 377302 | 577037 | 461016 | 140561 | 35368 | 1591284 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.1 Family Assistance

Question No: 12

Topic: Family Tax Benefit

Hansard Page: CA46

Senator Harradine asked:

- a) Do you have a table which shows how many Tasmanian families are receiving Family Tax Benefit Part A, Family Tax Benefit Part B, Maternity Allowance; and the total amount paid for Tasmanian families?
- b) Do you have a similar table which shows the amounts paid overall for Australia?
- c) How many families in Tasmania have family payment debts? What is the amount currently owed?

Answer:

a)

| Payment type | Tasmanian families paid through Centrelink | Total Tasmanian fortnightly entitlement | Entitlement Period |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| FTB A | 50,259 | \$8.8 million * | Figures are for the fortnight ending 6/2/04. It is not possible to provide the data in the form requested. |
| FTB B | 33,176 | \$2.4 million * | Figures are for the fortnight ending 6/2/04. It is not possible to provide the data in the form requested. |
| Maternity Allowance | 2,732 | Fortnightly expenditure on Maternity Allowance is not available. | Cumulative figures for the period 1/7/03 to 26/12/03 |

* These figures do not include entitlements that have been deferred or adjusted under More Choice For Families provisions.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

b)

| | Australian families paid through Centrelink | Total Australian fortnightly entitlement | Entitlement Period |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| FTB A | 1,796,697 | \$313.6 million * | Figures are for the fortnight ending 6/2/04 |
| FTB B | 1,213,394 | \$92.8 million * | Figures are for the fortnight ending 6/2/04 |
| Maternity Allowance | 106,825 | Fortnightly expenditure on Maternity Allowance is not available. ** | Cumulative figures for the period 1/7/03 to 26/12/03. |

* These figures do not include entitlements that have been deferred or adjusted under More Choice For Families provisions.

**During the period 1/7/03 to 26/12/03 \$217 million has been paid to Australian families in respect of Maternity Allowance and Maternity Immunisation Allowance. It is not possible to identify the amount for Maternity Allowance separately.

c) As at 8 March 2004 there were 10,161 customers in Tasmania with a FTB debt. The amount outstanding as at 8 March was \$15.466 million. These debts arose from non-lodgement of tax returns, circumstance debts (eg changes in shared care arrangements) or reconciliation overpayments.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.1 Family Assistance

Question No: 63

Topic: Family Tax Benefit

Written Question on Notice

Senator Collins asked:

Salary Sacrificing

- a) How does salary sacrificing impact on Family Tax Benefit and Child Care Benefit?
- b) Does the treatment differ to that which applies to Child Support Agency Assessments?
- c) What is the rationale for this differential treatment?
- d) How many FTB and CCB families have an adjusted fringe benefit added back to determine their ATI?
- e) What is the average adjusted fringe benefit added back in?
- f) For families with an adjusted fringe benefit can you provide a breakdown of the number of families by ATI income band, including the average value of adjusted fringe benefit added back in by income band? Could this be done by ATI bands of \$1,000 or the bands in which FACS collects information by?

Answer:

- a) Reportable fringe benefits are included in the income test for Family Tax Benefit (FTB) and Child Care Benefit (CCB).
- b) Reportable fringe benefits (shown on a person's payment summary) are taken into account by the Family Assistance Office in the income test for FTB and CCB, and by the Child Support Agency in the assessment of child support liabilities.

In both instances, a person is required to declare the amount of reportable fringe benefits shown on their payment summary. The Family Assistance Office uses the 'non-grossed up' amount of a person's reportable fringe benefits when calculating their entitlement to FTB and CCB while the Child Support Agency uses the 'grossed-up' amount for determining child support liabilities. The 'non-grossed up' value is the actual dollar value of the benefit. The 'grossed-up' value of an employee's fringe benefit is the value of the benefit plus the notional amount of income tax that would be paid by the employee if the benefit was paid as cash salary, rather than as fringe benefits.

The use of the non-grossed up value of fringe benefits for determining family assistance entitlements reflects the continuation of existing income test arrangements for the previous family allowance system introduced in 1993.

- c) The Government's reforms to the Fringe Benefits Tax (FBT) provisions required employers, from the 1999-2000 FBT year of income, to identify on group certificates the grossed-up value of an employee's fringe benefits that are part of their remuneration package or award, where the value of an employee's fringe benefits exceeds \$1,000.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

From July 2000, the grossed up amount of those fringe benefits is included in calculating a person's child support liability. The non-grossed up amount of those fringe benefits is included in calculating a person's entitlement to FTB or CCB. The previous method (prior to 1 July 2000) of calculating child support liabilities did not include remuneration received as a fringe benefit. As a result, there was an incentive for parents with high earnings to reduce their liabilities by taking some of their remuneration as fringe benefits.

The current arrangements closed a loophole that had enabled some parents to minimise financial responsibility for their children. This treatment of fringe benefits is intended to ensure that parents who receive packages of equivalent value would be treated the same way irrespective of how they receive their remuneration.

Both child support payers and payees have the right to apply to have child support payments adjusted (a departure from the formula) if they believe that the assessed liability is inappropriate.

d) As at 5 March 2004 93,585 FTB customers and 26,689 CCB customers who have so far been reconciled for 2002-03 had declared an adjusted fringe benefit tax amount greater than zero.

e) The average amount declared for FTB customers is \$5,404 and for CCB customers is \$5,282.

f) It is not possible to provide the data in the form requested.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.1 Family Assistance

Question No: 64

Topic: Family Tax Benefit

Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

FTB Overpayments

[Refer QON 218 and 219 from November 2003 Estimates]

- a) Can you please provide an update of the 2002-2003 reconciliation for FTB by number and value for:
 - Nil adjustments;
 - Overpayments (debts);
 - Underpayments (Catch up payments)?
- b) Do you still stand by comments at the last round of estimates that debts may be underestimated and catch up payments overestimated due to behavioural effects?
- c) If not why not?
- d) Has the change in the number of underpayments (catch ups) been matched by a commensurate reduction in overpayments (debts)?
- e) Can you please provide an update of the 2001-2002 reconciliation for FTB by number and value for :
 - Nil adjustments;
 - Overpayments (debts);
 - Underpayments (Catch up payments)?
- f) Can you please provide an update of the 2000-2001 reconciliation for FTB by number and value for :
 - Nil adjustments;
 - Overpayments (debts);
 - Underpayments (Catch up payments)?

Answer:

- a) Refer to Attachment A
- b) The 2002-03 reconciliation results for the December quarter suggest that for 2002-03 overpayments as a proportion of total FTB outcomes will be lower than for previous years and that top-ups will be higher.
- c) Not Applicable.
- d) Yes.
- e) Refer to Attachment A
- f) Refer to Attachment A

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Attachment A

| <i>Quarter</i> | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8 th | 9 th | 10 th |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 2000-01 data at end of: | Sep-01 | Dec-01 | Mar-02 | Jun-02 | Sep-02 | Dec-02 | Mar-03 | Jun-03 | Sep-03 | Dec-03 |
| Top-Up | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | N/A | 333,487 | 378,351 | 451,436 | 472,186 | 477,034 | 477,521 | 477,912 | 482,560 | 486,686 |
| % | N/A | 23 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Total Amount | N/A | \$249m | \$312m | \$403m | \$431m | \$436m | \$438m | \$438m | \$441m | \$445m |
| Average Amount | N/A | \$746 | \$826 | \$892 | \$912 | \$915 | \$916 | \$917 | \$915 | \$913 |
| Overpayment | N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | N/A | 514,929 | 568,081 | 666,772 | 699,419 | 722,037 | 728,458 | 732,577 | 736,212 | 737,463 |
| % | N/A | 36 | 35 | 35 | 34 | 33 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 33 |
| Total Amount | N/A | \$403m | \$473m | \$577m | \$616m | \$638m | \$645m | \$650m | \$652m | \$653m |
| Average Amount | N/A | \$782 | \$832 | \$865 | \$881 | \$884 | \$885 | \$887 | \$885 | \$886 |
| Nil Change | N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | N/A | 600,411 | 660,298 | 795,438 | 857,368 | 966,487 | 963,923 | 965,272 | 978,367 | 982,435 |
| % | N/A | 41 | 41 | 42 | 42 | 45 | 44 | 44 | 45 | 45 |
| Total | N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | N/A | 1,448,827 | 1,606,730 | 1,913,646 | 2,028,973 | 2,165,558 | 2,169,902 | 2,175,761 | 2,197,139 | 2,206,584 |
| <i>1st quarter data not available for 2000-01 reconciliation.</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Quarter</i> | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5 th | 6 th | | | | |
| 2001-02 data at end of: | Sep-02 | Dec-02 | Mar-03 | Jun-03 | Sep-03 | Dec-03 | | | | |
| Top-Up | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | 226,997 | 390,582 | 434,258 | 509,283 | 528,777 | 532,689 | | | | |
| % | 25 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | | | | |
| Total Amount | \$133m | \$289m | \$349m | \$439m | \$468m | \$472m | | | | |
| Average Amount | \$587 | \$740 | \$803 | \$860 | \$885 | \$886 | | | | |
| Overpayment | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | 266,753 | 492,966 | 542,940 | 643,524 | 671,944 | 679,221 | | | | |
| % | 30 | 32 | 32 | 33 | 33 | 33 | | | | |
| Total Amount | \$190m | \$396m | \$462m | \$573m | \$611m | \$620m | | | | |
| Average Amount | \$712 | \$803 | \$851 | \$890 | \$909 | \$913 | | | | |
| Nil Change | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | 398,884 | 658,582 | 708,325 | 819,679 | 858,967 | 875,533 | | | | |
| % | 45 | 43 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | 892,634 | 1,542,130 | 1,685,523 | 1,972,486 | 2,059,688 | 2,087,443 | | | | |
| <i>Quarter</i> | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5 th | 6 th | | | | |
| 2002-03 data at end of: | Sep-03 | Dec-03 | | | | | | | | |
| Top-Up | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | 267,849 | 435,448 | | | | | | | | |
| % | 29 | 28 | | | | | | | | |
| Total Amount | \$171m | \$342m | | | | | | | | |
| Average Amount | \$638 | \$785 | | | | | | | | |
| Overpayment | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | 231,222 | 424,593 | | | | | | | | |
| % | 25 | 28 | | | | | | | | |
| Total Amount | \$154m | \$327m | | | | | | | | |
| Average Amount | \$668 | \$770 | | | | | | | | |
| Nil Change | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | 423,008 | 672,829 | | | | | | | | |
| % | 46 | 44 | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | 922,079 | 1,532,870 | | | | | | | | |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.1 Family Assistance

Question No: 29

Topic: Family Tax Benefit & Child Care Benefit

Hansard Page: CA 90

Senator Collins asked:

FTB and CCB

How many FTB and CCB families have an adjusted fringe benefit added back to determine their ATI?

What is the average adjusted fringe benefit added back in?

Answer:

Please refer to the answer to Question on Notice 63.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.1 & 1.4

Question No: 30

Topic: Family Tax Benefit & Child Care Benefit

Hansard Page: CA 91

Senator Collins asked:

For families with an adjusted fringe benefit, can you provide a breakdown of the number of families by ATI income band, including the average value of adjusted fringe benefit added back in by income band?

Could this be done by ATI bands of \$1,000?

Answer:

Please refer to the answer to Question on Notice 63.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.1 Family Assistance

Question No: 31

Topic: Playgroups

Hansard Page: CA124

Senator Collins asked: Please provide information on the break-up of funding for playgroups.

Answer:

Current funding for playgroups:

| Program | 2003-04 Estimate |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Playgroups – on-going | \$1,890,000* |
| Playgroups – Innovative Projects (Rural & Remote) | \$70,000 |
| Intensive Playgroups | \$620,000 |
| TOTAL | \$2,580,000 |

* This includes \$0.112 funding from the December announcement (see below).

New Playgroups initiative announced December 2003:

| Allocation | 2003/04 | 2004/05 | 2005/06 | 2006/07 | TOTAL |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Administered | 0.112 | 2.487 | 2.667 | 2.897 | 8.163 |
| Departmental | 0.436 | 0.840 | 0.917 | 0.674 | 2.867 |
| Total | \$0.548 | \$3.327 | \$3.584 | \$3.571 | \$11.030 |

Note. All figures are **GST exclusive**.

The break up of this new funding of \$11.03m announced in December 2003 is:

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| Mainstream playgroups: | \$2,570,000 |
| Supported playgroups: | \$1,670,000 |
| Intensive support playgroups | \$3,923,000 |

TOTAL administered funding (incl indexation) over 4 years is: \$8,163,000.

There is also departmental funding for marketing and administration which brings total funding for the measure announced in December 2003 to \$11.03 million.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.1 Family Assistance

Question No: 62

Topic: Playgroups Announcement

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

We have details of the state by state breakdown of your playgroups announcement from December last year. The detail we received does not divide between mainstream and intensive playgroups.

- a) Please provide detail of how much you have allocated per mainstream playgroups?
- b) Please provide detail that shows how much you allocated per supported and intensive playgroups?
- c) How much do mainstream playgroups receive in federal funding?
- d) How much do mainstream playgroups cost to deliver?
- e) How much do supported and intensive playgroups receive in federal funding?
- f) How much do supported and intensive playgroups cost to deliver?
- g) Could you please tell us the division of dollars between mainstream and supported playgroups state by state?
- h) Could you please provide detail of the allocation of those playgroups to localities (eg LGA or Planning area)?

Answer:

- a) \$250 per new playgroup per year and \$12,500 per year per State and Territory Playgroup Association for administration costs (\$6,250 in first year due to a half year effect).
- b) \$1.7 million over three years for supported playgroups, and a further \$3.9 million over three years for intensive support playgroups.
- c) Playgroup associations receive \$1.8 million a year from the Australian Government for mainstream playgroups. The \$2.6 million over 4 years announced in December 2003 is additional to this amount.
- d) FaCS' assessment is that a playgroup costs on average around \$400 per year to deliver, of which FaCS' contribution is \$198, the additional funding coming mainly from membership fees. For the new initiative, FaCS is providing \$250 per playgroup, in recognition of increased set up and delivery costs.
- e) The Australian Government does not currently fund supported playgroups. The new \$1.7 million funding commences from 1 July 2004.

There are 4 intensive support playgroups currently operational. Each intensive support playgroup receives approximately \$155,000 per year over two years.

- f) Supported playgroups are estimated to cost \$8,300 each per year to deliver and intensive support playgroups cost approximately \$155,000 each per year to deliver.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

g) The table below shows funding over 4 years.

| State | Mainstream | Supported | Intensive support | Total Admin \$ |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| NSW | \$751,319 | \$434,815 | \$980,616 | \$2,166,750 |
| VIC | \$541,843 | \$330,460 | \$490,308 | \$1,362,611 |
| QLD | \$497,439 | \$330,460 | \$490,308 | \$1,318,207 |
| SA | \$211,174 | \$147,837 | \$490,308 | \$849,319 |
| WA | \$266,285 | \$182,622 | \$490,308 | \$939,215 |
| TAS | \$111,920 | \$52,178 | \$490,308 | \$654,406 |
| NT | \$90,242 | \$139,141 | \$490,308 | \$719,691 |
| ACT | \$100,950 | \$52,178 | 0 | \$153,128 |
| TOTAL | \$2,571,172 | \$1,669,690 | \$3,922,464 | \$8,163,000 |
| GRAND TOTAL | Including Departmental funding of \$2.86m | | | \$11.03m |

Departmental funding includes funds for marketing, administration, needs analysis, expression of interest process, program management and evaluation.

h) Distribution of mainstream playgroups is a matter for each State/Territory playgroup association. Distribution of supported and intensive support playgroups is still being finalised.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.1 Family Assistance

Question No: 65

Topic: High Income Earners Receiving FTB

Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

In a press release of 15 August 2003, the former Minister stated in relation to high wealth individuals receiving FTB that:

I have asked my Department to conduct an urgent investigation into the circumstances that have led to this situation and any steps that might be necessary to prevent it happening again.

1. Can you provide a copy of the analysis that accounts for all of the estimated 18,000 high income families who received FTB which the former Minister asked the Department to check?

In the same press release the former Minister stated:

I am determined to make sure that taxpayer's money only goes to those in genuine need and if any loopholes have been exploited in either tax or family assistance legislation, they will be closed.

2. Please provide details of what loopholes, if any were exploited?
3. Please provide details of what action has been taken to date against people identified to have broken the current Family Assistance legislation?
4. Please provide details of what action has been taken at an administrative level to close down identified loopholes?

Please provide details of what legislative action was recommended by the Department to close down any loopholes?

Answer:

1. The figures of around 17,000 or 18,000 used for the number of FTB Part A families with incomes in excess of \$100,000 are incorrect, but were included in a table released to the Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee. The Committee was subsequently advised that the figures were incorrect.
2. No loopholes were exploited.
3. No cases were identified as having broken the current Family Assistance legislation.
4. No loopholes were identified.
5. No legislative action is required.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 34

Topic: National Youth Roundtable

Hansard Page: CA 105

Senator Collins asked:

Can you indicate for me who those external panel members were from the last selection process?

Answer:

The members of the Independent Selection Advisory Panel for the 2004 National Youth Roundtable were:

| | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Lyn McLelland | AMP Foundation |
| Lachlan Cameron | 2003 National Youth Roundtable Member |
| Mary Wooldridge | Foundation for Young Australians |
| Claire Treadgold | Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 66

Topic: 2004-05 Forward Estimates

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

In QON No.88 2003-04 Supplementary Budget Estimates hearings, the Department provided a breakdown of the total expenditure and forward estimates for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03 & 2003-04 under the Youth Bureau Programs Branch. Where possible could forward estimates for 2004-05 be provided. Further, could the total expenditure/estimates in each financial year be further broken down into the line items for each program?

Answer:

FaCS is unable to provide forward estimates for 2004-05 appropriations prior to the 2004-05 Budget.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 67

Topic: Forward Estimates 2004-05

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

If any of these programs are due to conclude please detail the reasons for their conclusion?

Answer:

None of the programs referred to in Question No. 66 are due to conclude.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 68

Topic:

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Youth Bureau Policy and Promotions Branch.

In QON No.90 2003-04 Supplementary Budget Estimates hearings the Department provided a breakdown of the total expenditure and forward estimates for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03 and 2003-04 under the Youth Bureau Policy and Promotions Branch. Where possible could forward estimates for 2004-05 be provided. Further, could the total expenditure/estimates in each financial year be further broken down into the line items for each program?

Answer:

FaCS is unable to provide forward estimates for 2004-05 appropriations prior to the 2004-05 Budget.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 69

Topic:

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: If any of these programs are due to conclude please detail the reasons for their conclusion?

Answer:

None of the programs referred to in Question No. 68 are due to conclude.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 32

Topic: Green Corps

Hansard Page: CA 99Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Please provide the total number of participants in Green Corps each year of its operation by the following details, age group, broken into:

- i) 15 to 17 years
- ii) 18 to 19 years
- iii) 20 to 24 years
- iv) and 25 years and over
- v) income support status; and
- vi) level of education

Answer:

- i) 15 to 17 years – **See Attachment A**
- ii) 18 to 19 years – **See Attachment A**
- iii) 20 to 24 years – **See Attachment A**
- iv) 25 years and over – **See Attachment A**
- v) No data available.
- vi) Level of education – **See Attachment B**

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Question No: 32 Attachment A

**AGE OF GREEN CORPS PARTICIPANTS BY ROUND
SINCE THE INCEPTION OF THE PROGRAM**

Data has been broken into two tables. Table 1 includes data for financial years 1996/97 to 2001/02. Table 2 includes data for financial year 2002/03.

Information provided indicates the financial year in which a participant commenced on the Green Corps program. The placement is of 26 weeks duration and can cross over financial and/or financial years.

Table 1

| Financial Year | 17 Years | 18 Years | 19 Years | 20 Years | Other |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1996/97 | 97 | 175 | 174 | 145 | 9 |
| 1997/98 | 207 | 340 | 307 | 327 | 19 |
| 1998/99 | 291 | 497 | 460 | 444 | 8 |
| 1999/00 | 373 | 507 | 436 | 372 | 12 |
| 2000/01 | 365 | 560 | 446 | 360 | 9 |
| 2001/02 | 422 | 550 | 447 | 353 | 28 |

Table 2

| Financial Year | 15-17 Years | 18-19 Years | 20-24 Years | 25 Years And Over |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 2002/03 | 449 | 928 | 361 | 3 |

Notes:

Table 1

1. Data aggregated by the requested age break-up for participants from 1996/97 to 2001/02 is not available. Data has been provided for each of the Green Corps target age groups of 17, 18, 19 and 20 years.
2. Data for any participants outside these age groups in this table has been collected as "other", i.e. participants could have been under 17 or over 20 years of age. No participant in the program from 1996/97 to 2001/02 was 25 years and over.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Question No: 32 Attachment B

**LEVEL OF EDUCATION SINCE THE INCEPTION OF
THE GREEN CORPS PROGRAM**

| Financial Year | Less Than Year 10 | Year 10 | Year 11 | Year 12 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1996/97 | 34 | 140 | 92 | 334 |
| 1997/98 | 57 | 251 | 183 | 709 |
| 1998/99 | 98 | 368 | 232 | 1002 |
| 1999/00 | 140 | 418 | 295 | 847 |
| 2000/01 | 135 | 448 | 286 | 871 |
| 2001/02 | 154 | 461 | 284 | 897 |
| 2002/03 | 203 | 527 | 276 | 735 |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 33

Topic: Green Corps

Hansard Page: CA 99 Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Can the Department provide the most recent data on the outcomes achieved by participants exiting Green Corps by the following:

- 1) % Employed full-time
- 2) % Employed part-time
- 3) % Employed casual
- 4) % Employed total
- 5) % Not in the labour force
- 6) % Receiving further assistance (transferred to other forms of income support)
- 7) % In education or training
- 8) Number of exits

Answer:

- 1) 32.2%
- 2) 20.7%
- 3) No data is collected on this outcome.
- 4) 54% - Some participants do not identify themselves as employed full-time or part-time, therefore are not included in answers (1) and (2) above; but are include here.
- 5) 2.3%
- 6) No data collected on this outcome
- 7) 3.4%
- 8) 187 – Specifically for Green Corps Round 28.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 70

Topic: Green Corps

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

i) Senator Collins asked: Can the department please provide an update on Green Corps, including details of the programs current operation and forward estimates?

Answer:

Please refer to Question on Notice 78 for details of Green Corps' current operation. The department is unable to provide forward estimates prior to the 2004-05 Budget.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 71

Topic: Green Corps

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Please provide data on the proportion of Green Corps participants (by equity group and type of labour market assistance) who received an off income support outcome 3 months after participation who subsequently transferred to other types of income support (i.e. for Newstart or Youth Allowance or to another income support payment).

Answer: Data not available.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 72

Topic: Green Corps

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Please provide data on the proportion of Green Corp participants (by equity group and type of labour market assistance) who received an off income support outcome 3 months after participation who subsequently re-entered one of the following Labour Market Assistance programme - *Intensive Support- customised assistance, Job Search Training, Job Matching, Job Placement, NEIS, SEDS, Work for the Dole, IEP, CDEP, IEP-Wage Assistance, Transition to Work.*

Answer: Data not available.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 73

Topic: Green Corps

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: What proportion of participants in Green Corps are not unemployed?

Answer:

Green Corps participants are undertaking a youth development program, and are not considered to be in full time employment. The number of participants who may be in casual or part-time work is not known.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 74

Topic: Green Corps

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Can the department provide the total number of participants in Green Corps in each year of its operation, by the following?

- Age group (15-17 year, 18-19 years, 20-24 years and 25 years and over)
- Income support status (Youth Allowance, Newstart, not on income support or other)
- Level of education

Answer: Please refer to Question on Notice 32.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 75

Topic: Green Corps

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Can the Department provide the most recent data on the outcomes achieved by participants exiting Green Corp by the following:

- % Employed full-time
- % Employed part-time
- % Employed casual
- % Employed total
- % Not in the labour force
- % Receiving further assistance (transferred to other forms of income support)
- % In education and training
- Number of exits

Answer: Please refer to Question on Notice 33.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 76

Topic: Green Corps

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Can the Department provide the most recent data (by funding level, age group, duration on income support, gender and equity group) on the outcomes achieved by participants, in Green Corps by the following:

- % Employed full-time
- % Employed part-time
- % Employed casual
- % Employed total
- % Not in the labour force
- % Receiving further assistance (transferred to other forms of income support)
- % In education and training
- Number of exits

Answer: Data not available.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 77

Topic: Green Corps

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked: Can the Department provide the most recent data (By state and regional basis, by Statistical Local Area and by postcode) on the outcomes achieved by participants, in Green Corps by the following:

- % Employed full-time
- % Employed part-time
- % Employed casual
- % Employed total
- % Not in the labour force
- % Receiving further assistance (transferred to other forms of income support)
- % In education and training
- Number of exits

Answer: Data not available.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 78

Topic: Employment, education and training programs

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

- a) Could the Department provide a list of all employment, education and training programs and any transitional support programs targeted to youth aged 15 to 19 year olds and the forward estimates for each of these programs?
- b) Could the Department provide an update on each of the programs and explain how it operates in relation to the type of assistance provide to the target group?
- c) Will there be funding continuing to these programs beyond 2004/2005? If not please outline the reasons why the programs will no longer be funded?
- d) How many participants have gone through each program since its commencement?
- e) Can the department provide an itemised breakdown of where the funding has gone eg: advertising costs, Centrelink staff, external service providers or organisations etc?
- f) What has been the progress of each program, including any employment outcomes (full time, part time and casual employment outcomes) by gender, equity, age and target group?
- g) How do these programs differ from ones provided by DEST or Job Network?

Answer:

Please find attached a spreadsheet that answers the above questions for all Youth Bureau Programs, excluding part of a) and excluding e).

- a) Forward estimates are unavailable until Budget 2004-05.
- e) FaCS is unable to provide a breakdown of the total expenditure of these programs by line item as this task would be an unreasonable demand on resources.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| Q78 attachment a) FaCS Program | b) Update of Program How it operates re type of assistance? | c) Will funding continue beyond 2004/05? Reason if not continuing | d) How many participants have gone through the program since it commenced? | f) Progress/outcomes of program, including employment outcomes by gender, equity, age and target group. | g) How does the program differ from ones provided by DEST or Job Network? |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reconnect | Reconnect provides early intervention support for young people, aged between 12 and 18 years at risk of homelessness, and their families. Reconnect works with Centrelink and schools as 'first to know agencies' that identify young people who need assistance. Services offer counseling, adolescent mediation and practical support to both young people and their families to help young people stay connected with family, education, training, the community and, to a lesser extent, employment. | In the 2003-04 Budget the Australian Government committed to fund Reconnect for a further four years until 2006-07 | Approximately 37,000 young people and families have been assisted by Reconnect since its commencement. | A recent program evaluation found that: - the proportion of young people living in temporary situations fell from 16% at Reconnect's initial intervention to 5% at exit from the services. - the proportion of young people living with their parents increased from 57% at the start of support to 62% after support, an increase that was found across all age categories. - the proportion of young people employed full time or part time increased from 2% at the start of Reconnect support to 5% at completion (noting that the target age is primarily of a pre-employment group). - the proportion of young people who were not in | Reconnect has a primary focus on homelessness. The main outcome is for young people to stay connected with their families and the community. Outcomes of connection with education and employment are also important in preventing homelessness. |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | education, training or employment dropped from 15% at program entry to 11% at exit. | |
| JPET | <p>The JPET program helps vulnerable young people aged 15 to 21 years (with a focus on 15 to 19 year olds) each year to overcome significant personal and social barriers. Barriers may limit a young person's capacity participate socially, economically or remain engaged in education. The JPET program has a particular focus on young people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.</p> <p>JPET also assists young people in the following groups who are not necessarily homeless or at risk of homelessness, but who face multiple barriers to social and economic participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • young people leaving the juvenile justice system; • young refugees; and • young people who are particularly disadvantaged because of geographic | <p>The JPET program lapses in June 2005 and will be reviewed for consideration of further funding.</p> | <p>Approximately 83,378.</p> | <p>The information requested is not available for each financial year since establishment of the program.</p> <p><i>The JPET – Keeping on track</i> evaluation, reported in the FaCS 2001–02 Annual Report found that access to safe accommodation increased from 58 per cent on entry to 80 per cent on exit and 85 per cent at six months post-exit.</p> <p>The evaluation also found that employment levels improved from 1 per cent of clients participating on entry to the program to 27 per cent on exit.</p> <p>The report advised that participation in education and training increased from 20 per cent at entry</p> | <p>JPET assists young people to stabilise their situation and to overcome personal and social barriers. JPET does not deliver job brokerage or job placement services.</p> |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | isolation. A selection process is currently underway with new funding agreements to commence from 1 July 2004. | | | to 47 per cent on exit and 43 per cent at six months post-exit. | |
| Green Corps | Green Corps is an Australian Government youth development and environmental training program for young people aged between 17-20 years. Green Corps provides young people with the opportunity to volunteer their commitment to conserve, preserve and restore Australia's natural environment and cultural heritage. Each Green Corps project involves 10 young people taking part in a range of activities and experiences over a twenty-six week period. The young people receive a participant allowance and take part in projects mostly located in rural or remote areas. | In May 2002 the Australian Government committed to fund Green Corps for a further three years until 2005. | 11 710 young people have taken part in Green Corps as at February 2004. | Data provided in Questions on Notice 32 and 33. | Green Corps has a primary focus of youth development. Outcomes of connection with education and employment are secondary and are important in achieving the primary focus. |
| Mentor Marketplace | The Mentor Marketplace program aims to establish new mentoring activities and to assist the growth of successful existing projects. It encourages the use of mentoring to increase outcomes for young people, particularly those at | No. Terminating program. | Data not yet available. Program in early stages. | Data not yet available. Program in early stages. | It is a transition support program and does not have employment or education outcomes as a sole focus. |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>greatest risk of disconnection from their families, community, education and work.</p> <p>Mentor Marketplace aims to develop a mentoring culture in business, schools and communities that will result in a wide-ranging and enthusiastic engagement of business and community sectors in numerous self-sustaining mentoring activities.</p> | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO

2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 79

Topic: Mentor Marketplace

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

- a) Will this program continue to be funded beyond April 2004?
 - If yes, can the department provide the forward estimates?
 - If no, what are the reasons why the program will be no longer funded?
- b) Could the Department provide an update on this program and explain how it operates in relation to the type of assistance provided to the target group?
- c) Can the Department provide the details of the 15 projects which have been approved under the Mentor Market Place including:
 1. The name of the organisations/ individuals receiving funding?
 2. The address of the organisations/ individuals receiving funding?
 3. A copy of the latest reports submitted by the organisation/individuals detailing the progress of their performance funded under the Mentor Market Place?
- d) Can the department supply the outcomes achieved by each organisation receiving funding under the Mentor Marketplace by:
 1. Number of young people participating
 2. Number of young people completing the project
 3. Number of community and business partnerships established
 4. Number of strategies developed for establishing the project as self-sustaining
 5. Percentage of young people satisfied with the mentoring provided
 6. Percentage of young people who believe they have increased self-esteem
 7. Percentage of young people who believe they have increased opportunities for participation in work, education, training and community life
 8. Percentage of young people who believe they have increased skills
 9. Percentage of participating communities satisfied with their involvement in the project
 10. Percentage of participating communities satisfied with the outcomes of the project.

Answer:

- a) Yes, the program will be funded beyond April 2004. The forward estimates will be included in the next Budget.
- b) The Mentor Marketplace seeks to expand mentoring opportunities for young people between 12-25 by establishing new mentoring activities and assisting the growth of successful existing projects. The mentoring opportunities should ensure access to mentoring for all young people, including those in foster care, young carers, young people with disabilities, Indigenous young people and those from disadvantaged groups and localities.
- c) 1/2. Attachment A provides the names and addresses of the 15 organisations funded to date, including a description of the projects.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

- c) 3. Only those projects selected in the first funding round have been going long enough to have been able to provide performance reports. The reports contain sensitive and confidential information. While no individuals are named in the reports, there is also a risk that (particularly in smaller communities) information contained in the reports could possibly be disaggregated and could identify individuals. The Department, therefore, respectfully requests the Committee not to press for the production of these reports.
- d) As the program is in the formation stage, insufficient data is available to respond to this question.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004
Question 79: Attachment A

MENTOR MARKETPLACE - Summary of Approved Projects

| NAME | TARGET GROUP | ADDRESS |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The Smith Family | Disadvantaged youth – Yr 9 & 10 | Level 8, 35 Pitt Street SYDNEY NSW 2000 |
| Big Brothers Big Sisters Australia | Youth lacking adequate adult support | 16 The Vacluse RICHMOND VIC 3121 |
| CREATE Foundation | Young people in, or have been in, care | 24 Buckingham Street SURRY HILLS NSW 2010 |
| Integrated Family and Youth Service Inc | Youth | 12/65 Bulcock Street CALOUNDRA QLD 4551 |
| Downs Industry Schools Co-operative | Youth | Ground Floor, 'Crane on Neil' Street Building 65-67 Neil Street TOOWOOMBA QLD 4350 |
| The Baptist Union of Queensland | Boys without positive role model or disadvantaged | 72 Nikenbah/Dundwran Road HERVEY BAY QLD 4655 |
| Youth Off the Streets | At risk youth | PO Box 6025 ALEXANDRIA NSW 2015 |
| Big Hart Incorporated | Youth experiencing multiple layers of disadvantage | 11 Boronia Street CRONULLA NSW 2230 |
| Hunter Star Foundation Inc | At risk youth | C/- Newcastle PCYC, cnr Young and Melbourne Roads BROADMEADOW NSW 2292 |
| Whitelion | Youth who have had contact with juvenile justice | 900 Park Street PARKVILLE VIC 3052 |
| Migrant Resource Centre | Migrant and refugee youth | 53 Flinders Street ADELAIDE SA 5000 |
| Flinders University | Secondary students | Flinders University of SA GPO Box 2100 ADELAIDE SA 5001 |
| Aboriginal Medical Services | Aboriginal youth | Unit C Trenton Street WILUNA WA 6646 |
| School Volunteer Program Inc | At risk school children | Scarborough Community Centre Office 2, 173 Gildercliffe Street SCARBOROUGH WA 6019 |
| The Gap Youth Centre Aboriginal | Indigenous secondary students | 91-93 Gap Road |

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO

2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|
| Corporation | | ALICE SPRINGS NT 0870 |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|

Overview of Recommended Projects

1. The Smith Family

Project aim

Aim to provide support in career pathways and increase sense of responsibility. The expected outcome is the preparation of students from disadvantaged backgrounds for successful entry and retention into the workforce.

Target group

Students of low socioeconomic status in years 9 and 10 in Dubbo.

2. Big Brothers Big Sisters Australia

Project aim

To develop a trusting and significant long term relationship between the mentor and mentee with the aim of establishing an improvement in school attendance, grades, behaviour, social adjustment and self esteem.

Target group

Young people aged 12 to 15, in Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney and Roma.

3. CREATE Foundation

Project aim

To provide a three-month module of personal development and leadership to identify and enhance skills and knowledge. There aims to be participant, community team and community outcomes that will empower and enable positive changes.

Target group

Young people aged 14-18. To be delivered in 6 State/Territories - ACT, Tas, SA, WA, NT and Qld.

4. Integrated Family and Youth Service Inc

Project Aim

To facilitate the coordination of surrounding mentoring programs and promote good practice. Participating mentoring programs will be provided with adequate resources, both human and financial, to develop and maintain appropriate processes and strategies to meet the needs of identified groups of young people.

Target Group

Young people aged 12-25 years. To be delivered over two years in the Sunshine Coast region.

5. Downs Industry Schools Co-operative – D.I.S.C.O.

Project Aim

A community based approach to assisting young people in their transition through school or from school into employment or onto further study.

Target Group

Young people aged 14-25 years. To be delivered over 1 year, centred in Toowoomba but operating with partners south to Stanthorpe, west to Dalby and Tara, east to Gatton and north to Crows Nest.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

6. The Baptist Union of Qld

Project Aim

To develop practical participative programs that involve both boys and fathers or male role models, give skills to assist youth with future employment and training, reconnect young boys with parents in a positive way, give parenting skills to parents while participating in recreational and practical tasks together with their sons.

Target Group

Disadvantaged boys, aged 12 to 18 years, from dysfunctional families or who are without a positive role model, located in the Hervey Bay and Maryborough-Wide Bay Region.

7. Youth Off the Streets

Project Aim

To provide support to young people as they experience significant transitions and/or challenges in their lives and build social capital within local communities. To develop a best practice model for mentoring programs for disadvantaged young people at risk.

Target Group

At-risk youth aged 12-18 years. To be delivered over 2 years across NSW in the Southern highlands, central and western Sydney, the Central Coast and the Hunter Valley.

8. Big Hart Incorporated

Project Aim

To provide concentrated mentoring to the most disadvantaged participants who have gained positive experiences through Big hArt's "kNOT AT HOME" projects.

Target Group

Young people experiencing multiple layers of disadvantage, aged between 12-24 years. To be delivered nationally over 1 year. Areas to be covered include Kalgoorlie WA, Palmerston NT, Sydney, Tweed Heads, Armidale, Moree, Narrabri, Gunnedah, Tamworth, Inverell, Walgett, Coonamble, Burke and Lismore NSW, Melbourne VIC, Coolangatta QLD and West Coast TAS.

9. Hunter Star Foundation Inc

Project Aim

HSFI created the Linking Youth to the Newcastle Community (LYNC) Model in November 1999. Its purpose is to create links between young people 'at risk' and the community in which they live. To facilitate this, a three phase model was developed which leads young people from a position of being 'at risk' of long term unemployment, welfare dependence and offending behaviours to a position of contribution to and acceptance by their community.

Target Group

At risk youths aged 15-18 years. To be delivered over two years in the Newcastle and Lake Macquarie regions.

10. Whitelion

Project Aim

Range of aims including increased opportunity for connection to positive adults and for community participation, engagement and support for young people in educational, vocational, employment and recreational choices, and to contribute to more positive community attitudes and opportunities for the target group.

Target Group

Youths aged between 14 and 21 years, who have been in contact with juvenile justice. To be delivered over two years in the Northern Region of Melbourne.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

11. Migrant Resource Centre

Project Aim

To assist young people develop their marketplace knowledge and potential through a mentoring program.

Target Group

Migrant and refugee youth aged 12-25 years. To be delivered over two years in metropolitan Adelaide.

12. Flinders University

Project Aim

The Peer Mentoring Program links students from senior school and university with mentors to ensure that they complete their secondary education, enter appropriate further education and if entering University progress into employment at the completion of their studies.

Target Group

Students aged 15-24 years. To be delivered in the southern suburbs of Adelaide.

13. Aboriginal Medical Services

Project Aim

An early intervention approach which aims to identify positive mentors and role models within the Indigenous community and develop their skills to provide positive mentoring to young people.

Target Group

Young Aboriginal people aged 5-20 years. To be delivered over two years in the Mid West and Central Desert Region.

14. School Volunteer Program Inc

Project Aim

To achieve the implementation and expansion of a range of mentoring programs such as Career Mentoring, Computer Links, Crimes Against Society Education Program and People with Disabilities becoming mentors and mentees, with the aim of assisting young people in difficult circumstances to have access to guidance with basic academic, social and life skills.

Target Group

'At-risk' school children from Kindergarten to year 12, to be delivered over two years in all Perth suburbs and all regional and remote areas throughout WA.

15. The Gap Youth Centre Aboriginal Corporation

Project Aim

A three-pronged approach designed to provide support resources to extend the current informal mentoring model, to increase the number of trained mentors in the Community and to provide quality time for mentors to build relationships with young people through a camping program.

Target Group

14-17 year old Indigenous secondary students in years 8-10. To be delivered to over 2 years in the Alice Springs area (and also on a national front using the Deadly Mob website).

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO

2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.2 Youth and Student Support

Question No: 97

Topic: Customer Numbers by Payment Type by postcode (15 to 24 year olds)

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

a) Can the department provide a breakdown of 15 to 19 year old recipients of Youth Allowance or any other form of welfare assistance for each year between 1996 and 2004, by the following?

- Gender and Postcode (and/or SLA)
- Long term unemployment and Postcode (and/or SLA)

b) Can the department provide a breakdown of 20 to 24 year old recipients of Youth allowance or any other form of welfare assistance for each year between 1996 and 2004, by the following?

- Gender and Postcode (and/or SLA)
- Long term unemployment and Postcode (and/or SLA)

Answer:

Data for the years 1996 to 2002 is not readily available.

Unemployment duration data is not available. Data showing income support duration has been provided as at 20 June 2003 for Youth and Newstart Allowances and as at 13 June 2003 for other income support payments. It should be noted that this duration may include periods on other income support payments and, in the case of current jobseekers, may also include periods when they were not jobseekers (eg may have been a full-time student for part of the period).

The tables show the number of recipients on payment for less than one year or greater than one year. 'Other' refers to YA customers who are not full time students (eg. Looking for work, incapacitated, etc.)

Due to privacy regulations, where postcodes have less than 20 customers in the relevant customer groupings the table will show a value of '< 20'.

[Note: the attachments have not been included in the electronic/printed volume]

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO

2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.3 Child Support

Question No: 80

Topic: Child Custody report

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

- a) Has the Child Support Agency been asked to coordinate the Government's response to this report?
- b) Who is coordinating the response?
- c) Has the CSA provided its input to the response yet?
- d) What is the timetable for responding to the report?

Answer:

- a) No.
- b) Department of Family and Community Services and the Attorney-General's Department.
- c) Yes.
- d) The government will respond in due course.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO

2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

Output Group: 1.3 Child Support

Question No: 81

Topic: Change of Assessment Trend Data

Hansard Page: Written question on notice

Senator Collins asked:

We are seeking information about the annual number of change of assessments lodged and decisions made?

- a) Has the rate increased since the start of the scheme? Can we have the figures?
- b) Can you provide some data over time of who initiates Assessments?
- c) What data do you have on the lodgement of multiple Assessments?
- d) Where there are multiple lodgements, do you have information on the frequency of lodgements?
- e) Can you provide us with some information about the proportion of Change of Assessments which result in an upward variation for the a) payer b) payee?
- f) Can you provide us with some information about the proportion of Change of Assessments which result in a downward variation for the a) payer b) payee?

Answer:

(a) Data for the period 1992 -30/6/1999 is not available.

The application rate for Change of Assessment (COA) applications received over the past four years is as follows:

| Year | Total COA Applications | Total COA Applications as a Percentage of Active Caseload |
|-------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 99/00 | 30848 | 5.4% |
| 00/01 | 31933 | 5.2% |
| 01/02 | 31919 | 4.9% |
| 02/03 | 31174 | 4.5% |

(b) For the period 1/7/02 to 29/02/04

53.4% of applications were initiated by the payer

45.4% of applications were initiated by the payee

1.2% of applications were initiated by the Child Support Registrar

(c) Data is available on multiple lodgements from 1/7/03.

(d) For the period 1/7/03 – 29/2/04:

66% of applicants lodged one application

25% lodged two applications

6% lodged three applications

2% lodged four applications

1% lodged five or more applications

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO

2003-04 Additional Estimates, 19 February 2004

(e) For the period 1/7/02 to 29/02/04

30% of all applications resulted in an increased assessment

59% of payee initiated applications resulted in an increased assessment

9% of payer initiated applications resulted in an increased assessment (due mainly to cross applications having been lodged by the payee)

(f) For the period 1/7/02 to 29/02/04.

25% of all applications resulted in a decreased assessment

7% of all payee initiated applications resulted in a decreased assessment (due mainly to cross applications having been lodged by the payer)

37% of all payer initiated applications resulted in a decreased assessment

Note: In (e) and (f), an upward or downward variation would vary between payer and payee on the same application, consequently upward or downward variations of the **assessment** have been given.