

ATTACHMENT A

SUMMARY TABLE – COMPARISON OF THE CDP AND THE FAIR WORK AND STRONG COMMUNITIES SCHEME

	Existing Community Development Programme <i>(2019 Reforms in italics)</i>	Proposed Fair Work and Strong Communities scheme
Job opportunities	<p>No direct employment creation. Incentives for employers. Indigenous enterprise development funding available for commercially viable business ideas.</p> <p><i>2019 Reforms: 6,000 wage subsidies of \$21,034 over two years to create full time jobs. Employer must be able to cover remaining employment costs. Subsidies can go to private employers. Subsidised positions can be taken up by anyone provided they are on CDP.</i></p>	<p>A new Remote Jobs Investment Fund will be established to directly create part-time jobs in communities where long term unemployment is very high. Initially around 10,500 jobs, with numbers to be adjusted with labour market conditions according to funding formula.</p> <p>Most jobs will be created within Indigenous community based organisations working on identified services and projects. Labour hire or group training type arrangements can be used to enable employees to be assigned to traineeships and/or other temporary work assignments with a range of employers, facilitating long term skills development. A training account will be attached to the jobs to encourage work related and foundation skills training on the job.</p> <p>Jobs will have normal employment conditions. Superannuation will be paid, leave will be available, and jobs can be ‘won’ or ‘lost’. Applicants must be local unemployed.</p> <p>Job creation will also be supported through re-designing the current enterprise development fund to support social enterprises. Rules that restrict income generating activity will be relaxed and simplified.</p> <p>Wage subsidies available to employers.</p>
Work preparation, individualised case management assistance for those on income support	<p>CDP providers offer two sets of services. People who are 18-49 are required to Work for the Dole – usually 5 days per week, 25 hours Basic services provided to all participants - principally monthly appointments, usually office based and focussed on IT/administrative tasks, daily reporting to Government that</p>	<p>CDP providers would be replaced with Remote Jobs Centres which will provide strengths based case management for individuals and families, focussed on personal and family goals Obligations of participants would be no greater than those of other unemployed Australians. ‘Default’ structure for obligations, with capacity to change at the community level.</p>

	<p>obligations are being met, including daily submission of compliance reports.</p> <p><i>2019 Reforms: hours reduced to 20 per week, but still Monday to Friday</i></p>	<p>Current IT/admin tasks of providers will be minimised, including eliminating daily reporting. Reporting on participant activities is by exception (for example because compliance action is being considered) or as necessary to track progress to outcomes.</p>
<p>Use of income support penalties</p>	<p>Mandatory reporting by provider of non-attendance at appointments and Work for the Dole Failure to recommend penalty for non-attendance at Work for the Dole means provider loses revenue</p> <p><i>2019 Reforms: New compliance system that imposes harsher penalties on those that have multiple 'failures'. Fees would no longer be tied to breaching because if provider determines no reasonable excuse, new 'demerit points' are automatically applied. No discretion for provider to decide that penalty or demerit is not an appropriate way of engaging.</i></p>	<p>Those in work positions created under the new Remote Jobs Investment Fund would be subject to the normal employment arrangements set by their employer.</p> <p>For those people who remain on income support, the local organisation (Remote Job Centre) will have discretion to decide, in each case, whether applying a penalty is the best approach. Local governance committees to have input into local approach to obligations and penalties within framework of national Social Security rules.</p>
<p>Education and training</p>	<p>No recognition of education or training as valuable outcomes in themselves (except drivers' license and Language Literacy Numeracy) Training must be linked to a specific job or to a specific Work for the Dole activity</p>	<p>Training, education and related work experience will be able to be recognised and supported as part of a long term plan to improve the number of local people in local, quality jobs, as well as contributing to individual and community wellbeing.</p> <p>A training account would be attached to jobs established under the Remote Jobs Investment Fund to encourage foundation and/or vocational training on the job. RIJF jobs could also be used to establish traineeships and apprenticeships, and can be used to provide continuous employment over the full length of an apprenticeship through a group training type arrangement.</p> <p>The Remote Youth Projects will provide training in the context of paid work experience as a stepping stone to future jobs.</p>

<p>Employment focus</p>	<p>Providers can claim outcome payments when people have been in work for 13 weeks and for 26 weeks, regardless of job quality or level of assistance provided by provider Employers can claim an incentive payment after 26 weeks of employment - \$7,500 for full time employment, \$3750 for part time <i>2019 Reforms: 12 week instead of 13 week outcomes.</i> <i>Employers who keep the same person in a subsidised job for 2 years can access retention payments.</i></p>	<p>Funding will be available for new jobs to be created – both directly through the jobs fund (RJIF), and indirectly through social enterprise development funding. The focus of the work of the Remote Job Centre (and the scheme more broadly) will be on net employment impact, with success measured on the basis of long term improvements in (1) the proportion of local people in work, (2) movement into higher level jobs in the community (3) the proportion of people earning some income (eg: through sales, intermittent work). There will be additional measures in other areas, including governance and youth participation. Wage subsidies will be available to employers.</p>
<p>Support after work placement</p>	<p>Support must be provided to stay in employment for up to 26 weeks. Funding level drops after placement. People who relocate must change provider</p>	<p>Remote Job Centre provides initial support to employer and employee, but then can continue to provide assistance when needed and requested – for example support for an individual to move into more stable, or higher skilled employment and assistance where job is ‘at risk’. Remote Job Centre can also provide support where participant takes up work or training outside the community.</p>
<p>People with substantial impairments, psychological, or other health impediments to employment</p>	<p>Where DHS has identified the issue/s, a person may have part time Work for the Dole requirements, or only be accessing ‘Basic Services’ Temporary exemptions are available through DHS There is widespread concern that DHS is not identifying serious health and other issues <i>2019 Reforms: more flexibility for DHS to consider evidence, including evidence from providers.</i></p>	<p>Remote Jobs Centre will provide assistance for people to get proper assessment and treatment by relevant health/other experts wherever possible. RJC will assist participants (and family members, for example carers) to get onto the correct income support payment. Remote Jobs Centre provides individual support to achieve income stability, personal goals and employment where appropriate. Where people do not have capacity to work – even with support – Remote Job Centres would have discretion to place people in a ‘personal support’ stream without work-related obligations for up to 12 months at a time. Annual review of whether the participant is benefiting from assistance, with opportunity for some participants to ‘exit’ from program and go to minimum DHS reporting requirements if no benefit. Special rules for access to DSP for people in remote areas to be considered</p>

Youth	<p>No specific services for young people, including under 18s who have left, or are considering leaving school Emphasis on getting Early School Leavers (under 22) to go back to education, but limited options in most areas Young people who do not claim benefits are outside the program. 2017 Budget included \$11m for local strategies to engage youth. One off payment.</p>	<p>Remote Job Centres deliver or partner to deliver local strategies and programs to engage young people, including school to work transition support New Remote Youth Projects to provide temporary (6-9 months) paid work experience with training for young people as a stepping stone into employment Remote Jobs Investment Fund able to be used to provide traineeships and paid work opportunities for young people. Ability to provide long term retention and advancement support to young people while they are in work or education, including when they temporarily relocate. Specific targets and outcome measures in relation to young people to be set</p>
Social and Indigenous enterprise development	<p>Generation of income from Work for the Dole is restricted and has complex requirements Enterprises run by CDP providers are restricted in access to incentives available to other employers because of 'related entity' rules \$25million per annum is available in an Indigenous Enterprise Development Fund. Grants for businesses assessed as financially viable. <i>2019 reforms: some investment in microfinance and business incubator, but unclear what these area, or what evidence has been used to inform design</i></p>	<p>Remote Jobs Investment Fund provides major stimulus to new Indigenous social enterprises Rules promote generation of 'top up' income by RJC's and others involved in the scheme \$25 million revised to support a wider range of projects, and to build capacity for social enterprise development and expansion</p>
Institutional arrangements		
	Existing CDP	Proposed remote development and employment scheme
Approach to policy decision making and implementation	<p>Centralised, top down No arrangements for inclusion of Indigenous stakeholders in decision making process</p>	<p>Scheme based on principles of Indigenous leadership and participation, and of community development Substantial scope for flexibility at local level</p>

	<p>Lack of transparency in relation to program operations and outcomes</p> <p>Frequent rule changes</p>	<p>Role of Indigenous stakeholders embedded both in national structure and in local and regional governance mechanisms</p> <p>Stakeholders involved in identifying and tracking program measures</p> <p>Program changes based on testing ideas, learning from experience, negotiation</p>
Local 'providers' role	<p>Majority of CDP providers are Indigenous organisations, although non Indigenous providers deliver in around half of all regions</p> <p>Providers are considered to be the 'delivery arm' of Government and operate under close direction</p> <p><i>Reforms: all providers are Indigenous organisations or in partnership with Indigenous organisations. But they need not be non-profits or have local governance structures.</i></p>	<p>Locally controlled Indigenous organisations are funded (wherever possible) to be the Remote Jobs Centres on a 'co-production' basis.</p> <p>Work towards agreed program goals and within broad rules, but directed by community members. Community participation is a goal of the program.</p> <p>Remote Jobs Centres work together and with Government to learn from experience and to deliver continual improvements.</p>
Commonwealth Government role	<p>Program administered by PM&C, accountable to Minister</p> <p>Issues directions to providers and judges their performance on the basis of centrally determined measures</p> <p>Local contract managers monitor provider performance but any contribution (negative or positive) to outcomes is not acknowledged</p>	<p>Program to be administered by new organisation with Indigenous led Board</p> <p>One national organisation, but working through existing regional governance structures where they exist and have capacity</p> <p>The new body shares accountability for program success with local organisations</p> <p>Rather than policing local organisations, local government officials support program objectives and 'join up' government investments, participate in identifying and harnessing opportunities</p>
Capacity building	<p>Appears focussed on assistance to manage the contract (eg finances, rules IT system). PM&C design and set agenda for provider forums.</p>	<p>More systematic capacity building investment focussed on improving long-term impact and outcomes, including for specific groups (eg people with disabilities). Transparent processes for delivery of support.</p> <p>Collaboration with RJC's and regional decision-making bodies to develop and focus sector capacity building efforts.</p>
Measuring impact	<p>Success appears to be measured on the number of people attending Work for the Dole and the number of people</p>	<p>Move to long term impact framework, shared accountability</p> <p>Communities at the forefront of establishing goals and measures, and tracking progress</p>

	<p>achieving 13 and 26 week employment outcomes in each 6 month period</p> <p>Provider performance framework is 'one size fits all' (aside from employment targets) and largely assessed on administration. Providers held to account for things outside their control (eg actual attendance)</p> <p>There is no local input into desired outcomes or reporting of outcomes / impact to communities, Government contribution (negative or positive) is not assessed.</p> <p>Evaluations not published.</p>	<p>Core framework of common impact areas to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term improvements in proportion of people in work or earning some additional income. • Community participation in decision making and building of effective and legitimate governance structures; • Measure of youth participation <p>Transparency in performance reporting.</p> <p>Negative impacts and emerging problems identified, responded to</p>
<p>Funding and contracting</p>	<p>Asymmetric contract, altered by Government frequently and at will</p> <p>Payment arrangements are complex and have some perverse outcomes</p>	<p>Long term partnership based contracting arrangements</p> <p>Funding applied to support capacity of organisation to deliver long term outcomes, not short term 'results'</p> <p>Recognition of very different cost structures in different regions</p> <p>Consideration of 'success payments' once program is bedded down</p>