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1. INTRODUCTION

This appendix of the Community Services Sector Review Needs and Opportunities Report contains a write up of all of the activities undertaken as part of the engagement phase of the Community Services Sector Review project. During the course of the project, over 10 different engagement activities were undertaken and this appendix presents the methodology and findings for each. Due to the breadth of the project, analysis has not been conducted for these findings, but is contained instead in the main body of the report.
2. INTERAGENCY MINI WORKSHOPS – THREATS & OPPORTUNITIES

2.1 METHODOLOGY

At commencement of the project, in June 2011, five “mini workshops” were held with existing interagency networks. Council assisted in the coordination of these networks and they provided a great opportunity to engage with the sector and promote the project.

The mini workshops were run with the following interagency networks:

- CARM Forum – Tuesday 14 June
- Moreton Bay Regional Youth Service Providers Network – Wednesday 15 June
- Moreton Bay Regional Murri Network – Tuesday 21 June
- Moreton Bay Volunteer Managers Network – Wednesday 22 June
- Moreton Bay Regional Disability Network – Tuesday 28 June

The mini workshops were approximately 45 minutes in length with the objectives of:

- Introducing and gaining support for the project
- Identifying services in and servicing the region and any gaps
- Identify threats and opportunities to the community service sector and its clients

Activities at the workshops included:

- A “prezi” presentation introducing the project and its methodology
- A card storming activity with group discussion to identify threats and opportunities for the sector and for clients
- Later workshops discussed threats and opportunities identified at the early workshops, voting on those presented and identifying any missing
- Spatially mapping the services and gaps in the region

Copies of relevant materials can be found in Appendix 3 – Engagement Materials.

2.2 FINDINGS

Community services identified by interagency workshop participants were incorporated into the database developed as part of this project. Threats, issues and opportunities identified by workshop participants have been outlined under the relevant headings below.

Threats to clients

- Access to Public Transport
  The limited public transport options available in the Moreton Bay Region were identified as a significant threat by participants in each of the five interagency group workshops. Discussions revolved around the inadequacy of current public transport options in terms of: regularity of services, scheduling of services, connections between services and the overall coverage of the public transport network in the region. It was noted that these inadequacies impact on people’s ability access a range of employment, education, social and recreational opportunities, something which was of particular concern for people attending the disability interagency meeting.
• **Poverty/increasing cost of living**
The increasing cost of living including costs associated and with transport, electricity, rent and food was identified by all five interagency groups as constituting a threat to their client’s wellbeing.

• **Housing and Homelessness**
Homelessness and access to suitable and affordable housing/accommodation was identified as a top threat by participants of all five (5) interagency network groups. CARM Forum participants commented that homelessness in youth from a culturally and linguistically diverse background is of particular concern.

• **Lack of financial literacy**
People participating in the Volunteer Managers, Youth and Disability interagency meetings said that financial illiteracy was a major threat to their client’s wellbeing. Many people lack the skills to competently budget and manage their finances. Some of the participants in the volunteer managers meeting stated that they had noticed an increase in consumerism which in some cases had resulted in people being unable to meet their financial obligations. Participants also noted that there are insufficient financial management/counselling programs and services to cater for the growing demand in the Moreton Bay region.

• **Substance Misuse**
Substance misuse was recognised by participants in the Volunteer Managers, Murri and Youth interagency groups as being a threat to their client’s wellbeing and ability to access and participate in a range of opportunities. It was also discussed that client’s with substance misuse issues also tend to be over represented when it comes to other issues such as homelessness, unemployment and social isolation.

• **Education and Training**
Participation in and access to education and training was recognised by four of the five interagency groups (Youth, Volunteer Managers, Disability and Murri) as being areas of need. The Youth interagency noted that there are insufficient alternative education programs and pathways available for students who are disengaged with mainstream schooling options. It was also noted by all groups that there insufficient programs which support clients and provide them with the life skills necessary to successfully transition education and training into employment.

• **Inadequate literacy and numeracy in clients**
Volunteer Managers and Murri interagency participants said that inadequate levels of literacy and numeracy in clients impaired their clients’ abilities to effectively engage in a range of activities including learning and employment.

• **Mental health Issues**
Participants in all five (5) interagency meetings identified mental health issues as one of the biggest threats to their client’s wellbeing. It was noted that the presence of mental health problems generally made clients more vulnerable to other issues within the community such as social isolation, homelessness, substance misuse, unemployment and poverty. Increasing public awareness about mental health and ensuring people have access to appropriate programs and services to help manage mental health issues was therefore seen as a top priority by many participants.

• **Unemployment and access to suitable employment pathways and opportunities**
Unemployment and lack of access to suitable employment pathways and opportunities were identified as threats by all the interagency groups. CARM Forum participants in particular noted that some people in the linguistically diverse community have difficulties in identifying, accessing and participating in suitable employment pathways and opportunities. This disadvantage is often exacerbated by the failure of employers to properly recognise prior learning and employment activities engaged in by people from a culturally and linguistically diverse background. This results in many people being unemployed or underemployed.

- **Social Isolation**
  Social isolation was identified as a threat by members of the Murri, Youth, Volunteer Managers and Disability interagency groups.

- **Family Issues and relationship breakdowns**
  Family issues and breakdowns in family relationships were identified as significant threats to clients’ wellbeing by participants in the Disability, Volunteer Managers, Youth and Murri interagency meetings.

- **Violence**
  Violence was recognised as being a threat to clients’ wellbeing by all five of the interagency groups.

- **Lack of holistic approach to client’s complex issues**
  Each of five interagency groups recognised the interconnectedness between many of the client issues identified and acknowledged that there was a lack of a holistic approach between organisations to deal with clients’ complex needs.

- **Lack of community transport options**
  Participants in the CARM and Disability interagency meetings commented that there are inadequate community transport options in the Moreton Bay region to ensure client access to, and inclusion in, a range of activities.

- **Complex eligibility requirements resulting in service gaps**
  Participants in the Volunteer Managers and Disability interagency meetings identified that complex eligibility requirements for government funded services and programs often resulted in service delivery gaps, particularly where clients are transitioning from one funded service to another.

**Murri**

- **Lack of awareness and understanding about indigenous culture both in the wider community and more specifically by service providers. This impacts on the sector’s ability to provide clients with culturally appropriate support.**
- **Men’s and Women’s Business**
- **Aging Population**
- **Racism**
- **Client Health**
- **Lack of support and justice**
- **Bullying**

**Volunteer Managers**

- **Accessible spaces and places for people with a disability**
Disability

- Lack of access and social inclusion

Opportunities for clients

The following opportunities for clients were identified by two or more of the interagency groups:

- **Collaborative Sector**
  It was recognised by four of the five interagency groups (Disability, Volunteer Managers, Murri and Youth) that the collaborative nature of the community services sector offers one of the greatest opportunities in addressing client issues and needs.

- **Community willing to work with sector**
  The Disability, Volunteer Managers and Youth interagencies all commented on the willingness of the community to work with the sector to achieve positive outcomes.

- **Increased support and funding**
  Increased support and funding for services and programs was identified by all five interagency groups as providing opportunities for clients.

- **Training with links to employment**
  People in the CARM, Disability, Volunteer Managers, Murri and Youth interagency meetings saw the development of training programs with clear links to employment as being an opportunity to assist clients with their transition from education and training into employment.

- **Young Community**
  Participants in the Youth, Murri, Volunteer Managers and Disability interagency meetings commented that the Moreton Bay region has a relatively young community. This was recognised as providing opportunities for clients when considered in the context of Australia’s aging population.

- **Education**
  Participants in all five interagency groups identified that there are opportunities for more programs aimed at providing clients with the life skills (literacy, numeracy, financial management skills and social skills) necessary to identify, access and participate in a range of opportunities including employment, education, social and recreational activities. This was also seen as a way of providing people with the skills necessary to combat social isolation.

- **Awareness**
  Increasing client awareness of available services and programs was seen as an opportunity by the Disability and Volunteer Managers interagency groups.

Opportunities for clients which were raised by only one of the interagency groups are outlined under the relevant interagency below:

**CARM Forum**

- Address public transport
- HACC funding to promote employment
- School for at risk Youth
- Better use of Social Media to engage with clients
- State and federal interest in social inclusion
- Social Enterprise
Youth Service Providers Network
- Natural environment of Moreton Bay region
- Community driven information and networking

Murri Network
- Development of an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment strategy which includes the requirement that government and industry to employ a certain number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.
- More Youth Spaces
- Number of volunteers and social action groups in the Moreton Bay Region

Disability
- Semi-rural base network
- Social enterprise
- Social capital

Volunteer Managers
- Place based projects which are more easily accessible to clients.
- Establish systems to ensure greater engagement with the and awareness

Threats for the sector
- Funding
  Issues surrounding obtaining and retaining funding for services and programs were identified as being a top threat for the community services sector by participants in all five interagency meetings. Issues discussed included the:
  - funding bureaucracy
  - culture of competition rather than collaboration that competing for funding sources creates;
  - shifting government policies
  - fragmented funding sources
  - funding models not supporting time for strategic planning and collaboration work

- Workforce retention and low wages
  Staff retention was recognised as being one of the primary issues faced by many community sector organisations by all five interagency groups. It was noted that the low wages associated with many positions in the sector means that there is a high level of transience in the workforce. Participants in the disability interagency meeting also commented on the aging workforce and the impact this would have on the sector if no succession plans were established.

- Training opportunities
  Participants in the Murri, Volunteer Managers, Disability and Youth interagency meetings stated that identifying and accessing relevant and affordable training and professional development opportunities is problematic, particularly for some of the smaller organisations. The time and travel involved in participating in training is also seen as prohibitive given that replacement staff need to be found to fill the positions of staff on training.

- Lack of coordination and integrated planning across the three levels of Government
  A lack of integrated planning across the three levels of government to collaboratively respond to particular issues within the community was identified as a threat to the community sector by participants in the CARM Forum.
• **High workload**
Participants in the Youth, Murri, Volunteer Managers and Disability interagencies stated that the high workload associated with delivering many of the community services and programs is an issue for many workers within the sector. While time is lieu is often offered, it is difficult for workers to take while maintaining continuity of service delivery.

• **Lack of cultural awareness**
A lack of cultural awareness by organisations delivering services and programs to the community was identified as being a major threat to the sector by participants in the Murri, Volunteers and CARM interagency meetings.

• **Failure to share information**
Organisations’ failing to share information with one another was noted by three of the interagency groups (Disability, Volunteer Managers and Murri) as being a threat to the sector. Information discussed included client information and information about available services and programs.

• **Lack of business involvement in the community sector**
A participant in the Murri interagency meeting stated that there was need for business and enterprise to play a larger role in developing collaborative responses to identified community needs.

• **Centralised head office syndrome and middle management bureaucracy**
Head office syndrome was identified as a threat to the sector by participants in the Disability interagency while middle management bureaucracy was recognised as an issue by the Youth interagency.

• **Transition of people from federally funded services to state funded services**
The effective referral and transition of people from federally funded to services and programs to state funded services and programs was seen as an issues by participants in the Disability interagency meeting.

• **Organisational Governance**
Organisational Governance was identified as a threat by participants in the Murri interagency meeting.

• **Community sector workers are often undervalued and poorly supported in the work they do**
Participants in the Youth and Disability interagency meeting said community sector workers often feel undervalued and poorly supported in the work they do. This was considered to be a threat to the sector given the impact these sentiments have on people’s decision to remain employed in community services.

• **Micro-management and over-regulation of the sector**
Some of the participants in the Disability and Youth interagency meetings felt that the increasingly over-regulated nature of the sector is impacting on their ability to deliver quality services to their clients.

• **Lack of integrated planning and coordination between organisations and government**
A lack of integrated planning and coordination between organisation and government was seen as an issue by all five (5) interagency groups.

• **Interconnectedness of many client issues**
Participants in all five interagency meetings highlighted the interconnectedness of many of the client issues identified commenting that clients presenting at their services are often deal with multiple issues. It was noted that the sector is not necessarily good at working with the complex needs of such clients.
Opportunities for the Sector

The following opportunities for the sector were identified by two or more of the interagency groups:

- **Cultural awareness training for community service providers**
  Participants in both the CARM Forum and Murri Interagency identified that there is an opportunity to provide cultural awareness training to community service providers allowing them to be more sensitive and responsive to these sectors’ needs.

- **Partnership and collaboration opportunities**
  Participants in each of the five interagencies emphasised the opportunities effective partnering and collaboration with other community organisations, businesses and government can bring in terms of delivering positive client outcomes.

- **Passion and commitment in the community services sector to making a difference to people’s lives**
  Youth, Murri, Disability and Volunteer Managers interagency participants commented on the passion and commitment of community sector workers and organisations in achieving positive outcomes for clients and the wider community.

- **Job satisfaction**
  Participants in four of the interagencies (Youth, Murri, Disability and Volunteer Managers) stated that the satisfaction community sector workers get from their jobs is one of the biggest opportunities for the sector.

- **Community acceptance**
  Community acceptance and appreciation of the work that community sector workers do was recognised by all five inter-agency groups as being an opportunity for the sector.

- **Growing interest and resources from government**
  Participants in the Disability, Volunteer Managers, Murri and CARM interagency meetings recognised that there was an opportunity across the sector to grow interest and resources from government to respond to various community needs. It was noted that a collaborative approach between organisations would be the most effective way to grow such interest.

- **Development of innovative pilot projects**
  The development of innovative pilot projects to respond to community needs was seen as an opportunity by the Murri, Volunteer Managers, Disability and CARM interagency groups.

- **Sharing information and resources across the sector**
  Organisations’ sharing information and resources across the sector was recognised as an opportunity to enhance service delivery and client outcomes by participants in the Disability and Volunteer Managers interagency meetings. People at the disability interagency indicated that the sharing of information across the sector would assist in the identification of gaps in service delivery.

Opportunities for the sector which were raised by only one of the interagency groups are outlined under the relevant interagency below:

**CARM Forum**

- **Establishment of more Men’s Sheds**
• State, Federal and Local Government focus on multiculturalism and make resources available to address multicultural issues
• Providing for incentives for people to undertake volunteer work
• Specialised multicultural positions, for example CAMS, CAMP and settlement workers

Youth Service Providers Network
• Personal Development
• Networking

Murri Network
• Capacity building projects
• Development of new service models
• Improved governance
• Whole of government integrated planning
• Whole of government shared services
• More sustainable services and programs
• Development of partnerships with businesses to address community needs such as unemployment.

Volunteer Managers
• Develop an accreditation system for community service organisations (funded and unfunded) which involves the regular review of those organisation and the services they deliver.
• The community services sector generally has family friendly workplace policies which allow for a good work/life balance.
• Develop a centralised database which contains information about services and programs available throughout the region.
• Mapping client journeys through the Moreton Bay community sector as an opportunity to identify service delivery gaps.

Disability Network
• More innovative responses to community needs
• Local government providing better access to land for community purposes, for example community housing.
• Co-ordination of training opportunities by Moreton Bay Regional Council
The Community Service Sector Review Open Forum was held at the Morayfield Community Complex on 14 July 2011. A total of 108 people attended the forum (see Appendix 3 for the attendance register).

The agenda (refer to Appendix 3) for the day included the following engagement activities:

- Graffiti wall which asked participants to identify what they love about their job;
- Sticky wall on which participants were asked to identify needs and issues in the region;
- Zing Activity aimed at identifying “how we use information and resources to serve the needs of our community”;
- World Café exercise aimed at identifying “how can service mapping help us address the needs of the community”; and
- Zing activity aimed at identifying “how do we use partnerships to serve the needs of our community?”

Guest speaker Tim Costello also delivered two presentations about:

- The strengths and resilience of the community services sector; and
- Innovative partnerships and solutions in the community services sector.

Copies of relevant materials can be found at Appendix 3.
3.1 FORUM ACTIVITY – GRAFFITTI WALL – WHAT I LOVE ABOUT MY JOB

3.1.1 METHODOLOGY

A graffiti wall using butcher’s paper placed at the back of the venue. During breaks, forum participants were invited to write on the wall in response to the question “The thing I love most about my job...”

3.1.2 FINDINGS

HELPING PEOPLE IN MORE OF NEED THAN I AM
Seeing and hearing the results from clients who previously thought there was no hope and no one to help. Being able to participate in cross ageing partnerships that can remove barriers and really make a difference Making a difference in a young person’s life I work with highly motivated and committed staff who want to make a difference Improving someone’s life and making their day The people I support the ever changing dynamics the feel of seeing young people seek, and achieve quality of life Providing fun, safe and warm environment for children to learn, while supporting their families and interacting with the greater community Being able to contribute through management committee to continuance of legal assistance to clients What I love the most is what challenges me the most! Change – seeing the community/families/children change and grow being part and that change is a privilege Empowering person’s with dementia to lead valued lives in the community Challenge and making a difference Making my customers day Feeling that I can make a difference The chance to use my training, skills and experience ( & add to these) while benefiting the local community, alongside being a mother to 2 young children I enjoy the families, children and staff I meet and support in our community of M.B.R.C Finally enjoying the privilege of helping my fellowman (and woman) to help themselves Social change agent Drilling into the political issues behind gambling problems Building the relationships with the people that I partner with Partnering to achieve a sharing goal Food recovery people Making a difference ASSISTING THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF THE ELDERLY AND PEOPLE WITH A DISABILITY AND ALSO THE PEOPLE WHO LOOK AFTER THEM Helping out referrers achieve outcomes for their clients, this is what I love about my job Flexibility and ability to do what is required to clients I enjoy helping people as much as I possibly can and their smiles make me happy With every person I meet in my job comes a make story....never boring

Figure 1 – Things forum participants’ love about their job
3.2 FORUM ACTIVITY – STICKY WALL – NEEDS & ISSUES

3.2.1 METHODOLOGY

In the five interagency mini workshops held prior to the forum, there was an activity where participants were asked to identify needs and opportunities for clients and the sector. At the forum this list of identified needs was presented to forum participants. Time was given in the morning for participants to identify any additional needs not already named. Prior to the afternoon tea break, forum participants were given five sticky dots each and invited to put them on the needs they thought the greatest, with a proviso of one dot per need as a “dotmocracy” activity.

3.2.2 FINDINGS

More than 308 dots were placed on issues, indicating that over 60 people took part in the activity. The results are listed below. Those in bold are the needs previously identified at inter agency meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>Issue/Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>• Early intervention not waiting for crisis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13   | • Social isolation in clients  
|      | • Inadequate wages for community workers  
|      | • Access to housing for clients |
| 12   | • Lack of integrated planning  
|      | • Opportunities to share organisational resources vehicles, administration, and office space staff.  
|      | • Lack of cultural awareness |
| 11   | • Funding for support for people and children with disabilities |
| 9    | • Lack of holistic approach to client’s complex issues |
| 8    | • Increasing cost of living and its impact on clients |
| 7    | • Who conducts a community needs analysis? Support for volunteer organisations to meet identified needs. Nobody can do everything, but everyone can do something – how to share the tasks.  
|      | • Multicultural hub – one stop shop |
| 6    | • Role of volunteers  
|      | • Better and greater network coordination  
|      | • Parenting skills currently – programs for ‘problem’ but need preventative/proactive programs. |
| 5    | • Lack of Drug and Alcohol rehab facilities – mainstream and culturally appropriate  
|      | • Retaining funding for projects and programs  
|      | • Early intervention (0-3 years) and support in developing language and literacy  
|      | • Inadequate literacy in clients  
|      | • Opportunities for training workers  
|      | • No crisis and supported accommodation for young people under 16 (15 years limited only)  
|      | • Access to transport for clients and workers |
| 4    | • Unified referral system (electronic database) e.g. ACT. Police service  
|      | • Access to dental and health services  
|      | • Competing against services for funding  
|      | • Access to drug and alcohol counselling/services  
|      | • Lack of knowledge of other services  
<p>|      | • Lack of culturally appropriate services in Moreton Bay Area. HACC each D. Respite centre for |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>CD Net for networking Bernice Quinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage business involvement/partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of financial management skills in clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources – think smarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreter Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supported parenting and play schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cultural shift – empowering Vs. Disempowering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council support for building growth (current insensitive to zoning problems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community not asked about what service they require or want – funding dictates the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High workload for sector staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of coordination between organisations and government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational management structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to education for clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable disability respite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster recovery – who takes the lead?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community service organisations volunteers need to know who needs help, what help and when.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fostering leadership – 360 degree reviews, leadership skills and practices, peer support and sector leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding requirements and bureaucratic processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse funding (reduce reliance on government – funding and agendas) more flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shifting policy changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of awareness of funding opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental health issues of clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not to use words such as ‘clients’ either families or person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodation for service – 2 phones, 2 broadband – increase overhead. Efficiencies of two offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Person centred planning – circles of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web page creation at minimal cost to community organisations e.g. provided by Moreton Bay Regional Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of aged care clients e.g. dementia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to employment for clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social and educational activities, events and places for families, particularly those with newborn babies and young children and adjusting to life as a family (e.g. Zoo now absorbed into housing estate) very few facilitated ways to meet other families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for seamless referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to/ understanding of and choice of ante &amp; post natal services. Pre pregnancy, pregnancy and newborn babies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of crisis and supported accommodation – youth and adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community worker turnover and attrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of personal and spiritual development for care motivation of community and clients</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALD people**
- Holistic support not segmented support – integrated
- Clearer interagency referral processes
- **Lack of information sharing**
  - Availability of community halls for organisations who do not have the financial ability to pay the asking rate for hire
  - Cultural and indigenous workers to support clients
  - Educating and providing organisations/staff how to make program projects sustainable and show them the tricks
  - Disability school, vacation options, ASD and Autism clients.
The first activity at the forum used Zing technology to explore three questions about how information and resources are used to serve the needs of the community. The use of Zing technology for this activity involved selecting one person from each table to record the table discussions using the wireless keyboards provided. Responses were then projected onto a big screen allowing participants to see how other participants were responding, allowing immediate feedback and further development of ideas.

The questions considered by participants included:

- What information and resources do we share and use in the community sector?
- What are the benefits of doing this? For clients? For our organisations?
- Are there opportunities to improve the way the sector uses and shares information and resources?

The findings are presented by showing the collated responses for each of the three questions.

**Question 1 – What information and resources do we share and use in the community sector?**

A total of 203 comments were recorded for this question. The main themes which emerged included that organisations are using and sharing:

- Equipment and facilities such as meeting rooms and administration spaces (15 comments)
- Human resources including the skills, experience, expertise and knowledge of community sector workers and volunteers (14 comments) including:
  - Management (3 comments)
  - Social workers (1 comment)
  - Registered nurses (1 comment)
  - GP’s (1 comment)
- Information about the various community service organisations, programs and services available to the Moreton Bay Regional Council community (13 comments)
- Information about upcoming training and professional development opportunities, in addition to the training opportunities themselves (10 comments).
- Client information (12 comments)
- Partnerships and collaborations in addition to any information emerging from those relationships (8 comments)
- Anecdotal experiences and aspirations (13 comments)
- Information about emerging local issues and service delivery gaps (5 comments)
- Emotional and professional support (4 comments)
- Information about, and derived from, networking and information sharing opportunities such as:
  - Interagency meetings (4 comments)
  - Forums (4 comments)
  - Networks (4 comments)
  - Conferences (1 comment)
• Cross-organisational meetings (1 comment)
• Expos (1 comment)
• Local community events (1 comment)
• Events (1 comment)
• Workshops (1 comment)
• Council Updates (1 comment)
• Reference groups (1 comment)

• Information and resources used to support the planning, administration and delivery of community services including:
  o ABS and Census data (4 comments)
  o Organisational, community and government websites (4 comments)
  o Statistics (2 comments)
  o Council (2 comments)
  o Brochures and Flyers (2 comments)
  o Campaign Information (2 comments)
  o Community Notices (2 comments)
  o Community service directories (2 comments)
  o Newsletters (2 comments)
  o Australian Taxation Office data (1 comment)
  o Department of Health and Aging (1 comment)
  o FAHCSIA (1 comment)
  o Home and Community Care (1 comment)
  o Legislation.qld.gov.au (1 comment)
  o Government Department data (1 comment)
  o COMSIS (1 comment)
  o Office of Economic and Statistical Research (1 comment)
  o Workplace Health and Safety (1 comment)
  o Databases (1 comment)
  o Evidence based data (1 comment)
  o Ongoing needs identification tool (1 comment)
  o Research (2 comments)
  o Best practice research (3 comments)
  o Medical research (1 comment)

• Information about funding opportunities (4 comments) in addition to funding submission support (2 comments)
• Information about program vacancies (3 comments) and employment opportunities (2 comments)
• Volunteers (4 comments)
• Information about government and organisational policies (4 comments) and strategies (1 comment)
• Information about governance models (2 comments) and strategic plans (2 comments)
• Transport (2 comments)
• Campaign Information (2 comments)
• Insurance (1 comment)
• Technology (1 comment)

Question 2 – What are the benefits of doing this? For clients? For our organisations?

Forum participants identified many benefits for both clients and organisations in the sharing of information and resources by community organisations. A total of 210 comments were recorded for this question, with benefits including:
Client Benefits

• Empowered clients who can make informed choices (16 comments)
• Increased client and community awareness of available community services and programs (13 comments)
• Clarifies the processes and procedures involved in navigating the community services sector thereby decreasing the stress and frustration often experienced by clients and their families (11 comments)
• Allows for a more holistic, co-ordinated and integrated response to client needs (10 comments)
• More effective and appropriate client referrals and referral pathways (8 comments)
• Better client access to services (8 comments)
• Better and more sustainable client outcomes (5 comments)
• Increased community trust, confidence and satisfaction with service delivery (4 comments)
• Reduces social isolation (4 comments)
• There is “No wrong door” for clients (3 comments)
• Quicker response times (3 comments)
• Builds a stronger community (2 comments)

Organisation Benefits

• Better use of resources which results in increased productivity, efficiency and organisational sustainability (14 comments)
• Helps in the identification of emerging community issues and gaps in service delivery which can be addressed (13 comments)
• Provides a basis for strong partnerships, networks and collaborations which in turn increases the capacity of organisations to deal with any issues (12 comments)
• Helps reduce and prevent duplication of services (11 comments)
• Streamlines service delivery processes which allows for more comprehensive and consistent service delivery (11 comments)
• Enables organisations to more effectively advocate for the rights and needs of the community (7 comments)
• More cost effective (7 comments)
• Greater knowledge of the community and available resources (7 comments)
• Helps build a stronger and more professional community sector response (6 comments)
• Better use of organisational strengths to build knowledge and capacity of other organisations (5 comments)
• Improves staff morale and job satisfaction (5 comments)
• Provides more opportunities for collaborative funding submission with increased leverage (4 comments)
• Increased transparency, accountability and credibility (3 comments)
• Ability to develop better and more creative policies and strategies (3 comments)
• Better currency of information (3 comments)
• Opportunity to reflect on service delivery outcomes and collaboratively troubleshoot any issues (3 comments)
• Organisations can learn from one another’s successes and failures (3 comments)
• Reduces staff and organisational isolation (2 comments)
• Better able to train staff to meet client needs (2 comment)
• Raises the profile of the community service organisations (2 comments)
• Opportunities for innovative practice (1 comment)
• Provides learning based outcomes (1 comment)
• More flexible frameworks and processes (1 comment)
• Increase in referrals can translate into increased funding (1 comment)

Question 3 - Are there opportunities to improve the way the sector uses and shares information and resources?

A total of 147 comments were recorded to this question with opportunities identified by participants including:

• Creation of an up to date user friendly central service directory/database for the Moreton Bay region which is available online, in hard copy and on a CD (24 comments)
• Better promotion, co-ordination and utilisation of interagency networks with the purpose of the network being the development of priority actions and a strategic plan to address local issues (10 comments). Feedback about outcomes should be presented at the interagency in addition to presentations about best practice (3 comments).
• Implementing policies aimed at promoting and ensuring the integrity, transparency and accountability of community service organisations not only to other organisations, their clients and government, but also to the wider community. This should include making transparent outcomes, funding sources, partnerships and collaborations and organisational principles and structures (9 comments)
• Promotion and co-ordination of co-location and other resource sharing arrangements (7 comments) including the sharing of:
  o motor vehicles
  o marketing, communication and fundraising (1 comment)
  o administration and service reception functions (3 comments)
  o office equipment (2 comments)
  o training and professional development opportunities (1 comment)
  o meeting facilities (1 comment)
• Enhancing the climate of collaboration through development of a range of formal and informal partnerships (6 comments)
• Additional and more meaningful information sharing and networking events such as forums and expos (6 comments). These should also be used as an opportunity to showcase best practice models to improve practices across the sector (1 comment).
• Give clients more input in both service provision and policy (5 comments)
• Organisation providing additional training to staff about how best to share and use information and resources (5 comments).
• Development of a better referral processes which include the creation of a centralised referral system/database (4 comments).
• Development of community hubs which allow for the co-location of a range of community activities, services, programs and events (4 comments)
• Advocating for collaborative funding submissions and better communication between funding bodies and community organisations (4 comments).
• Better utilisation of available technology in accessing and distributing information and in service delivery (3 comments). This includes the use of:
  o Social media (3 comments)
  o Skype (1 comment)
  o Teleconferencing (1 comment)
  o Videoconference (1 comment)
Mobile case conferencing (1 comment)
Cloud computing (1 comment)
CD Networking (1 comment)

• Joint strategic planning with agreed priority actions for the region to be regularly reviewed (3 comments)
• Identifying and mapping community issues and needs (4 comments)
• Increased funding to address community needs (3 comments)
• Organisations entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (2 comments)
• Leadership by government in breaking down “silo” mentality apparent in community sector by sharing and facilitating the sharing of information and data across the sector (3 comments).
• Regular review and evaluation of organisations delivering community services to the Moreton Bay Regional Council community (1 comment)
• Develop a way to protect partnerships and relationships from staff attrition by ensuring continuity of contact (1 comment)
• Avoid duplication of resources (1 comment)
### 3.4 FORUM ACTIVITY – WORLD CAFÉ – SERVICE MAPPING

#### 3.4.1 METHODOLOGY

The second activity at the forum was a World Café exercise where participants were invited to answer four questions at separate intervals at different tables. Each table had one question and was facilitated by a Council or Engagement Plus staff member. The purpose of the exercise was to explore the role service mapping could play in the region by asking the questions:

- What information should be captured in service mapping?
- What are the benefits of service mapping to your organisation?
- What sector categories would need to be included?
- What would it take to maintain a sustainable service mapping system?

#### 3.4.2 FINDINGS

Notes from the world café discussions were captured on butcher’s papers by facilitators and are summarised per question below.

**Question 1 – What information should be captured in service mapping?**

**Service Information**

- Service/program catchment area (9 comments)
- Program and services offered (8 comments) including program limitations (4), descriptionPROFILE OF service (4 comments), whether programs are funded or unfunded (6 comments), the length of the program funding (1 comment) and program statistics (1 comment)
- Client eligibility and accessibility (8 comments)
- Contact details (7 comments) including after-hours details (1 comment), location (6 comments) and hours of operation (2 comments) and target groups (3 comments)
- Referral processes (5 comments)
- Volunteer opportunities (5 comments)
- Staff listing (5 comments) including specialist staff (2 comments)
- Waitlists and program/service capacity (4 comments)
- Networks and partnerships the organisation participates in (4 comments)
- Organisational charts (3 comments), organisation mission/values (1 comment)
- Cost to client (3 comments)
- Transport accessibility (3 comments)
- Tax status (1 comment), Insurance details (1 comment), Policies (2 comments), KPIs (3 comments)

**Information about the community**

- Community needs (3 comments)
- Demographics (1 comment)
- Local, state and national issues (1 comment)
- How to identify need (1 comment)
- Gaps in service (1 comment)

**Format**

- Available in a number of formats (not just internet) (6 comments)
• Central phone number and email (4 comments)
• Spatial mapping (3 comments) including service boundaries (1 comment) and including other datasets eg COMSIS (1 comment)
• iPhone app (1 comment)

Features

• Referral system (6 comments) including capacity/waitlist (1 comment)
• Noticeboard/Promotions (4 comments)
• Opportunities to partner/collaborate (3 comments)
• Strategic/future planning (2 comments)
• Ability to self-refer (2 comments)
• Needs assessment information (1 comment)
• Complex need clients (1 comment)
• Disaster planning/information (1 comment)
• Resources and forum (ACT CDNET) (1 comment)

System Levels

• 2 levels - Wider community/clients and organisations (7 comments)
• 3 levels - Clients, professionals, community (2 comments)

Usability

• Symbols and legends (1 comment)
• Easy to read and succinct/ not too much info (4 comment)
• Accessible language (4 comment)
• Key word search (4 comment)
• Search functions (location, service, outcomes) (1 comment)
• Links to related resources (4 comments)
• Stories/testimonials of service (1 comment)
• Clear font size and use of images (2 comments)
• Needs to be easy to use and not too fancy (9 comments)
• Web and other format (7 comments)
• Essential it’s kept up to date (3 comments), with a last updated line (1 comment) and a waiver for host to remove old info (1 comment)
• Portal for clients and for organisations (3 comments)
• Creative incentives for organisations to use and promote benefits (2 comments)
• Available in libraries, community centres etc (2 comments)
• Wide consultation for its development including community (4 comments)

Considerations

• Privacy of clients (1 comment)
• Don’t reinvent the wheel (2 comments)
• Culturally appropriate (2 comments)
• Ability for clients to make choice of program/service (2 comments)
• Maintain own information/ keep current (3 comments) and Show when last updated (1 comment)

Question 2 - What are the benefits of service mapping to your organisation?

• Identification of gaps, overlaps and duplications (20) which means the sector can be more responsive to need (6 comments)
• Raising the profile of organisations and educating people on the services they provide (11 comments)
• Better outcomes for clients and higher quality delivery (10 comments) and better referral pathways (3 comments)
• Better managed services, facilities and resources (10 comments)
• Building community, relationships and resiliency (9 comments)
• Increasing accountability to clients and consistency in service (8 comments)
• Having quick easy up to date and easily accessible information (7 comments) so that time can be saved (5 comments)
• Supports collaborative approaches/partnerships between organisations (6 comments) and reduces competition (1 comments) and enhances strategic planning (1 comments)
• Giving the community direct access to the information (5 comments)
• Sharing resources and information (5 comments)
• Improved accessibility (3 comments)
• Enhances proactive/preventative/development approaches (2 comments)
• Provides opportunities for collection data, feedback and evaluation (2 comments)

**Question 3 - What sector categories would need to be included?**

The table below uses the categories and subcategories used in the Community Organisation Census which comply with the commonly used Government classifications. The number is the amount of times the category or subcategory was mention and those in bold are not part of the standard classification but were added by participants.

It is important to note that additional comments to this questions focused on the ability to classify organisations and services under more than classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Welfare and Services</th>
<th>2 Adoption Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Development Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster and Kinship care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous child protection services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Supervised Child Visitation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child health and immunisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Care</th>
<th>4 Infant and child care centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mothers Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Services</th>
<th>3 Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home and Community Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult lifestyle support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carers</th>
<th>1 Respite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault</th>
<th>3 Shelters and Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselling support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency and disaster relief</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Education prevention and control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Training Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational counselling and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parent education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>single parent agencies and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>family support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandparent support and service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and material support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drug and alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gambling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volatile substance misuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child, Bulk billing, female doctors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disease/condition support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and homelessness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short and long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homes assist secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant advocacy services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, advice and personal social services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Telephone advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>support groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counselling support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit and money management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Like Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services and advocacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community legal centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victim support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant and refugee assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision or food, clothing shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services for refugees and immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential aged care and nursing homes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inpatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palliative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Service and youth welfare services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Youth centres, services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>training and employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>youth justice and court support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participation and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Early years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy programs (ESL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Service Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Service Clubs and Retired Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer Fire-fighters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbourhood Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting and Recreation Organisations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PCYCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public parks and precincts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women's and Mens Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD/Multicultural Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Interpreters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous/ATSI Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4 – What would it take to maintain a sustainable service mapping system?**

Who would be responsible for it?

- Consortium (3 comments)
- Not Council (2 comments)
- Peak body (2 comments)
- Community organisation (1 comment)
- All levels of government (1 comment)
- Federal government (1 comment)

Who will pay for it?
• All levels of government (3 comments)
• Federal government (2 comments)
• Advertising (2 comments)
• Philanthropic organisation (1 comment)
• Council (1 comment)
• Corporate sponsor (1 comment)

How will it be maintained?

• Each agency responsible for its own content (8 comments) with a registration process (2 comments) although unsure how unfunded would participate (1 comment)
• Council (4 comments)
• Automatic reminders (2 comments) although not just in email (1 comment)
• Annual maintenance review (2 comments)
• One nominated organisation (2 comments)
• Not government (2 comments)
• Make it a funding requirement to maintain (2 comments)
• Partner with a university or tertiary institute (2 comments)
• Dedicated person or role so is a priority (2 comments)
3.5 FORUM ACTIVITY – ZING – PARTNERSHIPS & NETWORKS

3.5.1 METHODOLOGY

The third activity at the forum again used Zing technology to explore three questions about how the community sector uses partnerships to serve the needs of the community. Questions discussed by participants were:

- What sort of partnerships does the sector participate in and for what purpose?
- Are there opportunities to improve and enhance these partnerships?
- Are there opportunities to respond to other issues in the community by using partnerships?

3.5.2 FINDINGS

The findings are presented by showing the collated responses for each of the three questions.

**Question 1 – What sort of partnerships does the sector participate in and for what purpose?**

There was general recognition by Forum participants that partnerships are essential to the effective delivery of community services to the Moreton Bay community. The 197 responses to the above question included types of partnerships, purposes of partnerships and examples of partnerships.

**Types of Partnerships**

- Formal partnerships between organisations which are governed by a brokerage agreements (2 comments), memorandums of understanding (4 comments) or service agreements (1 comment)
- Informal partnerships (1 comment)
- Interagency meetings like the CARM, Disability, Youth, Volunteers and Murri networks conducted by Council (10 comments)
- Carer support groups (3 comments)
- Community Support Groups (2 comments)
- Collaborative Action Group (3 comments)
- Workforce development partnerships (2 comments)
- Tiered partnerships (1 comment)
- Consortiums (1 comment)
- Corporate and local business partnerships (4 comments)
- Funding partnerships (1 comment)
- Partnerships with service clubs like the Rotary and Lions clubs (2 comments)
- Partnerships with government
- Partnerships with Universities (2 comments)
- Internal partnerships (1 comment)
- Networks (1 comment)
- Local partnerships (1 comment)
- Community reference groups (1 comment)
- Strategic partnerships
Purpose of Partnerships

- Conduct events such as expos, community information sessions and forums (7 comments)
- Sharing of information and resources such as (7 comments)
  - Websites and advertising (1 comment)
  - Venues and facilities (3 comments)
  - Motor Vehicles and community transport opportunities (1 comment)
  - Training opportunities (6 comments)
  - Technology (1 comment)
  - Skills and knowledge (3 comments)
  - Census information (1 comment)
- To identify emerging trends, gaps and issues (4 comments)
- Develop a collaborative response to specific issues and needs in the community (9 comments), such as:
  - Adult education (1 comment)
  - Healthy aging (1 comment)
  - Free or affordable legal services (2 comments)
  - Social inclusion (2 comments)
  - Homelessness (4 comments)
  - Early intervention (1 comment)
  - Disability access and inclusion (1 comment)
  - Community health and wellbeing (1 comment)
  - community recovery (2 comments)
  - Mental Health (2 comments)
  - Employment (2 comments)
  - Client skill development (1 comment)
  - Crisis Housing (2 comments)
  - Disaster management (1 comment)
  - Health care (2 comment)
  - Sustainable transport (1 comment)
  - Affordable housing (2 comments)
- To deliver programs and services (6 comments)
- To conduct research and community engagement activities (6 comments)
- Establish client referral pathways (3 comments)
- To provide support, whether it be operational, strategic or emotional (5 comments)
- To identify opportunities for, and carry out innovative projects (2 comments)
- Better client outcomes (3 comments)
- Shared responsibility for community wellbeing and outcomes (2 comments)
- Develop strategies, policies, procedures and action plans (4 comments)
- Fundraising (3 comments)
- Advocacy (2 comments)

Examples of existing partnerships

- UQ, Lifetec Tunstall and USQ – Assistive Technology Project
- Libraries and multicultural organisations to adapt library resources
- Solicitors and community organisations to provide fee legal advice to benefit clients
- Community wellbeing collective
- HACC Forum
• Art From Your Heart – Australia’s CEO challenge
• The Smith Family Literacy Development Program
• Redcliffe Community Recovery Committee
• Quest Newspapers
• Mental Health Services in Caboolture and Redcliffe partnering with Red Cross Employment Services
• Forums run by the Moreton Bay Regional Council such as the Forum on Homeless and Homelessness
• Blue Care and Multi-cap to coordinate client health care
• Caboolture Area Youth Service
• Co-ordinated Community Response to Domestic Violence
• Murriajabree and QUT
• Blue Care and the Uniting Church
• Blue Care and other aged care facilities
• Brisbane North Housing
• Moreton Bay Regional Council and Lions Club
• Chameleon Housing, local theatre groups, Centrelink, Rotary and Lions
• Chameleon Housing and MW training for life skill training
• Chameleon House – Jetty to Jetty race
• Advocacy Network for Pacific Islanders
• Brisbane North Dementia
• Ethnic Communities Council and Diversicare to develop a cross cultural development strategy
• EMMA Program
• Health and Wellbeing Network
• MICAH, Bris Housing and Roma House
• Health Communities Partnership
• Active Aging Partnership
• Healthy Children Partnership
• Breakthrough and Sunshine Coast Housing Company
• Moreton Bay Community Consortium
• Moreton Bay region AMTSI employment Partnership
• Moreton Bay Housing Network
• North Brisbane Community Transport
• Northlakes Health Precinct
• PICAC – Partners in Community Care
• YANQ - YARN - QYILS - HCAP - YSPN – IARM
• Playgroup
• Youth Affairs Network of Queensland

Question 2 – Are there opportunities to improve and enhance these partnerships?

There were a total of 92 responses to this question. Opportunities to improve and enhance partnerships identified by respondents included:

• Organisations recognising the importance of developing partnerships and prioritising networks and interagency meetings (8 comments)
• Organisations allocating staff time to the development and maintenance of partnerships with this time factored into the cost of service delivery (7 comments)
• The creation of a centralised community service directory which includes up to date details of services, programs, resources and facilities available in the Moreton Bay region (6 comments)
• Promotion and co-ordination of the co-location of services and other resource sharing arrangements. Resources being shared can include administrative staff, volunteers and training opportunities (6 comments).
• Increased sharing by organisations of information obtained through service delivery, including success stories, best practice research, emerging community issues and needs, funding opportunities and funding methodologies (5 comments).
• Develop networking opportunities aimed at linking organisations that have the capacity to respond to a particular community need (5 comments).
• Break down the silos and improve communication between all groups involved in community service delivery including government, community groups, volunteer groups, service clubs and community organisations (4 comments).
• Development of a holistic local area plan that can identify and help bring together resources, skills and knowledge which can in turn inform partnership relationships (4 comments).
• Make better use of technology including webinars, Skype and social media to enhance partnerships. (4 comments)
• Better co-ordination of network meetings which are to have clearly defined terms of reference. Participants are also to be provided with regular progress reports including any beneficial outcomes resulting from any actions developed (3 comments).
• Better co-ordination and management of partnership relationships through the development of a shared understanding of the partnership aim and the regular provision of progress reports (4 comments). This shared understanding can be in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding (2 comments).
• Identify and form more creative partnerships between the community sector and a range of different potential partners including the private sector, government, funded organisation and unfunded organisations (2 comments).
• Build organisational capacity to enter into partnerships by investing in staff development (2 comments).
• Partnerships should be included in an organisation’s strategic plan and key performance indicators (2 comments).
• Educate community organisations and employees about the various types of partnerships and the benefits each provides (2 comments).
• Build more sustainable partnerships that aren’t reliant on individual employees and can survive employee attrition (2 comments).
• Local strategic partnerships Regional or place-based funding allocations which concentrate financial support on specific geographic areas, allowing funding and resources to be focused in places where they are most needed(2 comments).
• Change the culture of competition between community organisations to one that is more focused on collaboration (2 comments).
• Identify and promote existing partnerships and networks (2 comments).
• Funding bodies need to recognise the importance role that partnerships and collaborations play in effective service delivery and fund accordingly (2 comments).
• The Community Plan needs to drive collaborative partnerships towards a strong and healthy community (1 comment).
• Focus on qualitative rather than quantitative outcomes (1 comment).

**Question 3 – Are there opportunities to respond to other issues in the community by using partnerships?**

Out of the 78 responses to this question, forum participants identified a number of opportunities to respond to issues in the community by using partnerships. These opportunities include:
• The ability to address specific issues and needs in the community such as:
  o Housing (2 comments)
  o Literacy (2 comments)
  o Mental Health (2 comments)
  o Community health and wellbeing issues like obesity and tri-morbidity (5 comments)
  o Unemployment (2 comments)
  o Substance misuse (1 comment)
  o Homelessness (1 comment)
  o Aging Population (1 comment)
  o Disability support (3 comments)
  o Education (2 comments)
  o Support for grandparents caring for grandchildren (1 comment)
• The ability of organisations to use partnerships as a vehicle to identify and advocate for community issues and needs (5 comments)
• Assist with community transport shortages by sharing vehicles between organisations (3 comments)
• The initiation of innovative collaborative community projects and partnerships aimed at addressing a community need (8 comments). An example provided included the PCYC Function Centre and Lagoon Creek café in Caboolture which provides employment opportunities for people with disabilities (2 comments).
• The ability to develop early intervention strategies that will allow the sector to be more proactive to community needs rather than reactive (3 comments)
• Collaborative funding submissions (3 comments)
• Partnerships between education and training providers and employers to assist clients with the transition from education into employment (2 comments)
• Partnerships between first contact services such as police and hospitals and community service organisations to ensure people are appropriately referred (2 comments)
• The opportunity to improve community awareness of, and access to, programs and services available in the region (2 comments)
• The opportunity to improve community wellbeing, connection and cohesion (3 comments)
• Encouraging more business and corporate involvement in responding to issues in the community (3 comments)
• The co-ordination of fundraising opportunities (1 comment)
• Developing an integrated and holistic approach to client needs (3 comments)
• Gathering better resources (1 comment)
• Government’s including the development of collaborative relationships to meet community needs in its key performance indicators (1 comment)
• Decreasing governmental and organisation bureaucracy (2 comments)
3.6 FORUM EVALUATIONS

Of the 108 community service workers, 61 completed evaluation sheets at the conclusion of the day which equals a 56% response rate. This section presents the findings from the evaluation. A copy of the evaluation form is in Appendix 3.

Respondents

Of those that completed the evaluation forms, 15 were male and 45 were female. Age groups and cultural identification are shown below.

![Figure 2 - Age group](image)

![Figure 3 - Cultural Identification](image)

Responses

1. Do you believe that the activities have been worthwhile and have been a good way to explore the topics?

![Figure 4 - Participants' views on the forum format](image)
Figure 5 – Participants’ views of the format of the forum and time allocated

Figure 6 – Participants’ understanding of the needs and opportunities facing the community services sector in the Moreton Bay area

Figure 7 – Participants’ views on the usefulness of the forum for learning about other services and for networking
5. Did you enjoy the guest speaker, Tim Costello?

![Bar chart showing participants' views on the guest speaker, Tim Costello.]

Figure 8 – Participants’ views on the guest speaker, Tim Costello

6. Did you think the facilitator, Michelle, and the Engagement Plus staff were skilled and helpful?

![Bar chart showing participants' views on facilitator, Michelle, and the Engagement Plus staff.]

Figure 9 – Participants’ views on facilitator, Michelle, and the Engagement Plus staff

7. Activity 1 - Do you believe that you have a better understanding of how information and resources are used and could be used in the region?

![Bar chart showing participants' views on Activity 1.]

Figure 10 – Participants’ views on Activity 1
Figure 11 – Participants’ views on Activity 2

Figure 12 – Participants’ views on Activity 3

Figure 13 – Participants’ overall satisfaction with the forum
Figure 14 – Participants' feelings about the direction of the review project and what it can achieve for Council and the region as a whole

When asked what was done well on the day, comments were received on the following:

- Format, organisation, coordination, timing and facilitation (20 comments)
- Zing technology (13 comments)
- Content, discussions and world cafe (9 comments)
- Guest Speakers (6 comments)
- Food (4 comments)
- Opportunity to network and come together (3 comments)

When asked what could have been done better, comments were received on the following:

- More time and/or opportunity for in-depth or further discussion (13 comments)
- More opportunities for networking and/or hearing others (8 comments)
- Warmth of the venue in the morning (4 comments)
- Food (3 comments)
- Showcase or present case studies of best practice around partnerships (1 comment)
- Length of day (1 comment)
- Size of words on screen (1 comment)
- Guest speaker keeping to topic (1 comment)
4. ONLINE WORKER SURVEY

4.1 METHODOLOGY

The worker survey was made available online via the Moreton Bay Regional Council website and was open to all community service sector workers, paid or unpaid. Areas of focus for the survey included:

- Work Experience and Conditions
- Services and Programs offered workers' organisations
- Contractual arrangements
- Advocacy
- Planning
- Top threats to and opportunities for the community sector in Moreton Bay

Workers who completed the survey went into the draw to win one of ten, $100 Coles Myer gift vouchers as an incentive to participate.

A total of 134 responses were received.

4.2 FINDINGS

The survey findings have been presented by showing the collated responses for all 27 questions under the relevant headings below.

A. Work Experience and Conditions

The online community service worker survey was completed by 134 people of whom 88% were paid employees. As shown below, nearly two thirds (63.3%) of respondents identified themselves as full time employees, 22.39% as part-time employees and 2.99% as casual employees. Fifteen (15) respondents did not answer this question.

![Graph showing employment status](image)

*Figure 15 – Respondents’ employment status*

When asked to identify the tenure of their employment, the majority (70%) of respondents stated that they were permanent employees as opposed to temporary or casual (15%).
There was a broad representation of respondents with varying levels of experience in the community sector, ranging from those who are relatively new to the sector having only 1 to 2 years of experience (21.64%) to those who had been in the industry from more than 10 years (36.57%).

It should be noted that more than a quarter (26.87%) of respondents chose not to answer this question.

When asked to specify the length of time they had been in their current role, more than half (50.75%) of the respondents said 1 to 2 years, 28.36% said 3 to 5 years and 17.9% said more than 5 years.

The majority of respondents also identified that they intended to remain in their current role for either another year (22.39%) or another 2 to 5 years (39.55%).

This information considered in conjunction with that outlined in Figures 17 and 18 above, suggests that there is a considerable degree of natural attrition and staff movement in the community services sector either through transfer, promotion or other career development opportunities. The average time a person stays in their role appears to be between 3 and 5 years.
Figure 19 – Length of time respondents plan to stay in their current role

The 208 responses to the question “what sort of role are you in?” indicate that some respondents have more than one role within their organisation. The majority of survey respondents stated that their role is in management (43 respondents), as a support worker (34 respondents), other service delivery (29 respondents) or as a social worker/case manager (26 respondents).

Those that identified as “other” include community development (4 responses), information and referral (2 responses) and community work, mobilisation and services (3 responses).

Figure 20 – Respondents’ Roles

**Educational Requirement & Attainment**

As demonstrated by the graph below, respondents’ actual and required level of qualification for their roles are mostly closely aligned with the exception of post graduate degrees. A proportionately high number of respondents stated that they had completed a post graduate degree (21%) where their role did not necessarily require them to do so (5%).

Interestingly, while only 42% of respondents indicated that their position required them to have a tertiary qualification, more than half (55%) of the respondents did in fact hold such a qualification.
Just over two thirds (70%) of respondents said that they lived in the Moreton Bay Regional Council area. When asked to specify how they travel to work, the overwhelming majority (85.82%) of survey respondents stated that they travelled to work by car. The remainder walked to work (5.22%) or travelled by train (2.99%), bus (2.24%) or bike (1.49%).
Work Conditions

Respondents were asked to consider the acceptability of a number of factors about their employment. Overall, the majority of respondents appeared to be very satisfied with most aspects of their employment, but most especially with:

- Their hours of work (86% of people agreed or strongly agreed this was acceptable).
- The location of their employment (81% of people agreed or strongly agreed this was acceptable).
- The conditions associated with their employment (73% of people agreed or strongly agreed this was acceptable).
- The image of their employment (70% of people agreed or strongly agreed this was acceptable).
- Their training (71% of people agreed or strongly agreed this was acceptable).

The aspect of their employment that respondents said was least acceptable was their salary and career path.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Path</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24 – Acceptability of various work factors
Work/Life Balance

Encouragingly, most respondents (70.15%) either agreed or strongly agreed that they had a good work/life balance. Only 22.39% or people disagreed or strongly disagreed.

![Figure 25 – Work/life balance](image)

When asked how often they were required to work additional hours, most respondents (92.55%) commented that there was some overtime involved in their role. More specifically, just over three quarters (36.57%) of respondents said they sometimes worked additional hours, 20.9% said they occasionally did some overtime and 16.42% said they always worked overtime.

![Figure 26 – Additional hours worked by respondents](image)

As the table below demonstrates, much of the overtime worked by respondents is either given as time off in lieu (50.75%) or paid overtime (9.7%). Almost a quarter of respondents, however, commented that any overtime they did was unpaid (22.39%).

![Figure 27 – Status of overtime worked](image)
Professional Development

Many respondents positively commented on their organisation’s ability to meet their professional development needs, with 61.2% of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing that their organisation did so.

When asked to consider their professional development needs and those of their colleagues, respondents overwhelmingly identified that they required opportunities to undertake further training relevant to their positions at a reasonable cost. Types of training commented on included cultural awareness training, computer skills training, management training, financial management training and administration training in addition to sector specific training opportunities such as drug and alcohol awareness training, counselling, youth and family support training and mental health training.

Some respondents noted that the cost of providing training and professional development to staff is prohibitive for many community organisations, given that not only is there the cost of the training itself, but also the cost of filling staff positions during the training period.

Other professional development needs identified by respondents include:

- The need to keep up to date with information which may impact on their work, including emerging trends, changes to policies and procedures, legislative changes and emerging research.
- Information about available community resources.
- Clearly defined career paths including information about the requirements for career progression.
- The need for external professional supervision and support.
- Employer support.
- Well facilitated interagency meetings.

Level of Opportunity

When asked to rate the level of opportunity to move to different roles in other areas of the community sector, the majority of respondents indicated that they had the ability to move (50.74%) although it had to be well planned (41.04%). The remainder of respondents either have no plans to move (26.87%), don’t think moving is real consideration for them (10.45%) or have no opportunity to move (6.72%).
B. Services and Programs

Service and Program Types

The table below demonstrates that in addition to delivering services and programs that fall within their primary areas of focus, respondents’ organisations are also delivering a variety of additional programs and services as part of their secondary areas of focus. When considering the primary and secondary areas of focus combined, program and service types represented by the largest number of overall respondents include:

- Social Services (65.67%);
- Disability services (57.46%); and
- Family Services (51.49%).

Program and service types represented by the least number of overall respondents include:

- Migrant and refugee assistance services (15.67%);
- Aged Care (17.91%); and
- Early years (17.91%).

The data also shows that program and service types overwhelmingly delivered as secondary rather than primary areas of focus include:

- Migrant and refugee assistance services with 12.69% of respondents indicating this is a secondary rather than primary (2.99%) area of focus;
- Domestic violence and sexual assault services with 19.4% of respondents indicating this is a secondary rather than primary (9.7%) area of focus;
- Financial and material support with 23.88% of people respondents indicating this is a secondary rather than primary (9.7%) area of focus;
- Legal services and advocacy with 23.13% of respondents stating that this is a secondary rather than primary (9.7%) area of focus.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether to their knowledge, demand for the various program and service types is increasing in the Moreton Bay region. Responses indicate that the top five (5) areas where respondents are noticing an increase include:

1. Housing and Homelessness (43.28%);
2. Health (42.54%);
3. Family Services (41.79%);
4. Disability Services (39.55%); and
5. Financial and material support services (38.06%).
### Figure 30 – Services and programs offered by the respondents’ organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>30.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>26.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>23.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>32.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant/Refugee</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>32.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>41.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>43.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>42.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>38.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Services</td>
<td>41.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>35.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>35.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>32.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>39.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years</td>
<td>26.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>35.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 31 – Increasing demand for types of services and programs
C. Contractual Arrangements

A third (33.58%) of respondents agreed that government contracts allowed them to adequately respond to client and community needs, 27.62% disagreed and 27.61% were unsure.

![Figure 32 – Adequacy of government contracts in responding to community need](image)

D. Advocacy

Encouragingly, almost three quarters (72.39%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their organisation regularly advocates on behalf of their clients. Only 6.72% of people disagreed or strongly disagreed with the remainder neutral (14.93%) or unsure (.75%).

![Figure 33 – Organisations ability to advocate on behalf of client](image)

When asked whether their organisation is able to speak publicly about the issues facing clients, just over half (53.73%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 19.4% were neutral and 18.65% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

![Figure 34 – Whether respondents' organisations are able to speak publically about the issues facing their clients](image)
E. Planning

The majority of respondents indicated that their organisations had both an operational/business plan (81%) and a strategic/long term plan (78%). The remainder or respondents were predominantly unsure.

F. Looking Forward

In identifying their top three (3) threats to the community sector in Moreton Bay, survey respondents commented on a broad spectrum of issues, ranging from those impacting directly on their clients, to those issues impacting on their organisations’ ability to deliver services throughout the region. A table outlining the top threats identified is outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat to Organisations</th>
<th>No of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding and financial resources</td>
<td>51 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of suitably qualified staff</td>
<td>15 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration and service coordination</td>
<td>14 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population growth resulting in increasing demand</td>
<td>12 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient and inadequate resources including equipment and facilities out of which to run programs and services</td>
<td>12 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff attrition and retention</td>
<td>11 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support and appreciation</td>
<td>7 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive tendering processes</td>
<td>6 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in government and government policies overriding social agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Low pay rates of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Increasing wage awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Government Bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small and effective community based organisations being absorbed by larger national organisations with little regional awareness and increased bureaucratic requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lack of employment pathways for community sector workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Costs associated with operating/facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lack of regional plan for the community sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lack of communication between organisations and government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Duplication of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Decline in volunteer numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Large organisations funded for delivering programs for Aboriginal people can lack the cultural awareness, knowledge, abilities and skills to deliver sustainable long term outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Failure to adequately identify emerging trends and needs in the sector and strategically plan appropriate responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Changes to management and organisational restructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Being excluded from policy processes of local and state government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fragmented approach to service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lack of training providers in community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Funding periods too short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Costs associated with providing staff with training and professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Unrealistic criteria and outcomes required for funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Failure to adequately promote and share information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bad media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lack of financial and management expertise within the small to medium size community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Too few skilled and qualified indigenous workers to deliver services to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Funding contracts which require service collaboration but do not fund the time involved in building and maintaining the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Regional focus ignores local community needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Threat to clients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat Identified</th>
<th>No of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Accessibility and Affordability of Transport options</td>
<td>15 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Homelessness</td>
<td>11 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Employment</td>
<td>10 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Lack of affordable housing</td>
<td>9 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Poverty and financial stress</td>
<td>9 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Increase in the cost of living</td>
<td>8 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Aging population and insufficient facilities and programs for aged care</td>
<td>6 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Increase in crime rates and violence</td>
<td>5 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Insufficient disability programs</td>
<td>4 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Substance Misuse</td>
<td>4 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mental Health Issues</td>
<td>3 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Insufficient youth facilities and programs</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Lack of support to deal with needs</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Unable to access the variety of services available in Brisbane</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Youth Disengagement</td>
<td>1 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Insufficient respite centres in the region</td>
<td>1 comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey respondents were also asked to identify their top three (3) opportunities for region. Responses are outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Identified</th>
<th>No of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increased collaborative relationships and partnerships with other community organisations, businesses and government</td>
<td>27 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establish more and better networks and networking opportunities, particularly around common issues</td>
<td>14 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strong regional growth</td>
<td>14 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increasing number variety and quality of community services to deal with rising demand</td>
<td>13 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sharing of information, resources and ideas across the sector enabling the organisations to better respond to, and advocate for, community issues and needs</td>
<td>12 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Address community issues and needs such as homelessness, depression, suicide, disability inclusion, employment, social inclusion</td>
<td>9 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grow government interest, support and resources/funding for the region</td>
<td>8 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Increased consultation around service growth and needs with both organisation and clients</td>
<td>8 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Council</td>
<td>8 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Strength of the community sector that with organisations that support one another</td>
<td>8 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Location and Lifestyle</td>
<td>8 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Building of additional infrastructure to support community services and respond to community needs (e.g. crisis centre, homeless refuge, adult centre, child centre, community hub etc.)</td>
<td>6 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. More local training and professional development opportunities to help skill workers</td>
<td>6 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Strong community spirit</td>
<td>6 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Improve access and social inclusion by increasing public transport coverage (e.g. rail)</td>
<td>5 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Good working conditions, job satisfaction and work/life balance for community sector workers</td>
<td>5 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Building awareness of available community services and programs</td>
<td>4 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Increased knowledge and awareness of the needs and gaps in the Moreton Bay region</td>
<td>3 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Growing community interest and involvement</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Development of a regional plan</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Recruit more volunteers</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Increasing staff wages will help attract and retain more people in the sector</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Development of innovative projects and supporting those already in existence</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Projects aimed at early intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Better utilisation of technology such as social media in accessing and distributing information and building and maintaining partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Networks such as the Youth Services Collaborative Action Group and YANQ North Coast Communities of Practice Leaders Action Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Better communication systems to reach more people, especially those outside the normal networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Increase service accountability – “make what matters count, not what can be counted matter”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 37 – Top opportunities for the community sector in Moreton Bay

**Additional Comments**

At the conclusion of the survey, respondents were provided with the opportunity to comment on any matters of further importance to them that may not have been covered in the survey. Many respondents chose to reiterate points previously made with key themes that emerged including:

- The need to identify and respond to a variety of social issues in the Moreton Bay region in an integrated and holistic way. Social issues mentioned included social isolation, depression, homelessness, cost and availability of child care, mental health, disability access and inclusion, youth disengagement, positive parenting, poverty, issues facing the culturally and linguistically diverse communities, literacy, education, substance misuse, sexual health, aged care and counselling.
- The need to develop partnerships and collaborative relationships with a range of different groups including government, business, industry, community groups and other community services.
- The need to better coordinate services throughout the region to avoid duplication and ensure wide coverage.
- The need to develop a regional identity for Moreton Bay.
- The need for further cultural awareness training for service providers.
- Issues surrounding the lack of funding for community services.
- Issues surrounding the administration of funding.
- Opportunities build the capacity of community organisations and community service workers through the provision of professional development training.
- The importance of sharing information and resources across the sector to ensure better client outcomes.
- The need to build community awareness surrounding available programs and services.
- The need to review the management models under which community organisations operate.
- Better use of opportunities that technology and social media present.
5. ORGANISATIONAL CENSUS

5.1 METHODOLOGY

The community organisation census (refer to Appendix X) was made available to organisations who deliver community services in the Moreton Bay region:

• at the open forum on 13 July 2011;
• via mail out to 648 organisations identified from Council’s Rapid database; and
• via email.

Areas of focus for the census included:

• Services and programs delivered
• Facilities
• Workforce
• Income and expenditure
• Governance
• Contractual arrangements
• Advocacy
• Planning
• Government relationships
• Partnerships and Coordination
• Community recovery
• Top threats to, and opportunities for the community sector in Moreton Bay

5.2 FINDINGS

The survey findings have been presented by showing the collated responses for all 27 questions under the relevant headings below.

A. SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

Number of years respondents have been operation

The number of years respondent organisations indicated they have been operating ranged from 4 months to 109 years, with the average across the 98 organisations who responded to this question being 27 years.

Respondents’ service coverage

The majority (40%) of organisations who completed the community organisation census identified themselves as being part of a local service. The remaining respondents were evenly split between those organisations who identified themselves as being part of a state wide service (30%) and those who are part of a nationwide service (30%)
Figure 38 – Service coverage

As shown below, almost three quarters (74.51%) of the respondent organisations said they service their local area and surrounding suburbs or the Moreton Bay Local Government Area. The remaining organisations identified that in addition to the Moreton Bay Local Government area, they serviced neighbouring local government areas (9.8%), the entire state (13.73%) or nation (0.98%).

Figure 39 – Percentage of organisations which service certain areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Receive Funding</th>
<th>Completed Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Community Services (inc Church run)</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Provided</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Clubs</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>747</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 40 - Total Identified Community Service Organisations, Moreton Bay

**Groups that respondents work with**

The five (5) groups which the largest number of respondent organisations indicated they work with include:

1. People with a disability (64 respondents)
2. Families (56 respondents)

<sup>1</sup> A total of 102 surveys were completed. Two of these were from groups better defined as facility management organisations but they have been included in the census.
3. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (56 respondents)
4. Children (53 respondents)
5. Culturally and linguistically diverse (52 respondents)

![Figure 41 – Number of respondents whose organisation work with a particular group](image)

The nine groups which respondents who work with those groups indicate predominantly have services and programs which are catered specifically to them include: children (81%); families (75%); housing and homelessness (75%); seniors (69%); women (68%); young people (68%); disability (61%); job seekers (54%) and trauma/crisis (52%).

Only three groups, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (57%), culturally and linguistically diverse (54%) and refugees and recent migrants (52%) had a higher proportion of respondents delivering services that these groups participate in rather than have services and programs specifically catered to the group.

Single parents is the only group which respondents indicated have an even number of organisations that both specifically catered services/programs for them and have services/programs that they can participate in (50%).
Figure 42 - Percentage of respondents whose organisations have services/programs that cater specifically to this group or have services/programs that this group participate in

**Location of programs and services**

Figure 42 shows that the majority of respondent organisations deliver their services and programs either onsite (34%) or a combination of both on and off site (48%). Only 14% said they delivered their services offsite.

Figure 43 – Location of programs and services available

**Accessibility of respondents’ facilities**

Where respondents indicated they deliver services and programs onsite, they were further asked to identify the accessibility of their facility through a variety of transport options. The majority of respondents indicated that their facility/location is easily accessible by car (81.37%) and bus (66.67%). Less than a third of respondents’ facilities, however, are accessible by train (32.35%), bike (30.39%) and foot (1.96%).
Programs and services provided and demanded

The description of the census results which follows refers to the graphs in figures 45 and 46 which outline:

- The number of respondents who receive funding to deliver particular programs and services;
- The number of respondents who don’t receive funding, but provide particular services and programs anyway;
- Whether respondents have noticed demand for their programs and services increasing; and
- Whether they are able to meet this demand.

**Child Welfare & Services**

Of the 9 organisations who said they provide child welfare services to the community, only 2 organisations said that they are funded to deliver these services. Both organisations work primarily with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander sector and receive their funding from the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (“DEEWR”) and Department of Communities (“DOC”).

The 7 remaining organisations indicated that they don’t receive funding to deliver child welfare services and programs but do so anyway.

While 5 of the 9 organisations said that they had noticed an increase in demand for their services, only 2 said that they were able to meet this demand.

**Child Care**

Overall 31 organisations identified that they deliver child care services within the Moreton Bay region. Only twelve 12 of those organisations said they were funded to do so with funding coming from DEEWR, the Department of Education and Training (“DET”) and the Playgroup Association of Queensland.

Interestingly, a large portion of the seventeen 17 organisations that said they delivered child care services despite not receiving funding to do so, were church groups (7 respondents).

When asked whether demand for child care services is increasing, almost three quarters of the 31 child care service providers indicated that it is. Only 11 of those providers, however, said that they are easily able to meet the demand.

**Disability services**
Disability Services were well represented by census respondents with 20 organisations stating they are funded to provide the service and ten indicating that despite being unfunded, they provide the service anyway.

Funded organisations said that they receive their funding to deliver services from a variety of sources including:

- the Department of Health and Aging’s (“DOHA”) Home and Community Care program (“HACC”);
- Department of Communities’ Disability and Community Care Services;
- Moreton Bay Regional Council;
- Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (“FAHCSIA”); and
- Parent Research Centre.

While, 19 of the thirty organisations said that they have noticed and increase in the demand for disability services, only seven thought they were in a position to meet the demand.

- Domestic violence and sexual assault

Thirteen (13) organisations said that they deliver domestic violence and sexual assault services to the Moreton Bay community, with the majority (9 respondents) not funded to do so.

The 4 organisations who said they received funding to carry out their programs and services did so from Queensland Health and the DOC.

The majority of organisations (11 respondents) who said they deliver domestic violence and sexual assault services said that demand for their service is increasing, with only 4 able to meet the demand.

- Emergency and disaster relief

Census responses indicate overwhelmingly that emergency and disaster relief services are primarily provided by organisations not funded to do so. Of the 15 organisations who said they deliver the service, only 3 are funded by DOC, DOHA or FAHCSIA.

Of concern, ten of the organisations also said they had noticed an increase in demand for emergency and disaster relief services with not one of them in a position to meet this increasing demand.

- Employment and training services

Of the 16 organisations that said they deliver employment and training services only 9 are funded to do so, with funding received from the Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation (“DEEDI”), DEEWR and DET.

Nine (9) organisations also indicated that demand for employment and training services is increasing with only 3 organisations able to easily meet the demand.

- Family services

A total of 29 organisations stated that they provide family services to the Moreton Bay community with just over half (16 respondents) funded to do so by DOC, FAHCSIA, DET and DEEWR.

Almost half (14 respondents) of the organisations said that they had noticed an increase in the demand for their services and only 8 organisations said they felt they were in a position to meet this demand.

- Financial and material support
Figure 44 below demonstrates that financial and material support services are primarily delivered by organisations not funded to do so, with only 3 of the 17 organisations receiving funding from FAHCSIA, DOC, DOHA or via the co-ordination of the Pine Rivers care networks.

Further, of the 14 organisations who said they do not receive funding but provide the service anyway, 7 are church groups.

Fourteen (14) of those organisations delivering financial and material support services said that they had noticed an increase in demand for their services, however, only 3 felt they were in a position to meet this demand.

- **Health**

Overall, 27 organisations identified themselves as delivering health services to the Moreton Bay region. Only 12 of those organisations said that they are funded to do so with funding coming from the DOC and DOHA’s HACC and Community Aged Care Packages (CACPS).

As demonstrated by the graph in Figure 45 Health services has the highest level of unmet demand of all the services with 22 of the organisations who deliver the service noticing an increase in demand and only 5 able to meet the demand.

- **Housing and Homelessness**

Of the 18 organisations who said they provide Housing and Homelessness services, 7 said that they are funded to do so by DOC, Baptist Care QLD, HACC and/or FAHCSIA.

Two thirds of the organisations (12 respondents) of the organisations delivering the service also said there is a growing need for housing and homelessness services in the region with only three organisations stating that they are able to easily meet that demand.

- **Information, advice and personal social services**

Information, advice and personal social services were well represented in census results with 17 organisations saying they are funded to deliver the service and 13 organisations providing the service despite not being funded to do so.

Funded organisations indicated they receive their funding from:

- Queensland Health including the Sexual Assault Support and Prevention Program;
- DOC including the Social and Economic Development program; and
- DOHA including the HACC program.

Eighteen (18) of the 30, or just over half of the organisations that said they deliver information, advice and personal social services to the Moreton Bay region have noticed an increase in the demand for their services. Only 7 of the organisations said that they are able to meet the demand.

- **Legal services and advocacy**

Seven (7) organisations stated that they are funded to provide legal and advocacy services to the Moreton Bay community with funding administered by Legal Aid and the DOC.

Four (4) organisations said that they don’t receive funding to provide legal and advocacy services but do so anyway.
While 5 of the 11 organisations who said that they deliver legal and advocacy services have noticed an increase in demand for services, only 2 are able to meet the demand.

- **Migrant and refugee assistance**

Of the 7 community organisations that said they deliver migrant and refugee services, none received any government funding to do so.

Further, 4 of the 7 organisations said that demand for migrant and refugee assistance services is increasing and not one of them feel they are in a position to meet this demand.

- **Residential aged care and nursing homes**

Overall, 9 organisations identified themselves as delivering residential aged care and nursing homes to the Moreton Bay community. Only 4 of those organisations receive government funding to deliver the service, with funding administered by the DOHA.

When asked whether demand for residential aged care and nursing homes is increasing, the overwhelming majority of providers (8 respondents) indicated that it was, with only a quarter (2 respondents) of respondents able to meet that demand.

- **Youth service and youth welfare services**

Of the 16 organisations that said they provide youth and youth welfare services to the Moreton Bay community, half said they are funded, while the other half deliver their services despite not being funded to do so.

Funding sources identified by respondents included the DOC and private donations.

Eight (8) of the 16 organisations said that they have noticed demand for their service increasing, with only one of those organisations able to meet the demand.

- **Seniors**

The graph in figure 44 below, suggests that senior support services are predominantly delivered by organisations not funded to do so, with only 8 of the 21 organisations receiving funding from DOHA or Moreton Bay Regional Council.

Almost two thirds (13 respondents) of the organisations delivering senior support services said that they have noticed an increase in demand for their services, although many of those (9 respondents) indicate that they were in a position to meet that demand.

- **Trauma, counselling and community recovery**

Seven (7) organisations identified that they deliver trauma, counselling and community recovery services, with only two of those receiving funding.

Five (5) of the 7 organisations also said that they had noticed demand for their services increasing with only 1 organisations able to meet that demand.
Figure 45 – Number of respondent organisations delivering various community services
Figure 46 - Demand for various community services as identified by organisations delivering those services
In completing the matrix of services and programs provided and demanded, respondents who did not provide particular services (e.g. child care services) were asked to identify whether there is an unmet demand for those services within the Moreton Bay community. The four service delivery areas, where respondents felt there was the highest level of unmet demand included:

1. Child welfare services (18.63%)
2. Legal services and advocacy (17.65%)
3. Housing and Homelessness services (17.65%)
4. Health services (16.67%)

Figure 47 - Demand for various community services as identified by organisations not delivering those services
General comments about service and program provision and demand

Census respondents were provided with the opportunity to make additional comments about service and program provision and demand. Respondents used the opportunity to:

- Provide further details about the programs and services they deliver.
- Comment on the increasing demand for services in the region beyond what many organisations are funded to deliver. Specific examples include mental health support services, adult literacy, CALD specific HACC services and community care services to assist people and families living with a dementing condition.
- Identify that localities such as Dayboro and Pine Rivers are underserviced.

B. FACILITIES

Tenure of respondents’ facilities

Almost half of the respondents (48.04%) indicated that they lease the facilities from which they deliver their services and programs with the majority of those leased at discounted rates (28.43%). A further 40.20% of respondents said that they owned their facilities and .98% said it was being mortgaged. Only 7.84% of respondents said that they do not have a facility or that the facility they have is not acceptable.

Size of respondents’ facilities

In commenting on the adequacy of the size of their facility, the majority of respondents stated that their facility is either too small (23.53%) or that they might run out of room in the future (39.22%). This could suggest that community organisations in the Moreton Bay region are experiencing growth.

No organisations said their facility is too big and only slightly more than a quarter (26.47%) of respondents said that that their facility is big enough.
Condition of respondents’ facilities

When respondents were asked to select the condition of their facility, slightly more than three quarters (77.32%) of respondents said that it was either in a good (50.52%) or excellent condition (26.80%). Only 14.43% selected that their facility was a bit run down and 8.25% said their facility needs a lot of work. It should be taken into account that two respondents did not answer the question and six respondents indicated that they did not have a facility or that it was not applicable and a result is not represented in the figure below.

Appropriateness of respondents’ facilities for use

When respondents were asked to identify whether or not their facility was appropriate for the organisation’s uses 72.55% said “yes, it is appropriate” as opposed to 14.7% who said “no, it is not appropriate”. Of the 102 respondents who participated in the census only 12.75% did not answer the question.


Figure 51 – Appropriateness of respondents’ facilities for use

Respondents sharing facilities

Only 30.39% of respondents said that they share their facility with other groups and organisations while the majority of respondents (56.86%) indicated that their facility is for their sole use.

Figure 52 - Are the facilities shared with another group or organisation?

Respondents’ use of other facilities to deliver services

Responses for this question were fairly evenly spread with 43.14% of respondents indicating they use other facilities to deliver their services and 37.25% saying they do not.

Figure 53 - Do organisations use other facilities to deliver services?
Respondents’ provision of community meeting rooms

The census results show that of 81% of respondents who answered this question the majority (50%) do not provide community meeting rooms at their facility.

Figure 54 - Do respondents’ facilities provide community meeting rooms?

C. WORKFORCE

Impacts of changes to awards, quality and/or standards

When respondents were asked to finish the sentence “what are the anticipated impacts in relation to changes to AWARDS, Quality and/or Standards...” a total number of 159 responses were recorded by 89 of the 102 census respondents, indicating that some respondents selected more than one option.

Approximately a quarter (¼) of respondents indicated that changes to awards would likely result in a reduction of their paid workforce (26 respondents) and/or an increased reliance on volunteer staff to deliver community services (29 respondents). Twenty-two (22) respondents anticipated that a change to awards would result in a reduction of hours and 19 though it would result in them having to rethink the viability of their service.

Almost half (46 respondents) of the respondents stated did not think a change to awards would impact their organisation or did not respond to the question.

Figure 55 - Anticipated impacts in relation to changes to AWARDS, Quality and/or Standards
Factors which make it easier or harder for respondents to attract and retain staff

Census respondents were asked to identify whether a variety of factors made it either easier, or harder to attract and retain staff. As shown by the graph in figure 55 below, seven out of the nine factors were identified as making it easier for organisation to attract and retain staff with these factors including: image of the organisation/sector (84.51%); Facility (72.73%); Support (83.08%); Training and Development (79.37%); Working Conditions (81.54%); Working Hours (70.15%) and Location (77.78%).

The two factors which respondents said made it harder to attract and retain staff include career path (56.9%) and salary (65.15%).

It should be noted that a total of 19 (18.63%) respondents did not answer this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Easier</th>
<th>Harder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>84.51%</td>
<td>15.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>83.08%</td>
<td>16.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
<td>56.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>79.37%</td>
<td>20.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>81.54%</td>
<td>18.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>34.85%</td>
<td>65.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>70.15%</td>
<td>29.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 56 - Factors that make it easier or harder to attract and retain staff

Staff work/life balance

More than three quarters of the respondents who participated in the census either agreed (59.55%) or strongly agreed (21.35%) that their staff have a good work/life balance. Only 4.49% of respondents disagreed and none strongly disagreed.
Professional development needs of workers

When respondents were asked whether they are able to meet their staff’s professional development needs slightly more than three quarters (77.53%) of the 89 respondents who answered the questions either agreed or strongly agreed that they are able to do so.

Workforce Representation

- **Number of Paid Staff**

  As shown by Table 1 below, roles within respondent organisations that are occupied by the largest number of both permanent and temporary/contract staff include:
  1. Support Worker/Aide;
  2. Other Service Delivery; and
  3. Administration.

  More than half of the support workers identified by respondent organisations as filling both the permanent and temporary contract positions, work in senior and disability support services. Similarly, a large portion of the staff identified as working in other service delivery work in child care.

  Roles which are primarily filled by permanent staff include policy, research or advocacy (100%), communications and media (100%), social worker (96.77%) and management (91.55%).
Respondents who indicated they had “other” staff included child care workers, trainers, senior staff/middle management, youth workers and teaching staff.

Table 1 - Number of permanent and temporary staff in various roles within census respondent organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Permanent Staff</th>
<th>Temporary/Contract Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Worker/Aide</td>
<td>270.9</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>483.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor/Coach</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Service Delivery</td>
<td>155.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>207.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>113.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/Media</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy, research or advocacy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 59 – Percentage of permanent and temporary/contract staff in various roles

- **Number of paid staff v unpaid (volunteer) staff**

When comparing the number of paid staff to the number of volunteer staff carrying out various roles within the respondent organisations, what quickly becomes evident is that many organisations appear to be heavily reliant on their volunteer staff to help them carry out many of their core functions.

Roles which the census results suggest are filled with a high number of volunteers include: support worker/aide (48.3%); management (55.44%), and other service delivery (90.14%). Interestingly, of the 1896 volunteers who were identified by respondent organisations as assisting with other service delivery, 1600 work with organisations in the senior and disability support sector.

While the role of counsellor/coach also appears to have a large proportion of volunteers, further review of the census results shows that thirty (30) of the forty-four (44) volunteers identified by seven (7) organisations as working in the role, work with two (2) church groups.
Roles which the results show are predominantly carried out by paid staff include:
  - Policy, research or advocacy (81.4%); and
  - Social worker (81.58%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Paid Staff</th>
<th>Unpaid Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Worker/Aide</td>
<td>483.9</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor/Coach</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Service Delivery</td>
<td>207.5</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/Media</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy, research or advocacy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Number of paid staff versus volunteers carrying out various roles

Figure 60 – Percentage of paid staff and volunteers carrying out various roles

- Turnover paid staff

The overall number of positions filled (194) within respondent organisations in the last year exceeded the number of positions vacated (118). This suggests that many community service organisations are employing additional staff to meet the demand for their services. As the graph in figure 60 below demonstrates, the number of support worker/aides and other service delivery workers in particular has increased by approximately 40%, while the number of policy, research, advocacy and management positions have remained the same.
When comparing the number of positions in the various roles left in the previous year to the overall number of people within those positions, the highest worker turnover appears to have been experienced in the roles of support worker aide (21.49%), counsellor (22.68%), other service delivery (22.65%) and other (30.06%).

Respondents, who selected “other” for this question, indicated that the high worker turnover is primarily being experienced in the child care sector.

As the graph in figure 62 below demonstrates, the top three areas where census respondents perceive there is a staff shortage include: support worker/aide (10 respondents), other (8 respondents) and administration (6 respondents).
respondents). Those respondents who selected “other” indicated that there is a shortage of child care workers, literacy trainers, senior staff, respite workers and youth workers.

Census respondents also indicated that in addition to the perceived staff shortages, they also had difficulties finding and retaining staff for the following roles: support worker/aide (10 respondents); other (6 respondents) and management (5 respondents).

Roles which respondents indicated were less difficult to find and retain staff for included finance (1 respondent), communications and media (1 respondent) and administration (2 respondents).

![Figure 63 – Perceived staff shortages in various areas](image)

**General comments about workforce**

Respondents were also provided with the opportunity to make some additional comments about their workforce with key themes that emerged including:

- Lack of funding means that organisations are unable to employ the number of staff they require for effective service delivery; and
- The value of volunteers to the operation of many organisations in the community sector.
D. INCOME & EXPENDITURE

Estimated annual income

Of the 86 organisations that responded to this question, most appeared to be smaller organisations with annual incomes of either:

- Under $250,000.00 (38 respondents); or
- Between $250,000.00 and $500,000.00 (18 respondents).

Only 30 of the 86 organisations had annual incomes which exceeded $500,000.00.

![Graph showing annual income distribution](image)

Figure 64 - Estimated annual income

Respondents’ non-government income

Census respondents identified that in addition to government funding, they receive additional income from a variety of different sources, with the client fees (35 responses), donations (35 responses) and fundraising (32 responses) being the most prevalent options.

As the graph in figure 65 below demonstrates, income received from most non-government sources is predominantly used to top up government funding for core business. Income received from donations and private trusts, however, is primarily used to provide additional programs and services.

Responses also show that there appears to be very little use of private trusts, business and social enterprise by community service organisations to assist in meeting the cost of service delivery.

Those organisations who indicated they received “other” non-government funding stated they received funding from: Medicare; Lions Club; membership fees and gifts.

Respondents were also asked to specify the estimated percentage each non-government funding option contributed to their total income, however, the number and variety of responses to this question meant that this was unable to be accurately and fairly quantified.
Figure 65 – Number of organisations receiving various types of non-government income

Figure 66 – Respondent organisations use of non-government income

As the graph in figure 66 below demonstrates, apart from client fees and social enterprise, the majority of non-government funding received by respondent organisations was identified as being non-recurrent.
Respondents’ government income

Of the seventy-four (74) organisations that answered this question:

- Thirty-two (32) said they receive Commonwealth funding with organisations delivering senior and disability support services (12), child care services (6) and services for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community (5) featuring prominently.

- Thirty-seven (37) indicated that they receive state funding with the four (4) community subsectors most represented including senior and disability support services (13), youth services (5), health and disease support services (4) and general support services (4).

- Six (6) organisations said they receive Local Government funding.

As the graph in Figure 67 below demonstrates, less than a third (33%) of census respondents find that government funding covers the full cost associated with providing the service they are contracted to deliver. State funding in particular was considered inadequate with only a quarter (24.32%) of respondents satisfied they were able to recover the cost of service delivery.

Figure 68 – Adequacy of government funding to cover the full cost of the contracted service

While 81.25% of respondents who said they receive Commonwealth funding indicated it was recurrent, almost a third (31.25%) also said that that funding had decreased in recent years. Further review of the results also
showed that half of the organisations who indicated their Commonwealth funding is non-recurrent deliver services which support the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community.

While almost three quarters (72.97%) of respondents who said they receive state funding identified it as recurrent, almost a quarter (24.32%) also said that funding is decreasing.

Only half (50%) of the respondents who said they received local government funding identified that funding as being recurrent. A further 50% of respondents also said that that funding has decreased in recent years.

Respondents’ Expenditure

The graph in figure 69 below shows that response rates to the question asking respondents to identify their organisation’s expenditure on a variety of outlays were low. This in turn reduces the statistical accuracy and reliability of the results which should be kept in mind when reading the following section.

The graph in figure 70 suggests that on average, staff salaries and wages make up the majority (64.82%) of a community sector organisations’ expenditure. This is followed by program expenses and consumables (22.38%) insurance and operational costs (11.22%) and facility costs (10.44%).
Figure 71 – Respondents’ average estimated organisational expenditure

When respondents were asked to identify whether funding arrangements adequately accounted for the variety of organisational expenses, approximately 56% of respondents said that they did. There were some small variances across the five options with the most respondents indicating that salaries and wages are adequately accounted for (61.70%), and the least number of respondents indicating that administration and marketing costs are adequately provided for (51.16%).

A further review of respondents who said their expenses were adequately accounted for in funding arrangements showed that:

- Salaries and wages were adequately provided for in only a third, or less of organisations who deliver child care services and services which support families and children.
- Program expenses and consumables were adequately provided for in less than half of the organisations who deliver child care services and seniors and disability support services.
- Facility costs were adequately provided for in less than half of the organisations who deliver child care services, general support services, health and disease support services and senior and disability support services.
- Insurance and operational costs were adequately provided for in less than half of the organisations who said they deliver child care services and health, disease and support services.
- Administration and marketing costs were adequately accounted for in only a third of child care services, family and children support services and general support services.

Figure 72 - Percentage of respondents who feel funding arrangements adequately account for expenditure

Respondents’ tax status

From the 102 total census participants, 42 (41%), did not specify what their tax status is. From the 60 participants who did respond, slightly more than half (51.19%) of the organisations have Income Tax Exempt Charity (ITEC) tax status, 19.05% are Public Benevolent Institutions (PBI) h29.76% are classified as Deductible Gift Recipients (DGR).
General Comment about income and expenditure

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to make some additional comments about their income and expenditure. Key themes which emerged included that:

- Increasing costs are impacting on respondents’ ability to deliver services to the community; and
- The majority of respondents’ expenditure is on salaries and wages, with recent wage increases not adequately accounted for in government funding arrangements.

E. GOVERNANCE

Respondents’ governance model

The graph (Figure 73) below depicts the type of governance models selected by the 96 respondents who answered this question. Slightly more than two thirds (68%) of the respondents said that their organisation is an Incorporated Association, 10% identified themselves as a company and only 1% said that they are an Aboriginal Corporation.

Of those that selected “other” two common themes emerged with 8% of the overall number of respondents to this question identifying themselves as a church and 4% as government. The remaining groups identified by 9% of respondents who selected “other” included foundation, social, Archdiocese Trustees, not-for-profit charity, sole trader, “a group of ladies that knit/crochet for our community” and “social get together of senior men”.

Figure 74 - Governance of organisations
Respondents’ management model

When the 102 respondents were asked what their management model is, a total of 104 responses were recorded; indicating that a few respondents selected more than one option. As depicted in the graph below (Figure 74) the most popular management model selected by 41 respondents is the board management model where board members act as trusted advisors and/or provide professional skills. The next most popular management model chosen by 26 respondents is the membership model where board members are representative of the organisation’s membership.

Management models selected by the fewest number of respondent organisations included the patrol model where board members serve primarily as figureheads for fundraising purposes (2 respondents) and the cooperative model where board members include board, staff, volunteers and other such as clients (4 respondents).

Sixteen (16) respondents selected “other” and provided specific details which included: “members of the public form our committee”; “collective management at service level and WCAA levels”; archdiocese; “church under congregational government”; “coordinator plus committee plus members”; “society, members are all volunteers” and “local government provides governance and management”.

![Figure 75 - Type of Management Model](image)

Number of board positions

Respondents who indicated their organisation had a board were further asked to identify how many voting positions there are. A total of 61 participants responded to this question, which resulted in an overall average of 8.22 voting positions within an organisation. Two qualitative responses were also provided and included:

- “Board/committee in which any member of association is eligible to vote” and;
- “All 150 members”.
F. CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

Respondents were asked to consider four statements regarding their government contractual arrangements and indicate on a rating scale whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement.

- **“Government contracts allow us to respond adequately to need with our clients/community”**

  The majority of respondents either agreed (37%) or strongly agreed (5%) that government contracts allow them to adequately respond to client and community needs. The remaining respondents were fairly evenly split between those that were neutral (19%) or undecided (8%) and those that disagreed (18%) or strongly disagreed (12%).

- **“Government contracts allow us to innovatively respond to our clients/community”**

  Forty-one percent (41%) of respondents said they agreed or strongly agreed that government contracts allow them to innovatively respond to client and community needs. When organisations delivering health disease and support services responded to this question 71.42% agreed or strongly agreed.

- **“Government initiatives or policies affecting our organisation are mostly positive”**

  Almost a fifth (19%) of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement while 39% were neutral or undecided. Churches (66%) and organisations delivering child care services (54.54%) had the highest portion of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement.

- **“Contract requirements adversely affect our organisational ability to deliver services”**

  When asked whether contract requirements adversely affect their organisational ability to deliver services, half (50%) of the respondents said that they are neutral (41%) or undecided (9%). The remainder of respondents were fairly evenly split between those that either agreed or strongly agreed (23%) and those that disagreed or strongly disagreed (28%).
G. ADVOCACY

The overwhelming majority of respondents positively commented on their ability to advocate on behalf of their clients with:

- 83% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that they regularly advocate on behalf of their clients;
- 84% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing they work with other organisations including peak bodies to advocate on behalf of their clients; and
- 74% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that they are able to speak out publicly about the issues facing their clients.
The respondents were asked in the survey to select the relevant sources of information that guide their organisation’s service planning, resource allocation and/or to identify gaps. From this response, community level (56.86%) and peak bodies and industry groups (50%) had half or more the number of respondents selecting this option with the majority recognising feedback from service users as a common information source (67.55%). A total of 14.75% had no response to this question and 9.80% specified other sources of information. These included “own registers”; “our database”, “own needs analysis”; “VCA Assembly advice”; “feedback from wider local community – surveys”; “needs in the community as presented”; “Archdiocesan information”; and “surgeons, specialise in Scoliosis”.

Figure 79 - Sources of information to guide service planning, resource allocation and/or identify gaps

The survey requested that respondents answer either ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to three statements in relation to planning within their organisation. From this binary approach, more than three quarters of respondents selected ‘yes’ to all three questions. As a result, it can be stated that Annual Reports are produced by 90.43% of organisations, operational/business plans by 86.81% and strategic or long term plans are put in place by 83.52% of organisations. With a binary approach, it is important to acknowledge the number of respondents who did not answer the question, which were the following:

- Strategic/long term plan – 11 participants did not respond
- Operational/business plan – 11 participants did not respond
- Annual report – 8 participants did not respond
I. GOVERNMENT RELATIONSHIPS

A total of 79 out of the 102 census respondents completed the matrix about government roles and relationships within the community services sector with results outlined below.

- **Provide funding**
  
  Respondents indicated that the provision of funding is a role which is primarily played by state (51 respondents) and federal government (38 respondents). Neither government, however, was identified by respondents as playing the role adequately with only a quarter (25.49%) of respondents saying they were satisfied with the state government’s performance and 36.84% with the federal government’s performance.

- **Build capacity**
  
  Building organisational capacity is a space which overall not many respondents identified governments as playing in. The majority of respondents who said that building capacity is a government role identified that role as being played by local (13 respondents) or state (12 respondents) government rather than the federal government (6 respondents).

  When respondents were further asked to identify whether they felt government is adequately playing this role a larger proportion of respondents were satisfied with the federal government’s performance (50%) as opposed to the state (25%) and local governments’(38.46%) performances.

- **Provide strategic direction and policy**
  
  The provision of strategic direction and policy is a role which respondents indicated is primarily played by state government (26 respondents) with only 38.46% of those respondents satisfied with the state government’s performance in this area.

  Interestingly, while only 11 organisations identified local government as providing strategic direction and policy, almost two thirds (63.64%) of those respondents indicated they were satisfied with local government performance in this area.

- **Provide information**
  
  The provision and distribution of information is a role which a comparatively large number of respondents indicated is being played by all three levels of government: local (33 respondents); state (32 respondents) and federal (23 respondents). Local and state government, however, had the highest satisfaction rating, with
approximately 69% of respondents stating that they though the state and local government are adequately acting in this role.

- **Facilitate partnerships**

  The facilitation of partnerships is role which respondents indicated is primarily being played by local and state government.

  Of the 22 respondents who identified that local government facilitates partnerships, 63.64% said they do so adequately. Similarly 56.25% of respondents who indicated that state government facilitates partnerships said they do so adequately.

- **Conduct research**

  A proportionately low number of respondents indicated that government roles include the conduction of research, with responses fairly evenly split between state (11 respondents), local (9 respondents) and federal (10 respondents) government.

  Respondents who indicated that government is acting in this role identified that for the most part it is not doing so adequately. Less than a third of respondent were satisfied with the state, federal and local government performance in this area.

- **Other**

  “Other” roles which respondents said government played included: maintenance; printing; photocopying and supplier.

![Figure 81 – Roles played by government](image-url)
Figure 82 – Adequacy of roles and relationships with the three levels of government

J. PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION

Partnerships

The eighty-two (82) organisations, who responded to this question, indicated that they participated in partnerships and co-ordination relationships for a variety of reasons, with the three most popular reasons including: client referral (61 responses); sharing information about projects and funding sources (50 responses) and joint service delivery (44 responses).

When respondents were asked to rate their experience of the various partnerships and co-ordination relationships they engage in, partnerships which received the highest number of positive responses included partnerships formed for purpose of:

- Sharing client information (97.44%) and client referrals (88.52%);
- Running joint campaigns (88.24%) and professional development activities (87.50%); and
- Joint strategic planning (96%), although responses for this option are slightly skewed given the results indicate that some respondents selected more than one option when asked to rate their experience as positive, negative or neutral.
Figure 83 - Partnerships which have been formed around a variety of activities
Figure 84 – Respondents’ experience of partnerships formed around a variety of activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing premises</td>
<td>81.21%</td>
<td>21.49%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running joint professional development activities</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing client information</td>
<td>91.44%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running joint campaigns</td>
<td>88.71%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information about projects and funding sources</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint case management</td>
<td>83.87%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint service delivery</td>
<td>77.77%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client referral</td>
<td>88.52%</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information about organisational structures</td>
<td>83.37%</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreton Bay Regional Council Community Services Sector Review
Interagencies and Networks

Of the sixty-eight (68) organisations that responded to this question, the majority indicated that they participated in interagencies/networks which had the function of sharing information (57 respondents) and joint professional development (39 respondents). As demonstrated by the graph in figure 85 below, interagencies with these two functions also resulted in the highest degree of participant satisfaction with:

- 84.62% of the respondents who said they participated in interagencies for the purpose of sharing information citing it as a positive experience; and
- 82.46% of the respondents who said they participated in interagencies for the purpose of joint professional development citing it as a positive experience.

Respondent organisations appeared less likely to participate in interagencies which had the function of joint service delivery (20 respondents) or joint planning (25 respondents) with participation in both these types of interagencies also resulting in a larger number of neutral experiences. Additional comments made by respondents, suggested that these neutral experiences were more as a result of how the interagency meetings are managed and run, rather than the function of the interagency itself. Four (4) respondents also made comment that more interagencies with the function of joint strategic planning and building of cooperative relationships would be beneficial.
K. COMMUNITY RECOVERY

A total of 36.89% of respondents indicated that their organisation has indirectly been involved in a natural disaster in the last 12 months while 20.39% said they have been directly involved. Only 38.83% indicated that they have had no involvement in responding to natural disasters.

![Bar chart showing response to natural disasters in the last 12 months](image)

Figure 87 - Response of organisations involved in natural disasters in the last 12 months

Of the 59 respondents that said they have been directly or indirectly involved in responding to natural disaster in the last 12 months, 30 said they assisted in the Moreton Bay region, 23 in Brisbane and 20 elsewhere. The 20 respondents who selected 'elsewhere' included areas such as state wide or worldwide and more specific responses such as Toowoomba, Cairns, Mackay, Charleville, Rocklea, Lockyer Valley, Gympie, Gatton and Rockhampton.

It should also be noted that a total of 73 responses were recorded for this question by 59 organisations indicating that respondents selected more than one of the options available for selection.

![Bar chart showing area of assistance](image)

Figure 88 - Area of assistance
Community Resilience
Respondent organisations were asked to indicate whether they agreed
1. they have the resilience to survive a natural disaster; and
2. the Moreton Bay community has the resilience to survive a natural disaster.

While very few respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that their organisation or the community had the resilience to suffer a natural disaster, respondents appeared to be more confident of their own resilience with 76% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that they were able to survive a natural disaster. In comparison only 68% of respondents were confident of the community’s resilience.

![Figure 29 – Respondents’ and communities resilience to survive a natural disaster](image)

L. LOOKING FORWARD

Top threats to and opportunities for the community sector in Moreton Bay

In identifying their top three (3) threats to the community sector in Moreton Bay, census respondents commented on a broad spectrum of issues, ranging from those impacting directly on clients, to those issues impacting on their organisations’ ability to deliver services throughout the region. A table outlining the top threats identified is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threats to Organisations</th>
<th>Threat Identified</th>
<th>No of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of funding and financial resources</td>
<td>29 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Population growth resulting in increased demand on services and infrastructure – unmet demand</td>
<td>13 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Insufficient and inadequate resources including equipment and infrastructure/facilities out of which to run programs and services</td>
<td>9 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shortage of suitably qualified staff</td>
<td>4 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High workload</td>
<td>4 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Staff attrition and retention</td>
<td>4 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Decline in volunteer numbers</td>
<td>3 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lack of collaboration, cooperation and service coordination</td>
<td>4 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Government Bureaucracy including changes to policies and procedures</td>
<td>4 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Economic climate &amp; concerns</td>
<td>3 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lack of government support</td>
<td>3 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Threat to the Community Services Sector Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Competitive tendering processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Change in government and government policies overriding social agendas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Increasing wage awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fragmented approach to service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Change in government and government policies overriding social agendas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lack of planning and support for community services working in Deception Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Demographic of the region which includes a higher than average number of low socioeconomic areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Changes to regulations surrounding the administration of funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Small and effective community based organisations being absorbed by larger national organisations with little regional awareness and increased bureaucratic requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Costs associated with operating/facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lack of communication between organisations and government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Failure to adequately identify emerging trends and needs in the sector and strategically plan appropriate responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lack of training for community service workers &amp; volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lack of employment pathways for community sector workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Smaller organisations becoming unsustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Too many child care providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Size of the region and the range of issues that can be identified across the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Community hubs result in smaller groups getting left behind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lack of opportunities to share information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lack of awareness of organisations and the services and programs they deliver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Council restructures and the resulting breakdown in community relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Inadequate consultation with elders surrounding the delivery of services to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Privatisation of child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Follow up for projects like the Community Services Sector Review not done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Lack of local leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Evidence based policy used by state government is ineffective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Referral process from government to services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Government move to funding national organisations rather than local organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Threat to clients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat Identified</th>
<th>No of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of affordable Housing and Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accessibility, affordability and suitability of Transport options and infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employment/Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Natural disasters including floods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poverty and financial stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Affordability of accessing community services e.g. counselling, child care services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aging population and insufficient facilities and programs for aged care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lack of community spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increase in the cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Health issues (incl Hendra Virus, chronic diseases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 – Top threats to the community sector in Moreton Bay

Census respondents were also asked to identify their top three (3) opportunities for region. Responses are outlined in the table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities for the sector</th>
<th>No of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Increased collaborative relationships and partnerships with other community organisations, businesses and government</td>
<td>17 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Address community issues and needs such as disability employment, low cost housing, truancy, financial stress, employment, youth support, crisis accommodation, family support, disability inclusion, social isolation, community care</td>
<td>16 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sharing of information, resources and ideas across the sector enabling the organisations to better respond to, and advocate for, community issues and needs</td>
<td>8 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Establish more and better networks and networking opportunities, particularly around common issues</td>
<td>6 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grow government interest, support and resources/funding for the region</td>
<td>5 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Increased knowledge and awareness of the needs and gaps in the Moreton Bay region</td>
<td>5 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Location and Lifestyle</td>
<td>4 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Strategic planning for future community development needs</td>
<td>4 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Strong regional growth</td>
<td>3 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Increasing number variety and quality of community services to deal with rising demand</td>
<td>3 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Building awareness of available community services and programs e.g. mapping community services</td>
<td>3 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Development of more spaces where people can participate in a range of cultural and passive and active recreational activities</td>
<td>3 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Strong, supportive and proactive Council</td>
<td>3 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Building of additional infrastructure to support community services and respond to community needs (e.g. low income housing, crisis accommodation)</td>
<td>2 comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Make available more land for the development of for community infrastructure and facilities</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Improve access and social inclusion by increasing public transport coverage (e.g. rail)</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Building a coordinate response to natural disasters e.g flooding</td>
<td>2 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Strengthening government and community relationships</td>
<td>2 comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 – Top opportunities for the community sector in Moreton Bay

General Comments

At the conclusion of the survey, respondents were provided with the opportunity to comment on any matters of further importance to them that may not have been covered in the survey. Key themes which emerged included:

- Comments about the applicability of census and/or various sections of the census to respondents such as service clubs and volunteer groups.
- Opportunities that sharing information and resources could offer for the community sector.
- Gaps in service delivery in localities such as Burpengary, Narangba.
- High levels of need identified in Deception Bay.
- Opportunities for increased local government support of the community services sector.
- The need to better link government and community services.
6. FOCUSED INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUPS

6.1 METHODOLOGY

In late August and early September, staff from Engagement Plus and Council facilitated a number of focused interviews and focus groups. The aim of this activity was to explore in more detail some of the findings from previous engagement activities as well as check for understanding.

Engagement Plus staff met with a staff member from six organisations for an hour long interview. The organisations chosen were a mix of size and focus and are listed below.

- BlueCare Redcliffe
- Boystown Deception Bay
- Caboolture Area Multicultural Service (CAMS)
- Deception Bay Community Youth Programs (DBCP)
- Homelife Community Care Caboolture
- Murriajabree Deception Bay

In addition to these interviews, Council staff also facilitated four focus groups with existing networks. It is estimated that between 35 and 40 groups represented. The networks attended were:

- Collective Action Group
- Community Wellbeing Collective
- Early Years Centre Caboolture
- Housing and Homelessness Forum

6.2 FINDINGS

Community and sector issues, needs and opportunities identified by interview participants have been presented under the relevant heading below.

Identification of Community Issues, Needs and Opportunities

Housing
- Of particular concern is the inability to house people in the region, with them having to move further out and losing connections with their families and networks, further exacerbating social isolation. The point was also raised that the housing sector is always working as a crisis response rather than a planned one.

Transport
- Community was raised as an issue at nearly every meeting. Comments were made about the needed for coordinated community transport and how there had been several attempts to develop something to respond to this need. Despite this there is a project underway in Deception Bay in this area and the need is perceived to be great throughout the region.
- There was also a belief that the government had a role in advocating for the community in transport planning.

Other identified general community needs and issues include:

- Need for cultural understanding programs
• Need for occasional care. This is something that is offered in Victoria but despite “incredibly significant need” is not offered in Queensland.
• Need for more funding for homelessness services such as KEIHS
• Better support from DSQ for people with a disability under the age of 65
• Need for a Pacific Islander group
• Social isolation
• Need for an affordable wound care solution for older people
• Literacy and numeracy skills for people from non-English Speaking backgrounds. It is reported that the Education Queensland program is servicing too large an area to be affective and those that undertake TAFE courses are given technical rather than functional language skills.
• Long term unemployment for people that have undertaken training

Identification of Sector Issues, Needs and Opportunities

Facilities
• This need was identified numerous times and related to the provision, planning and funding for community facilities. Comments such as “service and programs are run out of houses, that aren’t properly zoned because funding doesn’t allow for capital” were common.
• There was also a query for how the new youth facility at North Lakes was identified and being funded and whether that funding could apply to other facilities.
• Shared use of facilities was also raised with some questioning the opportunity to utilise existing spaces better.
• One participant saw the need for space as becoming superseded stating that technology can liberate the sector from their desks, where you can teleconference with colleagues to save time to meet with clients.
• The sector is keen to be engaged in any facility planning that Council
• An identified opportunity by interviewees included Local and State government partnering to provide facilities
• Local government assisting to utilise facilities better
• Utilising the libraries as community spaces where “people can be welcomed and valued”

Coordination
• The coordination and sharing of resources came up as an issue repeatedly with coordination identified as the key gap in the sector at the present time.
• Many believed Council could play a key role connecting and assisting in negotiations to enable partnerships and collaboration by identifying groups with synergies
• Sharing of resources and information was given most often as the examples of what needed coordination

Contractual Arrangement and Funding
• Comments related to the funding limitations, in that the contracts do not allow for reasonable rent, pay changes and time to undertake strategic planning and the program funding growth is not matched to the population growth and demand.
• Bureaucratic requirements such as audit, standard and reporting requirement vary with the funding agencies and the risk management requirements have “reached overload” becoming cumbersome and ineffectual
• The short length of contracts is reported not to allow for flexibility.
• The change in policy and eligibility requirements makes it difficult for clients and workers to negotiate pathways.
• Value adding such as using collaborative approaches is not supported in the contractual model although there are some reported positive changes regarding this in the Reconnect Program.

Service Mapping
• Those interviewed were all keen for an information source that identifies all services and programs in the region. Many of those interviewed used the word “portal” without being prompted.
• One respondent stated that the region cannot have “a well networked and collaborative approach [to addressing need] without knowing what’s out there”.
• One responded stated that it did not need to be too big, just a case level and if organisations want to add extra they can do that themselves. Examples of service mapping to explore offered by interviewees include the Alliance Database in Deception Bay and the work that Sunshine Coast is currently undertaking with mapping.

Community Development & Prevention as opposed to Service Delivery Response
• Some of the people interviewed stated that despite a verbal commitment to prevention and early intervention, this was the area that had seen the most funding cuts from government agencies in recent years. These people saw this gap as an opportunity, especially for local government. The sentiment is best described in the following statement from an interview:

> Government policy is driven by need which determines services. Through a body of evidence we need this service, a program is rolled out, a service is chose, workers are taken on board. Local government is not bound so much by that approach. If we’re going to build community capacity, we need development and prevention. Where funding cuts have been the greatest.

• There was an acknowledgement that this response is more intensive and less quantifiable.
• When speaking about developmental and preventative approaches, interviewees referred to the building of social capital so that we can “get people engaged with each other again”

Engagement and Advocacy between Government and the Sector
• The point was made by one interviewee that some strategic issues are better addressed by peak bodies, rather than local government as it not in their sphere. It was recognised that local government could, however, play a champion role for the sector, if they had effective mechanisms to gain information from the sector.
• The need for appropriate mechanisms was mentioned on more than one occasion with a belief that that there needs to be processes and points for information to feed up rather than taking an ad hoc approach. It was suggested that existing forums such as the Wellbeing Collective or new forums could be utilised for this.
• It was identified by one interviewee that town planning is local government’s core business and “so many planning decisions affect community amenity and community capacity building” and that there needed to be more engagement with the sector around these decision.

Sector Capacity Building and Strategic Planning
• Governance was identified as an area that smaller organisations in particular could benefit from great understanding.
• The importance of strategic planning in making organisations responsive and sustainable was also identified.
• One smaller organisation stated they have difficulty knowing what funding is available and would like assistance with this.

Information Coordination and Management
• There was strong agreements that a “connector” was needed to bring government, groups and networks together more effectively.
• Many of those interviewed believed Council was currently an excellent source of information but there was still room to improve.
• A common sentiment was best articulated as, “There needs to be a considered approach to the distribution of information”. With Council identifying its purposes for engaging and then planning activities around these rather than taking a scattergun approach.
• All called for a central source or clearing house of information where information and communication was “succinct, regular and clearly labelled” with less forwarding of sometimes irrelevant emails.
• Information required included: other organisations, changes in government policy and programs, funding opportunities, contact details, events and best practice examples.

Interagencies
• All of those interviewed found the time commitment required for interagencies a hindrance to attending, with one person stating “we don’t go to the interagencies because we’re just too busy. If we’re going to pay someone for four hours it will be to help get someone off the street”.
• Many reported previously attending interagencies but with them now spread throughout the region, the travel time and relevance was less, with one respondent stating “the Council might have amalgamated, but we haven’t”. One interviewee said that “we have lost our local networks to ineffective regional ones”.
• The effectiveness of interagencies was also questioned, with some believing they were “talkfests” and “bragging sessions” while others stating they held value for networking and information sharing especially for less experienced workers.
• All of those interviewed believed that forums for action planning were needed.
• While most of those engaged believe the interagencies need to be reviewed, they equally welcomed opportunities for networking such as the community café recently held at Caboolture.

Place Based Approaches
• All those interviewed were supportive of place based approaches to addressing community need.
• One suggested process would be to use statistics to identify locations and then build capacity and social infrastructure in local organisations that could then be provided with incentives to respond.
• One point was made that it would depend on the drivers as the approach could be “throwing good money after bad” if the right people weren’t at the table.
• Some of the focus group recommended possible locations for place projects. These were: LIST

Social Enterprise, Social Procurement and Corporate Social Responsibility
• Most of those interviewed brought up the need for support and development of social enterprise and social procurement.
• This was seen by all as important for organisational sustainability which is less reliant on funding.
• There has been some attempts, including in Deception Bay, to get social enterprise up and running and the President of the Deception Bay Neighbourhood Centre works for Social Ventures Australia.
• Examples of social procurement and social enterprise projects offered by interviewees included: garden maintenance, bush tarter gardens, traineeship programs, working with indigenous residents to help them maintain their properties so they don’t lose their tenancies and a café at the Caboolture Hub.
• An example of a successful social enterprise in the region is the Caboolture Coop Café started by the PCYC
• As well as social procurement and social enterprise, it was identified that the business sector could partner with community organisations to achieve social outcomes in Corporate Social Responsibility projects.

Employment Programs
• On a number of occasions, the opportunity to open local government up to benefit the community was raised, particularly in relation to employment programs.
• One interviewee thought Council should take student placements and the Brisbane City Council Multicultural Employment Infrastructure Program was cited as an example of a project Moreton Bay should consider.

Pilot Projects
• When asked what pilot projects local government could consider, most of those interviewed believed that the community should decide.
• One respondent expanded by saying there should be community forums where the community identifies issues and responses and another said that “when capacity is built if using a place based approach then the community would be in a good position to identify what projects to undertake”
• In some cases, specific projects were identified, such as an ATSI Early Childhood Network, possible conference and breakfast clubs, a Disability Action Plan, Mens Shed, Community Gardens, A Community Development Framework for the sector and work around community indicators
• The Social Infrastructure Program with the former Caboolture Council and Department of Communities and the project that resulted in the Bagama booklet was cited as an example.

Sector and Government Relationships and Partnerships
• Many of the interviewees reported good relationships with their local elected Councillors and members but stated that it would be good to have more participation from Councillors and presence at key events. One interviewee said that it would be great to have commitment from the Mayor around key issues affecting the community such as youth mental health.
• Interviewees stated on a few occasions that when entering partnerships the government agencies and departments need to be clear about intent, direction and what they could offer when engaging with the sector.
• One interviewee stated that some agencies would only “play on their terms” which made it difficult to partner.
• A number of interviewees believed that government officers could spend more talking to organisations and attending key events.
• Promotion of the sector by recognising and celebrating best practice was identified by some interviewees.
• A couple of interviewees believed there was a lack of internal dialogue in government and others mentioned that some officers had been extremely helpful in “holding their hand through the systems”
• Many of those interviewed believed that duplication between the three levels of government added to their workload.
7. CONCLUSION

This Engagement Report is the result of broad range of community engagement activities that have been undertaken as part of the Moreton Bay Regional Council Community Services Sector Review. The synthesis and analysis of the collated results outlined in the sections above will be presented in the main report.