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Capacity Building Seminar on "Getting the Young into Jobs: the Role of Partnerships", 26 – 28 October 2009, Trento, Italy

Ensuring a smooth and quick transition from education to employment and fighting education drop-out trends are key objectives of youth policies across OECD countries. The seminar is addressed to those already working in partnerships on youth policies, or in the process of establishing a partnership in one of the following areas: (i) promoting entrepreneurship; (ii) youth skills initiatives; and (iii) integrating youth with accumulated disadvantages. Read more...

Study Visit to Territorial Employment Pacts in Austria on “Partnerships for Labour Market Inclusion”, 28 – 30 September 2009, Innsbruck, Austria

The study visit offers the possibility to: (i) get insights about the TEPs labour market integration strategies and programmes, their rationale, development and how barriers to their effective implementation have been addressed; (ii) learn about the organisational and funding structure of Austrian TEPs within the framework of the ESF; and (iii) network with people running local social inclusion projects. Please send your application to foerschner@zsi.at before 31st August 2009. Read more...

Partnerships for social inclusion

In October 2008 an international conference on Partnerships for Social Inclusion was organised in Melbourne as the result of a long standing collaboration between the OECD LEED Programme, the Centre for Public Policy at the University of Melbourne, the Victorian Department of Planning and Community Development. On the back of the conference, that gathered over 450 participants, we have developed a special issue of the Forum news-letter to ensure that the rich learning emerging from Australia and New Zealand is transferred to partnerships and government officials across all OECD and non-OECD countries.
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Setting the context: Challenges for partnerships’ development in Australia

Australia. In his introductory speech to the conference Professor Considine focused on one central concern, the place of partnerships in the overall map of government responsibilities. Are they an instrument of policy in the same way as are programmes, contracts and grants? Or are they a form of institutional reform, in the same way as ministerial councils, tribunals and planning authorities?

Professor Considine’s proposition is the latter – the governance advantages of partnerships exceed that of a new programme. Partnerships offer gains in efficiency and legitimacy that extend beyond existing structures. They are a means of making economic and social arrangements more collaborative. But can this be done without generating a new set of problems? To explore this further the Australian context the case history the Playford Partnership in South Australia was analysed.

>> The following conclusions set the ground for the conference discussions:

- Australian partnerships are exciting but fragile
- Some show capacity to re-invent, often with significant loss of momentum
- Even 2 or 3 years of experience produces enhanced capacity to collaborate, prioritise and act strategically
- Programme funding is too temporary to sustain institution building
- Lack of government agreement on what institutional capacity they want from partnerships
- Original ‘sponsor’ department fails to enact durable role, so elections and reorganisations lead to erosion of commitment
- Weak commitment to enhancing the role and capacity of local government - state and federal departments over-rule
- Poor integration of social and economic programs reflects departmentalism at government level
- So, either shift back to using partnerships as an instrument with no institutional expectations (enhanced contracts) or invest in governance capacity.

Read the full paper and presentation...

1 Mark Considine is an Australian Research Council Professorial Fellow and a Fellow of the Institute of Public Administration Australia (Victoria) and the Australian Academy of Social Sciences. Mark's most recent book, Making Public Policy: Institutions, Actors, Strategies, was published by Polity Press in 2005. In 2000, Mark and co-author Jenny Lewis received the American Society for Public Administration's Marshall E. Dimmock Award for the best lead article in Public Administration Review. In 2001, Mark received the American Educational Research Association's Outstanding Publication Award for The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia (Cambridge University Press, 2000). Mark has been associated with governments and the community sector in the implementation of a number of recent projects and organisational reviews.
Partnerships and combating social exclusion in New Zealand

New Zealand. Steve Maharey, Vice-Chancellor of Massey University, provided a historical perspective of the relationship between voluntary organisations, government and welfare in New Zealand starting from the 19th century when both government and non-government agencies were gathering their resources, and when assistance was basic by modern standards but very progressive by world standards.

More recently, the past decade saw major changes in the way the state worked with the community. Significantly, a Ministry of Social Development (MSD) had been formed indicating the Government’s intention to implement policies consistent with the social investment approach. The focus was on finding solutions to social issues rather than on income transfers to those in need. MSD had considerable policy capacity, access to decentralised service delivery throughout New Zealand and provided a home for a new office serving the needs of the community and voluntary sector. Agencies like Child Youth and Family began local area mapping to establish what services were needed and who would provide them in consultation with community groups. The Treasury released material on a new approach to contracts that allowed for longer more flexible arrangements and simpler forms of accountability. Larger community agencies with multiple funders were able to negotiate one contract with a lead funder, improving accountability.

>> Local government and central government began to work more closely together. The Local Government Act was changed to allow for a “general power of competence” extending the role of local government to the social domain. They were required to produce a community plan showing what services they would provide. The community became increasingly involved in the delivery of services related to early interventions, family support, parenting, domestic violence, housing, community regeneration, justice, health, youth development, community safety and many other activities. New initiatives such as social entrepreneurs, the granting of funds to local trusts to drive social programmes under local control, and partnerships with Maori and Pacific Island communities were trialled. Tax changes allowed for more philanthropic giving to assist community organisations. All of this activity was and is productive. However, much remains to be done to overcome some major problems with partnering. One of this is accountability and impact assessment: partnering with the community means public funds being spent on initiatives that may, or may not, show a return. The following action can help overcome the difficulties:

- The partnership does have to be more equal. This means putting in place a formal Compact setting out the rights and responsibilities of each party.
- Resources have to be made available to community groups so they can undertake their own policy development and represent their own interests.
- There has to be an acceptance that the state and the community operate in different, but valuable, ways. The whole point of the partnership is to draw on the strengths of each sector.
- Accountability has to be made simple and not require community agencies to report to large number of state agencies.
- There has to be an acceptance of failure. Social issues are difficult to resolve. Failure is the only way to learn what to do next.
- Community organisations have to accept that they must have professional management and rely less on volunteers. Volunteering is still vital but the core of a community group of any size needs to be paid and accountable.
- There are too many community groups. While new groups will always appear in response to a need, if real progress is to made rationalisation of numbers is essential.
- Local communities need volunteer centres where induction and training can be provided.
- There has to be full funding of the work community groups are asked to do.

Follow the link to read the full paper.
Social inclusion and the complexity of the labour market in a global economy

OECD LEED Programme. In his keynote presentation Sylvain Giguère from the OECD analysed social inclusion as part of a broad and complex labour market management agenda.

Labour market policies traditionally focus on the supply side to equip individuals with the right skills and to ensure that they fulfill their potential on the labour market. This is becoming increasingly challenging in the context of increased labour mobility, volatility in employment, wages and benefits, and difficulty to forecast skills needs of businesses. At the same time, action needs to be taken on the demand side, working with employers to better understand their needs but also helping them improve their utilisation of skills as one aspect of raising local productivity. This complex agenda calls for increased flexibility in the management of labour market policy, including better coordination of sector policies that could provide scope for policy integration at local level. The preliminary estimates of the OECD study on the Effects of Flexibility of Active Labour Market Policy suggest that sub-regional flexibility is positively and statistically significantly related to employment rates in the countries surveyed by the OECD.

See the full presentation...

The EU New Skills for New Jobs initiative

European Commission. What jobs will be available in the next 10 years? Is the training provided now useful to finding a job tomorrow? Are skills needs and job profiles changing?

The European Commission’s "new skills for new jobs" initiative, presented by Robert Strauss, is devised to improve the anticipation of labour market and skills needs in the context of technological change and the ageing population. An initial assessment of skills and labour market needs in European countries up to 2020 foresees increasing demand over the next decade for a high-qualified and adaptable workforce, and a risk of labour market polarisation. To better face these challenges, this new initiative seeks to promote a more comprehensive collection of information on the Union’s future skills and job requirements to facilitate better matching.
Partnering with a Purpose: a comprehensive social inclusion approach

Australia. The Brotherhood of St Laurence’s working definition of social inclusion is: ‘A social inclusion approach involves the building of personal capacities and material resources, in order to fulfil one’s potential for economic and social participation, and thereby a life of common dignity.’

It stresses personal capacities – health, education social networks, material resources – adequate housing, transport, income, access to information technologies and access to services, to fulfil potential for economic – work – and social participation – cultural, political, recreational, sporting and everyday living activities. In his presentation, Tony Nicholson, Executive Director, Brotherhood of St Laurence, outlined a set of principles that derive from this definition and that are instructive of the type of partnering relationships necessary to implement this type of social inclusion approach:

1. Social Inclusion must be a matter for all Australians – involving business, all levels of government and the community sector.

2. Economic and social participation will be at the top of the hierarchy of outcomes we seek. Other outcomes, such as housing for example, will be shaped by the participation objective.

3. The most effective social inclusion strategy will have ‘prevention’ as a main focus. Prevention has to be front and centre in the policy and practice of mainstream agencies delivering health and education. Social Inclusion can’t be left to those picking up the pieces after the event.

4. Joined up service delivery must be matched by joined up policy. Joined up service delivery will be matched by joined up policy that in turn is reflected in joined up arrangements for the procurement of services.

5. Fifthly, devolved governance structures are necessary to maximise the effective allocation of resources, and to integrate programs at the local level.

>> There are four important preconditions for these principles to be implemented:

1. Both mainstream and specialist providers of services need to have Social Inclusion measures as part of their key performance indicators.

2. To tackle locational disadvantage we need to find new mechanisms for setting priorities and driving integration at the local level by constructing a funnel to capture resources from multiple sources – governments at all levels, business, philanthropy, and community organisations.

3. Because of the diverse cultures and ways of working between the worlds of business, government and community there is a need for deal brokers – people who can work effectively across sectors.

4. These principles should be reflected in a compact between the community sector and the national government.

Follow the link to read the full presentation…
Issues in Corporate-Not For Profit Partnerships

Australia. Private sector participation in community development and social inclusion has evolved from philanthropic action (chairman’s wife syndrome) to embedded strategy. According to Geoff Allen, Director and Founder, Allen Consulting Group, for the collaboration to be successful certain conditions should be put in place:

1. Both parties are committed to mutual benefit that can be articulated and understood by both parties; Neither will be in a dependency relationship to the other as a result of the partnership;

2. Both parties are able to demonstrate the relevance of the partnership to their own stakeholders, and society at large;

3. Both parties recognise the strategic importance of the partnership beyond the immediate programme’s objectives and deliverables, to the longer-term importance of sustainability, reputation, and social cohesion;

4. Both parties are committed to transparency and accountability in all aspects of the partnership.

5. Both parties are committed to establishing a mutually agreeable exit strategy.

6. These objectives should be articulated in comprehensive and formal contracts with community partners which set out mutual expectations and obligations, and criteria for evaluating performance.

Follow the link to read the full presentation…
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNT: Lessons from the conference

**Key points.** Professor Mark Considine summarised the key points emerging from the Melbourne *Partnerships for Social Inclusion* conference as follows.

>> Practice is clearly ahead of policy development and theory. Policy development and theory is emerging from practice rather than the other way around. One key challenge from the conference is how to better capture and be a part of that practical learning that is happening.

>> Social inclusion strategies almost invariably play out very locally, driven by local leadership. Leadership can come from anywhere and is more often than not ‘distributed’ as opposed to being one lone hero at work. The ability to better understand and support local networks and other governance arrangements – especially in joining up locally – is a key challenge. This is an area where the OECD has considerable experience to draw upon.

>> The importance of trust relationships. The glue of partnerships is around trust and specific shared objectives – including the willingness to change. Partnerships involve a change of culture and skill sets within all sectors.

>> There are multiple models of partnerships for social inclusion. So much depends on the point in time – what the issues are, where the energy is, what resources can be marshalled and which networks and institutions will commit. Social inclusion partnerships no longer operate within the more traditional ‘welfare paradigm’ but cross a range of boundaries and intersect with mainstream participation in social, economic and civic life. The OECD LEED Programme speakers in particular highlighted the importance of skills and employment strategies as both mainstream and targeted opportunities to building social inclusion. We can all continue to learn from both local and international activities.

>> There is considerable interest in growing a national agenda – in partnership between governments, communities and business. The initial focus for national effort outside of the Ministerial Council arrangements could be:

  ✓ A national approach to research effort to ensure both that we continue to learn from current practices and that such research is better shared. The pace of practice is accelerating well beyond the current capacity of universities to partner with research and evaluation. It’s important that universities have better capacity for real time engagement with current practice developments.

  ✓ A systemic approach for identifying and disseminating best practice in policy development, programme design, research, evaluation and local governance.

  ✓ A joint focus on building capacity within governments, business and the community sector, especially around policy design and broader strategy.
Learning from each other: partnerships’ experiences presented at the conference

Two days of work were structured around 21 thematic workshops focusing on various aspects of partnership working and on how partnerships contribute to:

- Improve inclusion for the aged
- Improve accessibility
- Rural and regional development
- Increase social inclusion through the arts
- Area-based development
- Support diversity
- Improve governance
- Indigenous and diverse communities’ development
- Sustainability and the environment
- Community enterprise development
- Skills
- Education
- Youth
- Health and caring

Read more about partnership initiative in the next sections ...
PARTNERSHIPS AND INCLUSION FOR THE AGED

Workshop presentations

- Social Inclusion and the Politics of Ageing in Australia by Elizabeth Ozanne, University of Melbourne
- Direct Payments and Social Inclusion by Jed Donoghue, Salvation Army
- Count Us In! Report of a Pilot Project Addressing Social Inclusion for People Living in Residential Aged Care by Susan Malta, Swinburne University of Technology, Victoria
- Empowering older people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (CALD) in Regional Victoria through collaboration and community strengthening strategies, Klaudia Vainshtein, Centre for Cultural Diversity in Ageing, Victoria, and Frances Salenga, North East Multicultural Association, Victoria

Summary

By Michael Newman

Liz Ozanne, University of Melbourne, opened the workshop with a discussion of the challenges in the Australian context of achieving a broadly based and representative structure in relation to aged based interest. Though there have been several successful mergers of mainly service provider organisations in the past, the much touted National Seniors/Council on the Ageing merger collapsed in 2007. Liz identified the barriers for older people to participate in political debate and effectively influence public policy. These include the fact that whilst age may be a common denominator, politics is not necessarily shared as older voters tend to be more loyal to a particular party rather than an issue. The polarisation of pensioners and self funded retirees is another factor that inhibits older people being able to find a single and more influential voice.

The next presentations by Jed Donoghue, Salvation Army and Chris Taylor, North Sydney Council, Susan Malta, Swinburne University, and Klaudia Vainshtein, Centre for Cultural Diversity in Aging and Frances Salenga, North East Multicultural Association all explored various practical models for achieving greater social inclusion for the aged.

Chris touched on the benefits of a North Sydney Council pilot programme where socially isolated aged residents can apply for funds from a flexibly funding pool to pay for services as needed. The benefit of the model is the sense of control that it gives to the resident and provides engagement with service providers. This small step can start the process of isolated residents re-forming connections with the broader community. Sue presented her experiences of the ‘Count us In!’ project in Victoria. ‘Count us In’ aims to build networks between aged residents and the broader community and in doing so, break down barriers and change attitudes. Sue outlined her specific experience with an aged care facility in Daylesford that had partnered with the University of the Third Age to provide stimulating courses in an aged care setting. The project delivered a range of positive outcomes including improved health and wellbeing (and in some instances individuals reduced their medication) increased interaction between the community and the residents, and reducing negative perceptions of aged care facilities by the community. Like Chris, Sue spoke of the ‘ripple effect’ that projects like this can have in stimulating the impetus for building further connections and relationships outside the original scope of the projects.

In the last presentation for the workshop, Klaudia and Frances discussed an innovative model that sought to identify the needs of aged people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and better link them to service provision. Through a unique partnership between the Centre for Cultural Diversity in Aging and North East Multicultural Association, the project aims to identify and train cultural peer facilitators from specific communities. The project has been highly successful in identifying issues for community members that have previously had limited opportunities to voice concern and linking them to specific services.
Direct Payments and Social Inclusion

By Jed Donoghue

This paper examines the provision of direct payments and their impact on social isolation. We define what social isolation means, and then evaluate the role of direct payments in the provision of social services in the United Kingdom. International research indicates that in some cases direct payments or self directed service provision helps to reduce social isolation.

Hall and Havens (1996) note that social isolation is a particular problem for older people because they have difficulties in negotiating public transport and bad weather. They can be embarrassed by their physical limitations, or lack an awareness of available services and resources. In addition, older people find particular social services too costly or restrictive.

>> In Australia there are an increasing number of older residents who are isolated, but would benefit from having greater choice in terms of how they access and receive social services. Increased access to direct payments could help to reduce waiting lists for traditional social services and address gaps in service provision. The paper concludes by suggesting that directs payments have the capacity to reduce social isolation in Australia.

Count Us In! Report of a Pilot Project Addressing Social Inclusion for People Living in Residential Aged Care

By Susan Malta

The Department of Human Services Count Us In! initiative was launched in 2006 to promote social inclusion for people living in residential aged care. The initiative provided grants to community organisations and Public Sector Residential Aged Care Services (PSRACS) to implement 16 pilot projects across metropolitan and rural Victoria. The aims of the projects were to:

- identify and break down barriers to social inclusion
- provide current residents with opportunities to be involved in positive activities
- produce positive examples of approaches that work
- establish and build on existing resources and networks to support inclusion
- change behaviours, attitudes and cultures of all stakeholders

>> This presentation describes one such pilot project run by Eastern Access Community Health (EACH) and implemented in 2007/2008 in Healesville, in Melbourne’s outer east. The project was successful, not only in meeting all criteria but by becoming self-sustainable at the end of the pilot phase. The project is marked as an exemplar due to its ease of implementation and its ability to bring together different community and partnership sectors, but also because of its relative low cost and high capacity to deliver benefits to its identified population group. The most important aspect of this particular project, however, is its potential to be easily applied in other areas on a state-wide or even National basis.

For further information, please contact SMalta@groupwise.swin.edu.au
Empowering older people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (CALD) in Regional Victoria through collaboration and community strengthening strategies

By Klaudia Vainshtein

The aim of North East Multicultural Association (NEMA) Aged Migrant Connections Project is to identify the needs of older people from CALD backgrounds and to link them to aged care services through volunteer Cultural Peer Facilitators. An innovative element of this project was the adopted methodology which involved the close collaboration and partnerships between NEMA and other organisations. Each of the organisations brought to the project their expertise that improved the process and outcomes of the project. The Centre for Cultural Diversity in Ageing played an important partnership role in this project. The presentation provides an overview of the processes undertaken to initiate community strengthening strategies through collaboration with diverse organisations.

For further information, please contact klaudia@culturaldiversity.com.au and nema@wangaratta.vic.gov.au

PARTNERSHIPS AND ACCESSIBILITY

Workshop presentations

- **Improving local transport and accessibility in rural areas through partnerships** by Andrew Wear, Department of Planning and Community Development, Victoria
- **Transport Connections - Partnerships for Sustainability** by Margo Northey, Department of Planning and Community Development, Victoria, by Sharon Simon Department of Planning and Community Development, Victoria
- **Case Study, Mountain Rivers Community Bus** by Ron Lambert, Baw Baw Shire Council, Victoria

Key issues

Efforts to address local transport and accessibility issues using a partnership approach have generally been concentrated in rural areas. This is because the policy context in urban and rural areas is quite different, and different governance mechanisms are therefore appropriate in each case. The three presentations provide a snapshot of the rationale for using collaborative structures such as partnerships to govern rural transport and accessibility issues. Partnerships in transport are useful because:

- Local transport and accessibility issues are complex, intersecting with many sectors, levels of government and policy areas;
- Low population densities and resource constraints in rural areas make innovation and flexibility in local transport a necessity;
- All rural areas are different, and strategies need to take into account local problems and opportunities;
- Effective delivery of projects often depends on the expertise or capacity of multiple actors, from multiple sectors; and
- Due to their local legitimacy, they are well-placed to influence policy.

There are challenges associated with the use of partnerships, although these difficulties are outweighed by the benefits. As the partnerships operating in this area mature, there will no doubt be continuing ongoing discussion on ways in which improved local governance can assist to deliver improved local transport and accessibility to local communities.
RURAL AND REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS

Workshop papers
- “Local and regional partnerships: how and by whom are they built and maintained?” by Christopher McDonald, Monash University, Victoria
- “Partnerships in a rural New Zealand community, Horowhenua District Council, New Zealand”, by Jim Crook, Horowhenua District Council, New Zealand
- “Small Rural Towns, Philanthropy and Government Working Together: The Community Building Initiative and the Macpherson Smith Community Alliance”, by Cath Peterson, Department of Planning and Community Development, Victoria and Chris Wootton, Helen Macpherson Smith Trust, Victoria
- “Local Futures”, by Jeff McNeil, FRST Futures Research Project, New Zealand

Summary of Presentations

By Ban Lian NG

The four papers focussed on local and regional partnerships in Australia and New Zealand. The common themes that emanate were the locus of decision-making, multi-level partnerships, the success of small, well-focused initiatives, and strategic planning based on the identification of local community outcomes.

Chris McDonald’s paper examined the importance of partnerships as a delivery mechanism for government initiatives, and the need to pay attention to influence the roles and responsibilities, membership and priorities of these partnerships, and how this influence occurs. Based on an example of the Laverton Community Renewal project in outer Melbourne, McDonald presented three approaches to sustain collaborative networking, ie: a) micro factors, involving leadership and interpersonal skills; b) meso/institutional factors to encourage reciprocity and to build trust; and c) macro factors involving the extent of responsibility and resources delegated by departments to state and regional partnerships.

Jim Crook examined the case study of the Horowhenua Local Council in New Zealand, where social isolation, low income and an ageing population were pressing issues. The challenge was for the local council to provide leadership beyond the three Rs - to form partnerships with public, private and voluntary sectors (funders and providers) to undertake small and focused projects that worked, such as the hospital shuttle bus service, parenting skills and youth mentoring programs.

Cath Peterson and Chris Wootton demonstrated that successful approaches build partnerships that operate any many levels. A unique philanthropic and government partnership has been developed with the Helen Macpherson Smith Trust and Victoria’s Department for Planning and Community Development. Both contributed $1 million, providing seed funding for projects and assist in leveraging additional funding, targeted at small towns in regional Victoria. The funding purpose includes improving community facilities - such as skate parks, memorial parks and jetties - and enhancing community capacity.

Jeff McNeil discussed the Local Futures, a five year research project funded by the Foundation for Research Science and Technology, to study the theory and practice of strategic planning by New Zealand local governments, as mandated by the Local Government Act 2002. The Act requires local governments to prepare ten-year Long Term Council Community Plans. McNeil analysed the strategic planning process of 19 councils. He found that the relative performance of these councils varies along a continuum, ranging from poor linkages between identified community outcomes and councils’ decisions and priorities, to those councils that were more successful in clearly articulating local community outcomes through participatory democracy, strong local discretionary leadership, and internal capacity building.
PARTNERSHIPS AND THE ARTS

Workshop presenters

- Anne Kershaw, Department of Premier and Cabinet (Arts Victoria) and Department of Planning and Community Development and Mandy Grinblat, Department of Premier and Cabinet (Arts Victoria)
- Cathy Horsley, City of Port Phillip
- Geoff Holden, Disability Services Commission Western Australia and Anne Thompson, Department of Culture and the Arts, Western Australia
- Dylan Davis, Swinburne University, Victoria

Summary of Presentations

By Gina Fiske, Department of Planning and Community Development

There is increasing evidence of the contribution the arts can make to Australia’s social inclusion agenda, including the social, economic and cultural dimensions of social inclusion. All of the presentations highlighted how community arts projects developed through collaborative partnerships can demonstrate effective ways to strengthen the social inclusion of people who are hard to reach groups such as youth, ethnic and socio-economically disadvantaged communities;

>> Increasing Social Inclusion through the Arts. The presentation by Anne Kershaw and Mandy Grinblat highlighted the impacts, engagement and community connections between diverse groups created through art productions. Recent research papers—Small Arts Sector: Research and evaluation (Deloittes, 2007) and Strengthening Local Communities: Arts in Community Settings, (Arts Victoria and DPCD, 2006) conclude case study evidence of key themes described as:

1. Engaging socially excluded populations – The Shed Project, Bendigo,  
2. Providing new career pathways and work opportunities – Breeze, Hume/Dallas,  
3. Providing a creative focus for communities to explore issues and aspirations - Sea Change Festival, Foster/Toora,  
4. Developing confidence, pride and a sense of belonging in participants; ARAB youth dance performance, Victorian Arabic Services, Victoria, and  
5. Creating new and diverse artistic work and cultural experiences – The Flow Project, Snow Performance, Omeo/Swifts Creek.

All of the case studies brought together people from diverse groups who generally don't know each other or engage in shared activities and created through art productions cultural awareness and changes in community perceptions. The intrinsic value of the projects was people enjoying social relationships and artistic experiences and learning new skills to develop and take on challenges both as individuals and as a groups to improve their community assets and inclusiveness. The evaluation study has been an important tool to also communicate and profile the benefits of community arts initiatives in strengthening communities in the wider community.

>> Partnering UP- Access Arts in Port Phillip. Social inclusion through participation in art projects can break through barriers otherwise not addressed in local communities, particularly when individuals live in isolation. In the City of Port Phillip a diverse community which is home to the inner urban middle class, people who live in public housing, supported accommodation and rooming houses, people with mental illness and with disabilities- access to the arts is increasing. A council commitment led to an Access Arts Officer dedicated to promote arts participation opportunities for people who live with mental illness.
The Officer responds to the expressed needs of individuals and community groups to build partnerships to support performance workshops and local arts initiatives. This is a unique approach to engagement and has changed the awareness, perceptions and active participation of those experiencing barriers to enjoy and produce arts events. Exciting initiatives such as The RAG Theatre group have created work based on the casts’ experience of mental illness, The BiPolar Bears Band – Victoria’s best known band of musicians living with mental illness and SPARC Theatre - are all working with partners to produce and expand their performance opportunities in fringe festivals, community events and arts productions. The success of the initiatives has led to benefits of participation by people who are hard to reach, sustainable arts events and those participating look to continue their artistic involvement, skill development and training and connections.

>> Enhancing Access: A Disability and the Arts Inclusion Initiative. A partnership in progress in Western Australia is a joint initiative between the Disability Services Commission (the Commission) and the Department of Culture and the Arts (DCA) and demonstrating the mutual benefits of working together to ensure people with disabilities, along with their families and carers, can access and participate in arts and cultural programs. In partners focused first on building relationships at meetings to explore common goals, language and cultural differences, participation processes, potential problems and communications. The intent was to foster an effective and cooperative relationship between staff and respond to community needs. A set of guiding principles proved valuable for the team to work to create a common approach, not identify as separate programs, explore ideas and find local solutions. The partnership benefited from the DCA contributing funding of $550,000 over two years to work in partnership with portfolio and funded arts and cultural organisations to enhance further participation in the events, performances, workshops and services through the implementation of projects and fellowships. The partnership process and joint agreement to implement the initiative happened over four stages:

- Reflect on current activities/services
- Connect across sectors
- Create projects and links with mainstream arts organisations
- Celebrate progress and evaluate stories

The positive case studies and outcomes two years on include new partnerships between people with an intellectual disability working as artists with a major dance group to produce performances, the Deaf Society working with Barking Gecko to run integrated workshops in schools and marketing of the Companion Card in regions for tourism. Key learning points were that a shift from a grant recipient model to a partnership approach does need new champions, builds confidence and connections with organisations, new projects and partners working to achieve mutual goal.

>> Digital Storytelling Project- local residents. The digital storytelling projects for participants involved since 2006 through the Swinburne University Design Centre and Inner South Community Health Services has created unexpected connections between housing residents, community groups and wider awareness in the community. Public exhibitions and celebrations resulted in sharing residents’ life history and cultural experiences of people from different backgrounds. Students who worked with individuals formed new relationships with over 55 year old tenants of local government housing. Tales from the High-rise has involved students meeting weekly to develop a narrative to produce digital stories on a laptop from the stories told by tenants of their lives and has highlighted the diversity of their backgrounds, and sharing interests and relationships by creating positive visual images. Digital stories of Roger and Lily’s childhood friendship reunited and living in the same block, Den the Fish, an individual story of an aboriginal man’s beliefs and hopes, were both produced through interviews and using animations and graphics showed the strength of the storytellers message. As a public production these stories give insight into the lives of local residents which otherwise may not be enriched and heard by others. The partnership and the project continues to provide a resource in promoting a vibrant image of older people living in public housing and demonstrates how this project model could be sustained and implemented by other community and or university organisations.
PARTNERSHIPS AND PLACE

Workshop presentations

- “Is Place-Based Renewal the answer to locational disadvantage and social inclusion – Key Findings from the Evaluation of Neighbourhood Renewal (NR)”, by Dianne Hill, Manager Policy, Strategy and Communications Neighbourhood Renewal, Department of Human Services, Victoria
- “Delineating the Policy Configuration of Social Inclusion, Place-based Approaches and Joined Up Government”, by Zara Lasater, University of Melbourne, Victoria
- “Over-time: The place and value of time in local partnerships that address social exclusion”, by Sally James and Shelley Mallett, Melbourne City Mission, Victoria
- “Healthy Communities through Social Engagement”, by Eloisa Costoso, City of Greater Dandenong

Summary

By Diana Rice

The recurrent theme in this workshop was that developing effective partnerships takes time, however a partnership approach is valuable and can contribute to building understanding between government and communities.

>> Presentation 1, “Is Place-Based Renewal the answer to locational disadvantage and social inclusion – Key Findings from the Evaluation of Neighbourhood Renewal (NR)” described some early findings from the NR evaluation process, including Key Results from community surveys over a two year period. The aim of NR is to narrow the gap between the most disadvantaged communities in Victoria and the rest of the State. The interim evaluation found that best improvements occurred in areas where strong partnerships exist between NR areas and local government. It was noted that with multiple partnerships, attributing results is sometimes difficult, however in general the partnership approach has been a catalyst for things to occur. In summary, the presentation concluded that NR is narrowing the gap, although results are not even across all areas, and it is important to tackle contextual factors. The model is a good platform for partnership and certain aspects have the potential to be ‘scaled up’ to tackle social exclusion in the long term.

>> Presentation 2, “Delineating the Policy Configuration of Social Inclusion, Place-based Approaches and Joined Up Government” explored how the place-based initiatives used as case studies altered the policy configuration and were indicative of joined-up government. Analysis of the case studies concluded that issues were not new or specific to place-based approaches; the joined-up government focus added an increased concern with partnerships and expectation of government coordination and engagement with communities; and joined-up government practice (as distinct from rhetoric) is still peripheral to the ‘core business’ of place-based approaches i.e. government is not joining up behind the scenes. The need for government to educate itself in working with community, and community with government, was asserted.

>> Presentation 3, “Over-time: The place and value of time in local partnerships that address social exclusion” used the experience of the Braybrook Maidstone Youth Partnership to critically reflect on the meaning of time for partnerships. The challenges facing organisations and individuals working involved included the considerable amount of time required to secure commitment from partner organisations, particularly where start-up funds were needed. The key lessons for time and partnership development were that it takes time, funding and resources to develop open communication and power sharing; trust; governance structures; and processes and protocols for effective partnership work. The proposed way forward included recommendations that government clearly articulate and coordinate between policy for places as distinct to policy for populations and service delivery, and test new governance and funding mechanisms, including taxation reform. Establishing a flexible fund with a 10 year time frame to enable establishment and implementation of long term partnerships was proposed.
Presentation 4, “Healthy Communities through Social Engagement” described a community engagement approach that recognised the cultural diversity of the municipality, and used both informal and formal consultations with people through local community agencies to increase participation in training opportunities that reflected community needs. A partnership approach between the Council and community centres was formalized through an MOU, and steered by a reference group which oversaw a mapping process of existing training programs. The outcome was a clear picture of what the community wanted, and training programs offered by Council that were based on expressed need. As a result 240 residents have now graduated from accredited and non-accredited courses and people from the community are spontaneously enquiring about training.

PARTNERSHIPS AND DIVERSITY

Workshop presentations

- W5- I: Presentation 3 - “Inner East Leadership for Social Inclusion Initiative”, by Ronda Held, UnitingCare Community Options, Victoria and Gregg Nicholls, MonashLink Community Health Service, Victoria
- W5- I: Presentation 4 - “Building sustainable partnerships with culturally and linguistically diverse communities and local government”, by Tracey Hall and Charyl Turner, Uniting Aged Care, Victoria
- W5- II I: Presentation 1 - “Refugee Brokerage Program in Practice”, by George Lekakis, Victorian Multicultural Commission
- W5- II I: Presentation 2 - “360: Partnerships for Successful Settlement”, by Rachel Smith, Department of Justice, Victoria
- W5- II: Presentation 3 - “Building Capacity: Ethnic Women’s Leadership Training Program”, by Vivien Wei Verheijen, Office of Ethnic Affairs, Department of Internal Affairs, New Zealand
- W5- II: Presentation 4 - “Welcome to the AFL – social inclusion through sport”, by Sue McGill, Sport and Recreation Victoria

Key issues

Ronda Held and Gregg Nicholls framed the discussion by providing the Department of Human Services definition of social inclusion: a socially inclusive society is defined as one where all people feel valued, their differences are respected, and their basic needs are met so they can live in dignity. The paper by Ronda and Gregg suggests that there is an increasing body of evidence that shows that people who are not socially included suffer a range of disadvantage including poorer health outcomes. This is amplified when people reach old age when the danger of isolation increases because people retire and leave the workforce, lose contact with their families because of increased family mobility and are left alone following the death of their spouse or long term partner. The initial research undertaken by the Boroondara Primary Care Partnerships suggested that certain population groups, such as the elderly and people with disabilities, might benefit more from community based intervention than others. Hence the necessity to support community building and target groups’ social connectidness.

A community building approach is also relevant when combatting social isolation of migrant and refugee communities. For the latter the Refugee Brokerage Program, presented by George Lekakis, provides useful lessons on how to create and support community agencies and government partnerships with and between
local refugee communities. A two fold approach is promoted: working within a flexible environment for refugee communities to improve their knowledge and understanding of available services and programs; and increasing the knowledge and understanding of service providers to refugee communities.

The New Zealand Office of Ethnic Affairs project on Ethnic Women’s Network, presented by Vivien Wei Verheijen, is a good example of how to support women as leaders and change agents in their communities. An Ethnic Women’s Leadership Training is helping to explore and develop leadership and communication skills with a stronger sense of purpose and self efficacy; build strategies for dealing with gender issues; stimulate social inclusion, participation, and networking.

### PARTNERSHIPS AND GOVERNANCE

#### Workshop 1 Presenters

- **Alison McClelland**, Department of Planning and Community Development
- **Nick Chiam**, Department of Planning and Community Development
- **Dr Sharon Brownie**, The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, Victoria

#### Summary of Presentations

_By Rachael Scotland_

Effective governance, whilst at times difficult and complex, was shown to be vital to partnerships between government, not for profit, community and business sectors. In turn, these partnerships are fundamental to progress the social inclusion agenda. Chiam argued that social inclusion surpasses the triple bottom line for organisations, and calls for support of the capability of individuals and communities to realise their potential. For governance, this means that various interventions aimed at different factors (housing, health etc) must be integrated; support for individuals and families must be more holistic and aligned with interventions in systems or communities; and social inclusion policies must be more strategic and responsive to change.

>> **A Fairer Victoria (AFV)**, the Victorian Government’s social policy framework, aims to build social inclusion through economic and social participation. The policy was created through partnership across government and the NGO sector. This commitment to consultation and engagement through each renewed policy statement has been a major achievement over the last few years, and will continue to be a vital element in the progression of the policy. AFV has required regular collaboration across government departments for a number of initiatives, and has helped to focus ministers beyond their own portfolios to a framework of disadvantage and inequality. Achievements of AFV include the establishment of cross government and community sector partnerships such as Frankston and Maribyrnong. Network governance, a key tenet of AFV initiatives, can better integrate policy and support more agile policy development than hierarchical or market based governance structures. The former Department for Victorian Communities established many new network governance arrangements aligned to the integrated, holistic and strategic demands of social inclusion, for example through whole-of-government policy structures, Local Team activity, and the establishment of Regional Management Forums.

>> **Looking at network governance in practice**, Dr Brownie’s research of the New Zealand Regional Partnership Programme (RPP) found that partnering is complex and heavily influenced by local context - no region participating in the study was operating the governance structure as originally envisaged. However, a number of key factors were common across the successful programs. These included skilled leadership; cohesion between key players; shared vision; and local ‘economic intelligence’. The RPP identifies regions as the key focus for developing national economies, and economic development is seen as both ‘place-based’ and ‘partnership-based’ with local actors collaboratively focussed on building regional capacity, innovation systems and market development through governance structures.
Workshop 2 Presenters

- Chris McInerney, University of Limerick
- Monica Pfeffer, Department of Human Services, Victoria (DHS)
- Lynne Wannan, Department of Planning & Community Development, Victoria (DPCD)
- Irene Verins, Victorian Health Promotion Foundation (VicHealth)

Summary

By Joy Elley

Above all else, partnerships are relationships. Issues of relative standing of the partners, shared values (or lack thereof) and trust between partners were some of the common themes of this workshop.

Chris McInerney (University of Limerick) argued that partnerships are institutions and must be understood as such if we are to properly assess their outcomes. Partnerships have their own rules and norms, formal and informal spaces for interaction and are shaped by the values they embody. However, the values associated with the dominant players tend to become the norm for the other players. In such partnerships there may be participation, but there is little room for dissent. If those from the community voluntary sector are not prepared to give up their own autonomy, there is a potent clash between the instrumental and communicative rationalities of the players, with the potential for a major impact on outcomes. Participation needs in-put and resourcing, including opportunities for government representatives to build their own capacity.

Monica Pfeffer, (DHS) argued that we must continually question what it is that partnerships are developed to address. If partnerships are to promote integration, particularly of disadvantaged people, then we need to be more critical of their role and acknowledge this will vary depending on the outcome sought. Partnerships are a means to achieve an end. Analysis should therefore focus on outcomes and not simply review process. Partnerships are not always the appropriate response, especially if change needs to be achieved fast and simply. There are also other ways of doing things. Structural reform, incentives and regulation may also achieve the desired outcomes.

A more nuanced approach to partnerships is required to deal with the issue of social exclusion/social inclusion.

Lynne Wannan (DPCD) described Victorian Government initiatives to support and develop the not for profit sector. Elements of partnership include shared goals, mutual trust and power-sharing. Governments and the community sector have different and views of approaches. Not for profit organisations also want to achieve outcomes for their constituents. The Office for the Community Sector has been created to work across government with local government to strengthen the not for profit community sector (an estimated 220,000 organisations in Victoria). An Action Plan for Strengthening Community Organisations has been developed. Challenges facing the government and the sector include different goals, the potential loss of some community organisations, the cost of addressing social inclusion, the need to retain and build the sector workforce and the capacity of the sector to bear the cost of partnerships. It must be recognised that participation costs, and we must identify ways to fund local initiatives while encouraging the bureaucracy to behave differently. The time for change is now as government and the sector are willing to engage.

Finally, Irene Verins described how partnerships are encouraged by VicHealth. All projects use a Partnership Analysis Tool at the outset of their project. This encourages the development of partnerships and provides a basis for reflecting on the outcomes of the project. In this context, partnerships are critical because they are about sharing the risk, reduce competition, increase available resources and also acknowledge that no single agency can deliver. A continuum of partnership types ranges from informal networking to the more formal marriage “collaboration”. Networking is the easiest for people to do, while collaboration and cooperation rely on higher levels of trust.
PARTNERSHIPS FOR INDIGENOUS AND DIVERSE COMMUNITIES

Workshop Presentations

- Building Capability Of Indigenous Community And Governments For Effective Partnerships (PDF), by Kati Krsevan, Department of Planning and Community Development and Justin Mohamed, University of Melbourne, Victoria

- Including the Excluded - The one that didn’t get away (PDF), by Ramdas Sankaran, Multicultural Services Centre of Western Australia and Mandy Flahavin, Family Dispute Resolution at Relationships Australia, Western Australia

Summary

By Cristina Martinez-Fernandez, OECD and Robert Strauss, European Commission

This workshop discussed some of the key elements of partnerships for Indigenous and diverse communities. The workshop examined two partnerships: the Shepparton partnership between the three levels of government (Federal, State and Council) and the Shepparton Aboriginal community; and the Perth Family Relationship Centre partnership between Relationships Australia, Western Australia and the Western Australia Multicultural Services Centre covering the catchment area of Southwest, Metropolitan, South East Metropolitan and Central Metropolitan Perth.

One of the key elements of the Shepparton partnership is community governance. Through this there has been substantial learning for both governments and the community. Capabilities to work in a developmental process has required the government partners to learn new ways of working. Among the capacities that need to be developed are a sustained coordination through practical forms of collaboration, streamlined funding, flexible on-site governance, training and education (and the education of educators) and the engagement in these efforts on the ground. At the community level it has required the community to change relationships and build their capacity to work together and strategically plan through leadership that leads to becoming organised and gaining credibility in the partnership. The Shepparton partnership highlighted the need for devolution of decision-making processes to Indigenous communities and the need for these communities to develop capabilities for digesting and understanding government plans and documents.

A primary element of the Perth Family Relationship Centre partnership has been addressing the cultural diversity of the clients who comprise a significant proportion of the population, having throughout access to a culturally and linguistically appropriate service; i.e. service delivery emphasis is on using bilingual/bicultural mediators and not just interpreters. Mediation takes into account cultural factors including “power distribution in relationships” and stigma attached to seeking external intervention. The partnership also highlighted other elements related to the ‘administrative cultures’ of different agencies. In this case relationships were established between the senior management of the two agencies and protocols developed to provide a fully integrated service from every perspective. In the end the combined expertise of the two agencies (linguistic, cultural and technical expertise) was used to develop parenting plans and other mediated agreements that provided services oriented to maximise social inclusion of clients while respecting their diverse background.

Conclusions from the session highlighted the need of developing together a social and political agenda for the most disadvantaged and the need to unfold this combined agenda through local partnerships systems that reflect people’s needs, aspirations and realities.
PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABILITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Workshop Presenters

- **Rachel Williams**, CSIRO, ACT
- **Ken Coghill**, Monash University, Victoria; Julia Thornton, RMIT, Victoria
- **Robin Tennant-Wood**, Canberra Environment and Sustainability Resource Centre, ACT
- **Brian Furze**, Latrobe University, Victoria

Summary of Presentations

*By Sharon Pepperdine*

Social inclusion is crucial for the effective response to deal with the complexity, unpredictability and uncertainty of environmental problems, for example climate change, to integrate community and individual behaviour and desires for change with government legislative powers and policies. An effective response to climate change requires active inclusion and engagement of all sectors of the community.

**Working Together - Learning Together: Insights On Cross-Sector Partnering From CSIRO’s Sustainable Communities Initiative.** A presentation on the Sustainable Community Initiative discussed a participatory action research project partnership with the public, private and non-government sectors to develop and explore options for the future environmental sustainability of communities. This project adopted an action research for learning approach, or learning by doing, to assist social learning to deal with the complexity, unpredictability and uncertainty of environmental problems. Monitoring and evaluation was incorporated in the project and was found to be valuable to facilitate social learning. The partnership with public, private and non-government sector was found to provide an effective way to include local knowledge and context to enhance local relevance, and support local ownership to enhance the likelihood of action. Individual and organisational characteristics found to help:

- Openness to new ways of working
- Tolerance of uncertainty
- Flexibility
- Organisational navigation skills (politically savvy, leadership)
- Persistence

**ClimateCare: a future direction for partnerships for socio-ecological sustainability.** Social inclusion is crucial for the effective response to climate change, to integrate community and individual behaviour and desires for change with government legislative powers and policies. An effective response to climate change requires active inclusion and engagement of all sectors of the community.

A new public-community-partnership between government and local communities was proposed to tackle climate change through a ClimateCare programme, inspired by Landcare and other successful models, aimed at achieving behavioural change at the personal level through community involvement in applying and executing policy led by government. Joining up of community and government can provide a mechanism to enable each to reflect on the governments’ behaviour. Government structures can assist this through enhancing phronesis and sense making, and partnership has increased the capacity to engage the community.
Building bridges: Case study of a university-community organisation partnership for sustainability. A case study of a university-community organisation partnership for sustainability was presented. The partnership was with a not-for-profit organisation concerned with environmental education and community work, the Canberra Environment and Sustainability Resource Centre, and a university, the Australian National University (ANU).

The ANU is a demonstrated leader in campus sustainability through its leadership in university environmental management and recognition in the academic literature. However, little was being done to assist its own local community in developing and adopting sustainable practices and there was no appropriate vehicle to enable social inclusion at a grassroots level. A partnership with an established environmental organisation in order to facilitate two-way communication between the community and the university on the dynamic and topical issue of sustainability was a step towards social inclusion on one of the country’s leading campuses.

The partnership has enhanced the capacity of both partners to engage the community in terms of sustainability and encouraging maximum social inclusion for environmentally and socially sustainable outcomes.
PARTNERSHIPS AND COMMUNITY ENTERPRISE

Workshop 1 Presenters

- Sue Campin, Queensland University of Technology
- Michelle Commandeur, ANZ Victoria
- Kevin Robbie, Social Ventures Australia
- Geraldine Earle, Braybrook Maidstone Youth Partnership; and Sue Fowler, Maribyrnong and Moonee Valley Local Learning and Employment Network (M&MV LLEN)

Summary of Presentations

By Vincent Sully

>> Local business engagement in community development through Business Improvement Districts

- Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) are micro business innovations that set up a private governance model in a defined geographical area.
- There are approximately 10,000 BIDs around the world.
- BIDs can improve communities through cleaning up streets, providing street furniture and animation of community spaces.
- BIDs can help communities respond to social issues through youth employment programs and social enterprise.
- Criticisms of BIDs:
  - sanitise the public realm (e.g. pristine park that is good to look at but not to play in),
  - businesses enforcing their values on the public,
  - geographic areas end up looking the same (loss of each area’s uniqueness).
- BIDs need to operate in a way that doesn’t lead to social exclusion.

>> Cross sector partnerships in financial inclusion

- The objective of Saver Plus is to help families on low incomes save for their and their children’s vocational needs.
- Participants receive financial and personal support.
- The components of the Saver Plus programme are:
  - Financial literacy education,
  - The ANZ matches every $1 saved by participants up to $1000,
  - Savings goals linked to educational needs.
- The programme is targeted carefully at the ‘working poor’.
- Main partner is the Brotherhood of St Laurence. Others are Berry Street, Victorian Government and the Benevolent Society.
- The programme runs in other Australian states and nearly 5000 people have participated. The drop out rate is low.
Outcomes include increased self esteem, reduced stress, children learning about saving, better planning for the future.

Doing business differently in Braybrook/Maidstone

The aim is to promote the health, wellbeing for all young people and help them make a transition from education into training and employment.

Braybrook is a culturally diverse community and extremely disadvantaged in indicators such as unemployment, early school leaving, refugees and sole parent families.

Research (by Dr Shelley Mallet) has helped the partners in the project understand the issues and challenges for people in Braybrook/Maidstone.

The governance structure is based on the Neighbourhood Renewal model and includes an executive, a partnership committee, youth advisory committees.

There is direct access for young people to information and to the partnership through a Youth Enterprise Hub.

Economic Development and Community Development – Stronger Communities

Economic development is about:
- Interdependence,
- Liveability,
- Sustainability,

Economic development is a new profession. It has 20 years of solid government support.

In Moving Forward, the (Victorian) state government announced $502m to improve/enhance rural and regional Victoria. In implementing these initiatives, it is important to have a triple bottom line approach.

Economic development is a long term focus.

Important to ‘take the community with you’ in economic development initiatives.

Local economic development is about rebuilding communities.

Important to develop a relationship with academia – many local governments have yet to do this.

Economic Development Australia is the national professional body for economic development practitioners employed in government, community and private sector.


Discussion from Partnerships and Community Enterprise #1

BIDs are a legal entity. Council passes legislation to enable a BID to be established.

Micro-businesses are everywhere but they need to be asked to do more corporate social responsibility work.
Workshop 2 Presenters

- **Phillip Marsh**, Latrobe City Council, Victoria
- **Rachel Davis**, Queensland University of Technology
- **Julius Peiker**, Monash City Council
- **Kevin Robbie**, Social Ventures Australia
- **Vincent Sully**

Summary of presentations

By Vincent Sully

>> Our Future, Our Place

- Programme is about work experience, on the job skills and training in the building of energy efficient houses
- Partners include state government, community, federal government, local business and industry.
- There was a loss of jobs at SEC (a big employer in the region) following the privatisation of the electricity industry
- Ordinary employment programs were ineffective in assisting the long term unemployed
- Need for a paradigm shift from ‘I am a victim’ to ‘I can make my own choices’
- For the generational unemployed, children are socialised into behaviours that perpetuate their situation
- Sometimes not enough incentives to go from welfare into a job
- Social inclusion requires a flexibility in funding arrangements
- 72% of participants had positive outcomes from the programme – full time work, part time work or further education and training.

>> Sustainable communities: A short theory of community investment

- Investment approach by government needs:
  - to be joined up within and across governments and other sectors
  - be organised around agreed outcomes
  - achieve greater returns on investment
  - enable community sustainability
- Investment is the means to attract and leverage resources to collectively build upon community assets for greater benefit
- Investment should be prioritised towards:
  - communities facing significant disadvantage / change
  - the investment readiness of a community
  - catalytic potential (initial investment is a catalyst for further investment)
- Future trends for government’s social investment include more entrepreneurial approaches targeted towards asset building strategies to mobilise community capacity.
Can Local Government Grant Making have an influence on the Social Capital in its local community?

- Grant making is an instrument of public policy.
- Local government grants are generally about maintaining services and activities.
- Local government needs to enter into an ‘investment’ type of grant making.
- Funding programs should aim to progress social inclusion.
- Local government should look at appropriate funding partnerships that will help progress social exclusion.
- There is some value in local government entering into ‘compacts’ – this can help strengthen/re-establish relationships with non-government organisations.

Working collaboratively with social enterprises: Lessons learned from the United Kingdom

- Social enterprises are achieving increased prominence as a model for the delivery of services.
- Profits from Social Enterprise are reinvested in the community.
- Government plays different roles in its interaction with social enterprises – as an investor, a purchaser and a partner.
- Social Enterprises are seen as the new way of doing business.
- The UK government tested different models of social enterprises (e.g. multiple outcomes purchasing across a range of government departments).
- The UK government is attempting to measure its return on its investment projects funded through social enterprise.
PARTNERSHIPS AND SKILLS

Workshop Presentations

- W7- I: Presentation 1 - **Community Learning Partnerships: The whole is more than the sum of the parts**, by Jane Dewildt, Department of Planning and Community Development, Victoria
- W7- I: Presentation 2 - **Fair Opportunities through Partnerships for Social Inclusion**, by Julie Neeson, Southern Grampians Adult Education, Victoria
- W7- I: Presentation 3 - **Partnerships for Local Skills and Employment in Australia** (PDF), by Cristina Martinez-Fernandez, OECD LEED Programme
- W7- I: Presentation 4 - **Local Learning and Employment Networks – creating pathways to inclusion through education and training** (PDF), by Bronwen Heathfield, Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, Victoria
- W7- II: Presentation 1: **Transitional labour market programs: procurement for social inclusion?** (PDF), by Jane Hunt and Aaron Hart, Mission Australia, Victoria
- W7- II: Presentation 2: **Will you have a kofta with that? A case of a Work Integrated Learning (WIL) partnership as a strategy for social inclusion**, by Frances Newell, Victoria University, Victoria
- W7- II: Presentation 3: **Local partnerships are working with the community to tackle the interconnected causes of disadvantage** (PDF), by Simon Scrase and Sue Silk, Melbourne Citymission, Victoria
- W7- II: Presentation 4: **Intermediate Labour Market at AMES** (PDF), by Sally Hearn, AMES, Victoria

Summary of presentations

*By Cristina Martinez Fernandez and Robert Strauss*

This two-session workshop discussed key elements of partnerships for education, skills and employment. The workshop analysed this topic through eight different papers including examples lead by government, not-for-profit and research and education organisations. Examples were drawn from different regions in Australia while examining national and state programs applied locally.

>>> A vital element of partnerships for skills is the capacity to leverage the contributions of the partners, thereby generating significant learning outcomes that build up the economic and social fabric of communities. One of the examples discussed was the Community Learning Partnerships (CLPs) formed and operated by Adult Community Education (ACE) providers through the funding of the Victorian Adult Community and Further Education Board. CLPs operate across Victoria, in small and larger communities and involve local government, community sector agencies, all parts of the education and training system and, increasingly, commercial and manufacturing enterprises. Specific local examples that have made a difference are found at the ‘Southern Grampians Community Employment Learning partnership’ and the ‘Morrison House partnership’.

>>> Another core element is the capacity to develop joint locally centred but, regionally responsive initiatives to increase skills, participation and social inclusion. For instance, the South Australia Government development of the Skills and Workforce Development Strategy aims to increase participation in employment, particularly of those who are most disadvantaged in the labour market. In many ways this is a new approach aiming to achieve long-term systemic change by building on and establishing new partnerships at the statewide level with opportunities for high level government, social, economic, training and skills bodies to work together in new and joined-up ways to address complex workforce, skills and participation issues. Another example is the Victorian Government funded ‘Local Learning and Employment Networks’ (LLENs), incorporated bodies whose members include representatives from local education and training providers, local government, industry and the community. The core role of LLENs is to develop partnerships and broker
initiatives between stakeholders to improve education, training and employment outcomes of young people, aged 15 to 19, in their areas.

>> A third element is found in the capacity of partnerships to develop transitional labour market (TLM) programs. Transitional labour market programs offer a pathway to mainstream employment, with a supported but waged and real work environment enabling this transformation. As commercial enterprises with social goals, TLMs sit in a new space between NGOs, government and business. One example is found in the ‘Mission Australia’s Urban Renewal Employment Enterprise Programme’ which provides opportunities in the building and landscaping industries for procurement policies and partnering with transitional labour market programs, public and private purchasers. Another example is the ‘Work Integrated Learning (WIL) partnerships’ which can provide opportunities for the delivery of accredited training in a supportive and real-life workplace environment. This is a partnership between Victoria University, a primary school, and two tiers of government enabling a not-for-profit community enterprise – a multi-cultural canteen at a primary school - to act as a site for WIL; the participants - mainly mature-age African women - study for Certificate II in Hospitality in the context of operating the canteen. Another example shows successful initiatives such as Victoria’s Neighbourhood Renewal strategy, a place-based approach which is initiating, stimulating and leveraging innovative partnership projects to respond to the multiple and inter-connected causes of worklessness and unemployment. Two examples of this programme, the Reservoir East Primary School Breakfast Club and the Council Office Skills training highlight what can be achieved when residents, local government, a primary school and a welfare/training provider work together in the planning, development and implementation of local projects to improve social and economic opportunities for local residents. Another example is provided by the Adult Multicultural Education Services (AMES) and its Intermediate Labour Market model to provide transitional employment opportunities for all AMES clients (new migrants and refugees arriving Australia in the last 24 months). The intention is to use these opportunities to support clients’ transition to work in the mainstream labour market as early intervention addresses risks of long term unemployment.

Partnerships for skills, however, need to acknowledge the different urban geographies for skills in Australia. On the one hand are the booming, prosperous towns where there is a fierce demand for skilled workers and on the other hand are the shrinking towns and declining regions, where just keeping people is a challenging task for local agencies. These different scenarios indicate three different challenges. First is the application of centralised labour market policy instruments to areas under very different market and life-style conditions. Second is the inclusion/exclusion dynamics under different urban development scenarios. Third is the important role of local knowledge that is relevant to the local needs, and for the design of local employment strategies. The argument here is that ‘place matters’ and that the local dimension is an important one when designing partnerships for skills, employment and social inclusion.

Conclusions from the workshop highlighted a number of key points. First is the need to be inclusive in the design of partnerships for skills and employment and the need for these partnerships to be lead from the local level while well informed and integrated with state and national umbrella policies and initiatives. Second is the need to address the needs of the most disadvantaged by pushing the social inclusion agenda and integrating it in every department in government, developing measures to understand how the integration is happening on a regular basis. This achieves joined up government and joined up services for the disadvantaged. Third is the important role that the local level plays in partnerships for skills and how this level of governance can leverage the coordination with national and state frameworks and its mediation in transitional approaches to the labour market.
PARTNERSHIPS AND EDUCATION

Workshop Presenters

- **John Allman**, Department of Education and Early Childhood (DEECD), Victoria
- **Karen Moodoo**, Anula Primary School, Northern Territory; **Kerrianne Souter**, St Georges Rd Primary School, Victoria; **Bernie Boulton**, Kiewa Valley Primary School, Victoria
- **Merryn Davies**, Victoria University, Victoria; **Marty Grace**, Victoria University, Victoria
- **Theresa Angelico**, Adult Multicultural Education Services, Victoria

Summary

By Joy Elley

Educational settings provide a fertile ground for partnerships ranging from informal networking to more formalised collaboration. The presentations in this session provided examples of partnerships and illustrated their importance to educational outcomes for individual students as well as for disadvantaged groups of students. However, they also reflected on the challenges to schools in developing partnerships such as the enormous time and effort required, the resource intensive nature of the work and conceptual challenges such as how to measure success.

**John Allman** (DEECD) described the work of a new division which was grappling with what social inclusion meant for schools. If social inclusion is about participation, then education is the cornerstone of that participation. Schools work not only with the families of their students, but also with other institutions and businesses in their community. Schools can tackle social exclusion through providing literacy, numeracy, completion and retention. Schools are major sites of social activity which can build capital in disadvantaged areas. However, this needs consistent and coordinated effort. As always, the challenge is to systematise good practice while recognising that each school/community setting is unique.

A consortia of principals from across Victoria, **Karen Moodoo, Kerrianne Souter and Bernie Boulton**, described the findings of a collaborative project which looked at the challenges schools faced in developing successful partnerships. Partnerships are critical in enabling schools to educate and nourish their students. Schools can not act in isolation and provide the required educational outcomes, but schools also need to feel that the Department of Education enables their work around partnerships.

The research question posed by **Merryn Davies and Marty Grace** was how a university could establish a partnership with a region in fulfilling its role as a regional university. The Access and Success Project, with schools as the main partners, was established as a locally appropriate partnership utilising a multi-pronged approach focussing on learning enrichment, youth access, and teacher leadership. The project, which also involves student teachers, is supported by a collaborative practitioner research framework. Outcomes of the project included better relationships with schools, increased participation of teachers in post-graduate leadership programs, stronger engagement of VU students with schools and increased numbers of students and teachers working as researchers.

**Theresa Angelico** described how the need to provide client centred education and training for culturally and linguistically diverse students has lead Adult Multicultural Education Services (AMES) to develop a “richness” of partnerships and partnership approaches. Partnerships prepared students for employment, or provided them with practical knowledge to promote day to day living and well-being. Partners in these activities included large and small business, the entertainment industry, sporting clubs, community groups and more than 200 individual volunteers.
PARTNERSHIPS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

Workshop Presenters

- “Best Start- working together for our children’s future”, by Jeanette Nargorcka
- “Queensland’s Logan Beenleigh Young Persons Project: innovation in best practice partnerships to strengthen the social inclusion of vulnerable young people”, by Andrea Lanyon, Department of Communities, Queensland
- “The role of Local Government in building sustainability in the provision of youth services in regional NSW through the establishment of partnerships”, by Laura Black, Greater Taree City Council

Summary of Presentations

By Ban Lian NG

Three of the papers dealt with different types of partnerships between state and local governments and community organisations in the delivery of youth programs in Victoria and New South Wales. The fourth paper detailed the establishment of a design model for the ongoing evaluation of the MCBI Regional Coordination Projects in Queensland, with the Logan-Beenleigh Young Persons Project as a case study.

Jeanette Nargorcka examined the Victorian Government’s “Best Start” prevention and early intervention programme (for 30 sites) that aims to improve the health, development, learning and well-being of children from pregnancy through transition to school (0-8 years). An evaluation of the programme showed that developing the trust of partners, exchanging information and joint planning are crucial to partnership success, thus contributing to innovative practices. The Best Start programs sit with local councils thus tapping into council facilities, and together with local partners such as schools, they develop and implement action plans to strengthen mainstream services and are responsive to local needs. Initiatives include new parent groups, play groups for vulnerable families and baby resource guides.

Robyn Broadbent and Faye Whitehead discussed a “Network Partnership Model” that brings together government, business, community and philanthropic organisations under the Mentoring and Community Building Initiative (MCBI). The MCBI is a state-wide Victorian Government initiative coordinated by the Office of Youth, and consists of both Targeted projects and Regional Coordination projects. Key components of the programs include mentor recruitment, training and ongoing support, debriefing, quality assurance, participative evaluation and capacity building. Good practice guides and evaluation reports have been published.

Laura Black reported on the case study of the regional Taree City Council located three and a half hours’ drive north of Sydney where there is a relatively high proportion of indigenous population and youths. The area experienced a loss of a number of youth services in 2000, and Council was approached by various funding bodies to pick up service delivery to avoid the loss of funding. In cooperation with other service providers, Council played the role as facilitator of programs – such as Taree Street Beat and Midnight Basketball - and began to achieve results, eg increased school retention rate. Council is now ready to take the next step of handling back well established services to the community.

Andrea Lanyon’s paper illustrated a multi-agency service delivery coordination model that brings together government agencies and community providers, such as the NGO sector, in managing and shaping new ways of working together. The model will identify new ways of developing and refining policy and programme design, including monitoring and evaluation, information and knowledge sharing mechanisms. The model was applied to the case study of the Logan-Beenleigh Young Persons’ project which targeted young people with multiple problems and complex needs in one of the most disadvantaged locations in the state.

OECD LEED forum on partnerships and local governance at the OECD LEED Trento Centre

Vico Marte 1, 38100 Trento, Italy. Tel +39/0461/27609, Fax +50, e-mail elisa.campestrine@oecd.org
PARTNERSHIPS FOR HEALTH AND CARING

Workshop Presenters

- “Partnerships between government and health and community services”, (PDF), by, Val Callister, Department of Human Services, Victoria and Cath Smith, Victorian Council of Social Service, Victoria

- “The Eastern Regional Collaboration Project: making connections between service providers across different sectors”, (PDF), by Lui Divenuto, Eastern Regional Collaboration Project, South Australia

- “Slipstreaming Hospitals into the community systems through partnership synergy”. (PDF), by Lisa Delaney, Central Victorian Health Alliance, Victoria and Jennifer Gale, Kyneton District Health Service, Victoria

- “Leadership in an alliance that brings together health equity approach with system redesign”, (PDF), by Lee Kennedy, HealthWest Partnership, Victoria
IMPROVING SOCIAL INCLUSION THROUGH THE SOCIAL ECONOMY

The challenges of social exclusion cannot be met by a single actor – governments, whether at national, regional or the local level – must work with others, including the private sector. However, an actor who is frequently overlooked is the social economy – a wide-range of organisations which inhabit the space between the state and the market, including associations, co-operatives, foundations, mutuals, and social enterprises. The LEED Programme has launched a new project whose specific focus is the improvement of social inclusion capacity through the social economy, and the provision of guidance to national, regional and local actors as to the most efficacious ways of doing so.

>> IMPROVING SOCIAL INCLUSION THROUGH THE SOCIAL ECONOMY, read more

STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES FOR INDIGENOUS AND TRIBAL COMMUNITIES

There remains a significant gap between employment and unemployment rates for indigenous people and the wider population in OECD countries. In Australia, the unemployment rate for indigenous people was three times the rate for non-indigenous people in 2006 (16% compared with 5%). The entrepreneurship rate for indigenous populations is also relatively low, with 6% of employed indigenous Australians indicating that they work in their own business, compared with 17% of employed non-indigenous people. Following a cross-country comparative approach this study will provide policy makers at the national and local level with a strong understanding of the issues faced by indigenous groups, and a set of tools and instruments with which to build an appropriate policy response to improving employment outcomes.

>> STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES FOR INDIGENOUS AND TRIBAL COMMUNITIES, read more
Improving Social Inclusion at the Local Level through the Social Economy

A New Series of LEED Cross-Country Studies

The LEED Programme has been working since its early days on the multiple topics related to social cohesion and social inclusion at local level. Not limited to the traditional approaches to tackle the issue of social exclusion and poverty, the analysis has been mainly directed to explore the most interesting social innovations that have contributed to improve social inclusion, such as for instance mechanisms to lift people out of poverty, like the Individual development accounts in the USA or community initiatives to deliver services to the less well-off. Over the years the complexity and multi-faceted nature of social exclusion has been well-noted: poverty, deprivation, unemployment, health, poor housing, low skills, etc., all contribute to the inability of individuals and groups to participate in the economic, social and cultural life of the society in which they live. At times of economic and financial uncertainty the numbers of people excluded, and those vulnerable to social exclusion, rises and the challenges to social inclusion grow ever more evident.

The challenges of social exclusion cannot be met by a single actor – governments, whether at national, regional or the local level – must work with others, including the private sector. However, an actor who is frequently overlooked is the social economy – a label given to a wide-range of organisations which inhabit the space between the state and the market, including associations, co-operatives, foundations, mutuals, and social enterprises. Rooted in local communities, social economy organisations are in an excellent position to identify the needs of their localities, and to respond quickly to social and economic changes at the local level. At the same time, they are also often in a position to be able to reach those groups who are ‘hard to reach’, further increasing their effectiveness in addressing social exclusion. The local embeddedness of social economy organisations, and their ability to harness resources (such as volunteers) from their local communities, is critical to their contribution to fostering social inclusion.

However to operate effectively they need an environment which not only recognises their potential role, but is also supportive of their activities. There are three key areas where supportive policies can play a critical role in enabling social economy organisations to tap their potential. The first is the creation of an enabling environment; the second is the development of mechanisms for financial sustainability for the social economy; the third is the inclusion social economy actors in the decision making process.

The LEED Programme has launched a new project whose specific focus is the improvement of social inclusion capacity through the social economy, and the provision of guidance to national, regional and local actors as to the most efficacious ways of doing so. The project aims to assist national, regional and local governments, and their partners at national and sub-national levels, to build their capacity to design and implement effective strategies for social inclusion. To this end, the project will identify the obstacles which preclude the effective working of the social economy and draw attention to the potential opportunities for the social economy to improve social inclusion.

The development of tailored recommendations to promote and enhance the contribution of the social economy in fostering social inclusion is the key objective of the project and to this end, guidance will be provided to national, regional and local actors on how to improve social inclusion capacity effectively, in particular, by leveraging the social economy. It is proposed to undertake cross-country studies to assess the current strategies of social inclusion in selected localities and in selected policy areas and to explore the contribution of social economy organisations in fostering social inclusion.
Another area of work which has an important contribution to make to social inclusion, is that of building community capacity. Community capacity building has been recognised as an important strategy for stimulating community involvement and participation in local development strategies. Ensuring that local communities are in a position to develop their resources and their capacity to respond to local problems has an important role to play in addressing the many challenges which they confront. Approaching community capacity building holistically and establishing the most appropriate ways to integrate the diverse dimensions of community capacity building is central to effective community capacity building.

Social inclusion can only be achieved through a collective commitment of a set of stakeholders and social economy is certainly an actor who can provide innovative solution to create more inclusive economies.

For further information contact Antonella Noya (Senior Policy Analyst, Paris) antonella.noya@oecd.org, Emma Clarence (Policy Analyst, Trento, Italy) emma.clarence@oecd.org.

Strategies for improving employment outcomes for indigenous and tribal communities

A new LEED project

From 2009, a new LEED project will look at ‘Strategies for improving employment outcomes for indigenous and tribal communities’. There remains a significant gap between employment and unemployment rates for indigenous people and the wider population in OECD countries. In Australia, the unemployment rate for indigenous people was three times the rate for non-indigenous people in 2006 (16% compared with 5%). The entrepreneurship rate for indigenous populations is also relatively low, with 6% of employed indigenous Australians indicating that they work in their own business, compared with 17% of employed non-indigenous people. A number of different factors can be held responsible. The historical relationship between indigenous groups and colonising settlers continues to play a strong role in shaping the participation of such groups in ‘mainstream’ society. Indigenous populations are more likely to be located in remote rural areas and reserves which can be isolated from economic opportunity. They often also have low schooling rates and high rates of educational disengagement.

In some parts of the world indigenous communities have recently received settlements from their governments from past injustices increasing their resource base. This, coupled with the differential application of certain laws, such as the gaming laws in the United States, has provided opportunities for economic development. However, the pace of these changes means that development has not always helped all those in the community, and strong local and community based governance mechanisms are necessary to ensure that economic opportunity provides sustainable employment opportunities over time for all.

In many cases, policies directed towards indigenous communities are managed at a national or federal level. This makes it important that federal policies are responsive to the local challenges experienced by indigenous populations, whilst also supporting local community based economic development. In New Zealand, for example, the government has a longstanding commitment to supporting Māori-led Māori development, channelling investment through tribal authorities. In Canada, HRSDC (Human Resources and Social Development Canada) has introduced an Aboriginal Human Resources Development Strategy which involves 80 different agreements with Aboriginal...
organisations across the country, delivering labour market programming specifically adapted to particular communities.

A tribe-based approach to economic development has also been taken by some indigenous communities in the United States following new rights for ‘self-determination’ introduced in the 1990s. The Choctaw tribe in Mississippi have used the new powers granted to them to develop a strong and growing local economy based around the hospitality and gaming industries, investing significantly in education and training for their members. Indeed, indigenous communities are often valuable sources of innovation which wider society can harness in the face of contemporary problems. In Australia, Aboriginal communities have been increasingly involved in innovative community initiatives to support sustainable environmental management in the context of increasing drought and climate change. It should not be forgotten, however, that many indigenous people are no longer living in a tribal context and have moved to cities, where they engage day to day in mainstream society. For such people, support may be needed for ‘bridging’ between different cultural frameworks, while mainstream education and employment institutions need to become better at managing diversity and challenging discrimination where it occurs.

Following a cross-country comparative approach this study will provide policy makers at the national and local level with a strong understanding of the issues faced by indigenous groups, and a set of tools and instruments with which to build an appropriate policy response to improving employment outcomes. The study will in particular consider the following issues: what data and information needs to be collected to fully understand the challenges faced by indigenous populations? To what extent should local Public Employment Service offices get involved with partnering other organisations (e.g. NGOs and indigenous groups) to deliver services to indigenous populations? How can indigenous assets be best be exploited within broader local economic and employment strategies? How can the ideas and practices of indigenous communities’ best be harnessed to support innovation, and meet emerging national and global priorities, such as sustainable environmental management and the tackling of climate change?

To learn more and to participate in the project, please contact Francesca.Froy@oecd.org.
Forum News and events


The capacity building seminar began with a one-day session open to a wide audience of policymakers and practitioners involved in tackling the impact of the crisis on jobs and skills. This session presented an assessment of the impact of the crisis on the labour market and discussed, using concrete examples, the value of various policy responses on the basis of three critical trade-offs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Discussion 1</th>
<th>Investing in &quot;winners&quot; vs. reducing redundancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Discussion 2</td>
<td>Are &quot;green&quot; jobs really an answer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Discussion 3</td>
<td>Targeting the disadvantaged vs. supporting the easy to support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Days 2 and 3 focused on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Tools and methods to measure local labour market trends, identify problems, prepare a diagnostic as a basis for strategy design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Ways to adapt labour market policy to local needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Ways to integrate different instruments into a coherent local skills strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watch short video interviews and video summaries of seminar lectures

Download the presentations

Capacity Building Seminar on "Getting the Young into Jobs: the Role of Partnerships", 26-28 October 2009, Trento, Italy

Ensuring a smooth and quick transition from education to employment and fighting education drop-out trends are key objectives of youth policies across OECD countries. The current economic downturn is once more reinforcing the need for governments to intervene in making labour markets more accessible for the young. In the EU-27 countries, four out of every ten unemployed belong to the age group 16-29-years-old, and in the OECD area around 12 percent of this age group are neither in employment, nor in education or training. Moreover, many qualifications attained at school and university do not meet the requirements of businesses, who today have to survive, compete and grow in globalised and knowledge driven economies.

The to-do-list of governments is long. But, there is growing evidence that those in charge of setting priorities and translating them into effective initiatives are gaining from partnering with employment, and training services, schools and higher education institutions, community based and voluntary organisations, the
business sector, and, increasingly also beneficiaries. Across OECD countries such partnerships have been active in advancing evidence-based decision making and the effective delivery of policies to prevent the economic downturn producing a ‘lost generation’ of youth to the labour market. Whereas some are more involved in the delivery of policies, and others seek to also influence priorities, targets and the ways of delivery, all share the same aims: to increase the effectiveness of policies to get the young into jobs, in terms of output and outcome achievement, and to improve local governance.

Much can be learned from an international exchange regarding the rationale behind partnership working, successful techniques, the results achieved, and how the pitfalls and barriers encountered have been addressed. This is what the OECD LEED Trento Centre for Local Development seeks to stimulate with a dedicated capacity building seminar on “Getting the young into jobs: the role of partnerships”. The seminar is part of a series of capacity building activities organised within the framework of the OECD LEED Forum on Partnerships and Local Governance.

The 2.5-day programme will be structured around a mix of presentations by invited experts and OECD staff followed by discussion and group work around case studies developed by participants prior to the seminar. An OPENSPACE session will also offer participants opportunities to engage in depth-interviews with people behind good practices.

The seminar is addressed to those already working in partnerships on youth policies, or in the process of establishing a partnership in one of the following areas:

**Promoting entrepreneurship.** Teaching youth with a business idea how to set up and run their own venture, and making access to finance easier;

**Youth skills initiatives.** Encouraging and assisting firms to train, hire and retain more low skilled youth, and tailoring skills-upgrading services to both the needs of businesses and the profile of unemployed youth;

**Integrating youth with accumulated disadvantages.** Enhancing long-term labour market integration of school drop outs, young and single parents, offenders, migrant or minority backgrounds, rural and remote dwellers, etc.

Read more about the seminar…

>> Applications

To apply, please complete the short on-line questionnaire by 1 September 2009.

Up to 25 participants will be selected on the basis of their submitted questionnaire.

For more information on these two seminars, please contact Elisa.Campestrin@oecd.org.
Forum in brief

The partnership network. The OECD LEED Forum on Partnerships and Local Governance, created in 2004 in co-operation with the Austrian Federal Ministry of Economy and Labour and supported by the European Commission, is a network for the exchange of information and experiences between local partnerships.

>> Forum mission. The mission of the OECD LEED Forum on Partnerships and Local Governance is to enhance the contribution of partnership structures to local development and local governance and the effectiveness of policies.

>> Forum partnerships. Area-based partnerships are tools to improve governance. They seek to improve policy co-ordination and adaptation to local conditions, lead to the better utilisation and targeting of programmes, integrate civil society’s concerns into strategic planning exercises, stimulate corporate involvement in local projects, and promote greater satisfaction with public policy (OECD, Local Partnerships for Better Governance, 2001).

Forum partnerships are primarily focused on employment and social issues and economic development and are characterised by a multi-level, multi-sectoral and multi-dimensional approach.

>> Objectives of the Forum
- to improve dissemination, stimulate learning between partnerships and facilitate the transfer of expertise and exchange of experiences;
- to create synergies between partnership programmes;
- to assess and develop co-operation models; and
- to advise and support partnership organisations on ways to promote an integrated approach and improve the co-ordination between policies.

>> Forum Structure. All institutions and organisations involved in the management of area-based partnerships may become members of the Forum.

All co-ordination tasks are carried out by the Forum Office Vienna at the ZSI (Centre for Social Innovation) and the OECD LEED Trento Centre for Local Development, under the supervision of the OECD LEED Programme (Paris).
Contacts

FORUM TEAM

**OECD Headquarters, Paris**

Sylvain Giguère, Head of the LEED Division  
(Sylvain.Giguere@oecd.org)

Ekaterina Travkina, Forum Team Leader  
(Ekaterina.Travkina@oecd.org)

Francesca Froy, Co-ordinator for activities on employment, skills and local governance  
(Francesca.Froy@oecd.org)

**OECD LEED Trento Centre for Local Development, Italy**

Andrea-Rosalinde Hofer, Policy Analyst (reviews, capacity building sessions)  
(Andrea-Rosalinde.Hofer@oecd.org)

Elisa Campestrin, Information and Communication Technology Manager  
(Elisa.Campestrin@oecd.org)

**Centre for Social Innovation (ZSI), Vienna, Austria**

Michael Förschner, Team Leader at ZSI  
(foerschner@zsi.at)

Jana Machačová, Network Manager  
(machacova@zsi.at)

Eva Rubik, Assistant  
(rubik@zsi.at)

Anette Scoppetta, Manager of the projects “Coordination Unit of Territorial Employment Pacts (TEPs) in Austria” at ZSI  
(scoppetta@zsi.at)

FORUM BOARD

**Chairman:** Robert Strauss, Head of Unit D/2 “EES, CSR, Local Development”, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, European Commission  
(Robert.Strauss@ec.europa.eu)

Doris Ballwein, Fed. Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection (BMASK), Austria  
(Doris.Ballwein@bmwa.gv.at)

Hélène Deslauriers, Executive Director, Réseau des SADC du Québec, Canada  
(hdeslauriers@ciril.qc.ca)

Denis Leamy, Chief Executive of Pobal, Ireland  
(DLeamy@pobal.ie)

Anna Orologa, Director for Monitoring & Evaluation of Active Employment Policies, Employment Observatory Research – Informatics SA, Greece  
(aorologa@paep.org.gr)

http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/forum/partnerships