

---

# Appendixes

---

## Appendix I: Terms of Reference

### Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants

#### Settlement Policy Objective

The objective of the Government's settlement policy is to enable migrants to participate equitably in Australian society as rapidly as possible. In the Government's view, this objective is best met through a coordinated mix of responsive mainstream services and of services that are specifically targeted to migrant, refugee and humanitarian entrant needs.

Consistent with the Government's policy in relation to mainstream social support systems, DIMIA settlement services:

- aim to equip people with the skills to participate equitably in Australian society;
- recognise that many people in a period of transition adjusting to a new society require particular assistance to help them through this period; and
- seek to understand individual circumstances that impact on that person's capacity to participate and target support to match those needs.

#### Impetus for the Review

The outcome of equitable participation by migrants in Australian society cannot be achieved by settlement services alone. DIMIA's settlement services, and their integration within the broader social support network, have not been reviewed since the introduction of the *Charter for Public Service in a Culturally Diverse Society* in 1998. It is timely to examine settlement services in this context, against the settlement policy objective, to ensure that the services offered enable migrants to participate equitably as rapidly as possible.

### Objectives of the Review

The objectives of the Program Review of Settlement Services are to:

- improve integration between settlement and mainstream services;
- strengthen partnerships among and between service providers and the government;
- promote innovation and flexibility in funding models;
- develop principles for future distribution of settlement services; and
- enhance the performance and accountability framework for the delivery of funded outcomes.

### Scope of the Review

The review will acknowledge the place of the Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) and the Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS) in the range of DIMIA's settlement services and will draw on existing review materials in its analysis of these services.

New analysis under the review will focus on:

- Migrant Resource Centres (MRCs) and Migrant Service Agencies (MSAs);
- The Community Settlement Services Scheme (CSSS); and
- The Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy (IHSS).

The review will build on the success of current programs and funding models in order to enhance the settlement experience of migrants.

While the National Integrated Settlement Strategy (NISS) is not a settlement service, its role in the integration of settlement services

with mainstream human services funded by all three spheres of government will be examined within the review.

The review will not re-visit the Government policy that settlement services funded by the Commonwealth are available only to permanent entrants.

**Terms of Reference:**

The review will identify strategies for improving service integration and enhancing mainstream service providers' responsiveness to migrant clients, including:

- enabling improved whole of government responses to migrants' service delivery needs in accordance with access and equity principles;
- in that context, developing strategies for more effective service provision to migrants in rural, regional and remote Australia;
- enhancing the performance of the NISS framework for service integration with other human service providers, whether they are funded by Commonwealth, state or local governments;
- strengthening partnerships among and between service providers and the government; and
- developing performance measures within funding agreements to reinforce service integration.

The review will explore options for innovation and flexibility in funding models and develop an enhanced performance and accountability framework for the delivery of funded outcomes, taking into account:

- the strengths and weaknesses of the current funding models;
- the effectiveness of current models in delivering outcomes;
- comparisons with other human service delivery models;
- the scope for harmonising funding models across programs;
- the relationship between the funding model and the performance and accountability framework;
- the promotion of best practice in service delivery through accreditation or other quality assurance mechanisms;
- linking performance to multiyear funding agreements;
- the adequacy of funding (including such factors as stability of staffing, rent, insurance and other cost drivers), equity in terms of dollar amount per client, and equity in terms of service priority; and
- opportunities for strengthening the role of volunteers in the delivery of services.

---

## Appendix II: Submissions to the Review

### Submissions from organisations

ACL Pty Ltd.	Centrelink
Adelaide Central Community Health Service	Chaldean Australian Culture Society
Adult Multicultural Education Services	Chinese Australian Services Society Co-operative
AIT English Language Services	Chinese Migrant Welfare Association
Al Zahra Muslim Women's Association	City of Casey
AMEP Research Centre	City of Ryde
Anglicare Migrant Services	CO.AS.IT (Italian Assistance Association)
Armenian Community Welfare Centre	Coffs Harbour Neighbourhood Centre
Auburn Council	Colony 47
Auburn Migrant Resource Centre	Community Information Whittlesea
Australian - Croatian Community Services	Consumer and Tenant Advice Service Northern
Australian and Khmer Consultancy Service	Council of Social Service of New South Wales
Australian Greek Welfare Society	CRF (Colac Otway) Pty Ltd
Bathurst Information and Neighbourhood Centre	Cultureseven
Baulkham Hills Holroyd Parramatta Migrant Resource Centre	Darwin Refugee Health Network
Belconnen Community Service	Department for Community Development, Government of Western Australia
Blacktown Migrant Resource Centre	Department of Health and Human Services, Tasmania
Botany Migrant Resource Centre	Devonport Refugee Committee
Brucemac Pty Ltd	Diversity Health Committee
Burnie Refugee Support Group	Ecumenical Migration Centre
Cambodian-Australian Welfare Council of NSW	Ethnic Communities' Council of Northern Tasmania
Canterbury Bankstown Migrant Resource Centre	Ethnic Communities' Council of Queensland
Catholic Migrant Centre	Ethnic Communities' Council of Victoria
CELAS – Spanish Latin American Welfare Centre	Ethnic Communities' Council of WA
Centacare Cairns	Ethnic Minorities Action Group
Centacare Canberra	Fairfield City Council
Centre for Multicultural Youth Issues and Partners	Fairfield Migrant Interagency
Centre for Philippine Concerns Australia	Federation of Chinese Associations (Victoria)
	Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia
	Frontier Services

Greater Dandenong Migrant Settlement Committee	Migrant Resource Centres Forum of New South Wales
Greek Orthodox Community of NSW	Moreland City Council
Greek Welfare Centre	Multicultural Affairs QLD
GyMEA Community Aid and Information Service	Multicultural Council of Tasmania
Household Formation Support Providers	Multicultural Council of the Northern Territory
Hurstville City Council	Multicultural Development Association
Illawarra Migrant Resource Centre	Newcastle District CRSS-CSR Group
Inner West Home & Community Care Development Project	Northern Sydney Region Multicultural Networks Forum
Kogarah Council	Northern Territory Government
Lgov NSW	Northern Territory University (AMEP)
Liverpool Migrant Resource Centre	NSW Local Government Community Services Association
Logan City Council	NSW Refugee Health Service
Macarthur Migrant Resource Centre	NSW Service for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture and Trauma Survivors
Macedonian Australian Welfare Association of Sydney	Polish Welfare and Information Bureau in NSW
Macedonian Welfare Association	Quaker Hill Family Centre
Mackay Regional Council for Social Development	Randwick TAFE
Macquarie Legal Centre	Reconnect St George Youth and Family Service
Maltese Community Council of Victoria	Refugee Council of Australia
Maribyrnong City Council	Resolve FM
Marrickville Legal Centre	Rockdale City Council
Melaleuca Refugee Centre, Torture & Trauma Survivors Service of the NT	Sanctuary Refugee Support Group
Migrant Network Services (Northern Sydney)	School of Health Sciences, Deakin University
Migrant Resource Centre (Southern Tasmania)	Service Support Provider Consortium-Deakin University, MRC (North East) and Myriad Consultants
Migrant Resource Centre of Canberra and Queanbeyan	Settlement Services Coalition
Migrant Resource Centre of Central Australia	Society of St Vincent de Paul Society (NSW)
Migrant Resource Centre of Newcastle and the Hunter Region	South Australia Council of Social Service
Migrant Resource Centre of South Australia	South Australian Department of Human Services
Migrant Resource Centre Tasmania (IHSS Contractor)	South Metropolitan Migrant Resource Centre
	South West Sydney Legal Centre

---

Sri Lankan Tamil Association of Western Australia  
St George Hospital and Community Health Service  
St George Migrant Resource Centre  
St John the Apostle Parish Refugee Resettlement Committee  
TAFE Queensland Language and Literacy Services  
Tribal Refugee Welfare of Western Australia  
Victorian Government  
Victorian Migrant Resource Centres  
Vietnamese Community in Australia (Victoria Chapter)  
Wentworth Area Health Service  
West Coast College of TAFE (West Coast AMES)  
Western Australia Department of Health  
Western Region Health Centre  
Western Suburbs Settlement Advisory Committee  
Women's Health Service, South East Health  
Woolgoolga Neighbourhood Centre  
Youth Action and Policy Association

**Submissions from Individuals:**

Brett Kitchner  
Emilio Fiorenza  
Fiona Luckhurst  
Henry Pan & Bee Koh (joint submission)  
Karu Liyanaratchi  
Ouyinh-Tram Trinh  
Roger Hanson  
Sally Aplin  
Steffi Schwarz  
Svetlana Chekhourdina

### Appendix III: Public Consultations

Date	Consultation	Location
30-Sep	QLD – Supplementary Consultation	Brisbane
1-Oct	QLD – Minister’s Consultation	Brisbane
8-Oct	WA – Minister’s Consultation	Perth
	WA – Supplementary Consultation	Perth
9-Oct	SA - Minister’s Consultation	Adelaide
10-Oct	NT - Minister’s Consultation	Darwin
14-Oct	ACT - Minister’s Consultation	Canberra
	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Parramatta/Blacktown
15-Oct	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Macarthur/Campbelltown/Liverpool
	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Newcastle
	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Fairfield
16-Oct	NSW – Supplementary Consultations (2)	Sydney CBD
	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	St George/Botany/Randwick
	VIC – Supplementary Consultation	Shepparton
17-Oct	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Auburn
	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Burwood
	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Canterbury/Bankstown
18-Oct	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Ryde/Eastwood
	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Hornsby
	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Chatswood
21-Oct	NSW – Supplementary Consultation	Illawarra
	VIC – Supplementary Consultations (3)	Melbourne CBD
23-Oct	ACT - Regional Supplementary Consultation	Wagga Wagga
24-Oct	ACT - Regional Supplementary Consultation	Albury
30-Oct	NSW - Minister’s Consultations (4)	Sydney CBD
31-Oct	VIC - Minister’s Consultations (3)	Melbourne CBD
1-Nov	SA - Supplementary Consultation	Adelaide
6-Nov	NT - Supplementary Consultation	Alice Springs
7-Nov	TAS – Supplementary Consultation	Ulverstone
18-Nov	TAS – Supplementary Consultation	Hobart
19-Nov	TAS – Supplementary Consultation	Launceston
25-Nov	TAS - Minister’s Consultation	Hobart

---

## Appendix IV: Settlement In Rural, Regional And Remote Australia

### Summary of Comments

In June 2002, DIMIA circulated to key government and community sector stakeholders with an interest in rural and regional issues an exposure draft of a discussion paper entitled *Supporting Settlement in Rural, Regional and Remote Australia*.

The department asked for comment, in particular on chapter five, which outlined a number of practical suggestions for increasing settlement support in rural and regional areas. It also sought suggestions for innovative and flexible approaches to service delivery, which could provide cost effective and quality outcomes for clients.

Input was received from around fifty different community organisations and local, State/Territory and Commonwealth government agencies across Australia.

Overall input indicated that:

- there is a need to raise awareness of the services available to migrants;
- local governments play a key role and increased contributions are required at the local government level, including the need to recognise the specific needs of migrants and provide them with additional assistance;
- government funded service providers and key mainstream agencies need to work together to deliver a more coordinated approach to service delivery;
- there is a need to promote cultural awareness and racial harmony. For example, increased efforts must be made to ensure that staff within agencies including all of the mainstream, job network and employment agencies, receive cross cultural awareness training; and

- the most effective strategies are those that build on existing services and create better links and coordination.

The overwhelming majority of responses to the discussion paper were extremely positive including the willingness of agencies and organisations to work with DIMIA to improve settlement outcomes for migrants in rural and regional areas.

Specifically, DIMIA was invited to consult or participate in forums, working parties and committees (for example, Regional Health Service Planning Committees and the Sustainable Regions Programme) and to promote settlement services through agency newsletters, television and radio broadcasts.

Information was also provided by other government agencies on support grants and assistance for community agencies such as the FaCs Stronger Families and Communities program.

A number of useful suggestions were made in relation to DIMIA settlement initiatives such as:

- improving the effectiveness of Settlement Planning Committees (SPCs) by expanding the agencies and organisations that currently participate in the committee and forging stronger links with organisations in rural Australia;
- including in DIMIA Settlement Information Kits additional rural information and encouraging overseas posts to deliver the information to migrants prior to their arrival in Australia; and
- using the AMEP hat to deliver increased settlement information and to act as a significant focal point for settlement providers, information dissemination and the coordination of settlement services in rural and regional areas.

Input requested that the following be considered in relation to improving service delivery in non metropolitan Australia:

- impediments caused by transport issues due to a lack of public transport, the inability of some migrants to drive and the high cost of petrol;
- child care shortages and the need for child care to be made available in conjunction with AMEP classes;
- the needs of itinerant workers, (who often do not require English to carry out work such as fruit picking) and the disruption this causes to their participation in English language training;
- limited access to accredited interpreters and translation services;
- difficulties with delivery of information through Internet technology (ie limited access in rural areas). Many migrants want to be taught computer skills only after learning English;
- timeliness and cost issues in relation to the delivery of services across large geographical areas;
- difficulties for those migrants in rural and regional areas with limited or no literacy skills;
- language barriers because of the small communities and the difficulty in finding other migrants of the same language background;
- shortage of affordable housing and employment opportunities; and
- the need to engage rural migrants. For example, to involve them in local sport and activities which may be very different to those of their own culture. It is recognised that increasing social participation will build and contribute to social cohesion.

---

## Appendix V: Further Information on Migrants Interviewed for LSIA 1 and LSIA 2

Most tables in the main part of this report are based on combined results of the Primary Applicant (PA) and the Migrating Unit Spouse (MU Spouse). The MU Spouse is a spouse, fiancé(e) or de facto partner travelling on the same visa application as the PA. Around 3% of MU Spouses (which is 1% of combined PAs and MU Spouses) were not interviewed. To this extent, results in tables will be very slightly

different to what would be reported if all MU Spouses were interviewed. PAs and MU Spouses combined account for around 90% migrants aged 15 years old or more. Tables 1 and 2 below indicate the size of the LSIA samples. Table 3 shows the major characteristics of migrants in LSIA 1 and LSIA 2.

**Table 1: Migrants interviewed for LSIA 1**

	Sample Selected	Sample Interviewed	Population Estimate from sample selected	% of Population represented by those Interviewed
Male Primary Applicants	2958	2958	39234	100
Female Primary Applicants	2234	2234	35756	100
Male Migrating Unit Spouse	365	344	3800	96
Female Migrating Unit Spouse	1472	1425	16714	98
<b>Total</b>	<b>7029</b>	<b>6961</b>	<b>95503</b>	<b>99%</b>

**Table 2: Migrants interviewed for LSIA 2**

	Sample Selected	Sample Interviewed	Population Estimate from sample selected	% of Population represented by those Interviewed
Male Primary Applicants	1692	1692	16847	100
Female Primary Applicants	1432	1432	15568	100
Male Migrating Unit Spouse	271	259	2854	96
Female Migrating Unit Spouse	823	798	7370	97
<b>Total</b>	<b>4218</b>	<b>4181</b>	<b>42638</b>	<b>99%</b>

**Table 3: Major Characteristics of Migrants (principal applicants and spouses) for LSIA 1 and LSIA 2**

	<b>LSIA 1</b>	<b>LSIA2</b>
<b>Average age (Years)</b>	35	35
<b>Time between migrating and wave 1 (six months after arrival) interview</b>	%	%
90 days or less	13	4
91 to 150 days	59	42
151 to 180 days	15	28
181 to 240 days	12	27
Over 240 days	1	0
<b>Primary Applicant or Spouse, Males, Females</b>	%	%
Male Primary Applicants	41	40
Female Primary Applicants	38	37
Male MU Spouse	4	6
Female MU Spouse	17	17
<b>Visa Category</b>	%	%
Preferential Family/Family Stream	49	41
Concessional Family/Skilled-Australian Linked	10	12
Business Skills & Employer Nomination Scheme	5	8
Independent	20	30
Humanitarian (a)	16	9
<b>Country of Birth</b>	%	%
Oceania	2	3
United Kingdom & Ireland	16	15
Other North-West Europe	4	4
Southern And Eastern Europe	15	10
North Africa and the Middle East	9	9
South-East Asia	20	16
North-East Asia	14	16
Southern and Central Asia	11	13
Northern America	3	3
Central & South America	2	1
Sub-Saharan Africa	5	10
<b>Level of Highest qualification</b>	%	%
Higher degree, post-graduate diploma	12	19
Bachelor degree	20	24
Diploma, certificate, trade	27	28
Year 12	17	16
Other	23	14

---

## Appendix VI: Background to the Pilot Client Survey

In May 2002, DIMIA commissioned a qualitative research project on the effectiveness of DIMIA-funded community settlement services directed towards helping migrants and humanitarian entrants participate equitably in Australian society. The research focussed on services provided by MRCs/MSAs and community organisations funded under the CSSS. Urbis Keys Young conducted the research for the department.

The project was an exploratory study of perceptions, opinions and experiences of the people who use and deliver these services, as well as those who work closely with them in the community. This three-stranded methodology had not previously been used by DIMIA. In this sense, the research project was a pilot study.

The objectives of the research were:

- to gain a better understanding of how useful these services are in assisting migrants and humanitarian entrants as they settle in Australia; and
- to evaluate the methodology used with a view to understanding how best to approach evaluations of this type in the future.

The exploratory nature of this pilot study meant that it was conducted on a small-scale only. It involved obtaining feedback from clients, service providers and community

stakeholders in four locations: Dandenong in Victoria, the ACT, and Cairns and Townsville in Queensland.

These locations were chosen by DIMIA for this initial study with the aim of reflecting large and small metropolitan and regional centres, and the diversity of services provided by MRC/MSAs and CSSS-funded community organisations.

The research sought to gather views and perceptions on:

- the experience of migrants and humanitarian entrants using these services, including frequency of use, the appropriateness of the services provided and levels of satisfaction with them;
- aspects of the services provided which have been of most assistance in equipping clients to participate equitably in Australian society; and
- suggestions for where value could be added to improve outcomes for clients.

The research also sought to test the appropriateness of the methodology for examining settlement service effectiveness, with a view to making recommendations on how best to proceed with evaluations of these types of services in the future.

A report summarising the results of the survey can be found on the DIMIA web site.

## Appendix VII: The Settlement Database

DIMIA's Settlement Database (SDB) provides a comprehensive source of data on new arrivals to Australia. The SDB is a mainframe statistical application that draws on data available from transactional processing systems that support DIMIA permanent visa and movement operations and from external systems such as the database that supports the AMEP. This electronic information is supplemented by SDB specific information captured on Settlement Information Forms. A summarised version of the SDB is stored on DIMIA's data warehouse platform and a World Wide Web online interface allows access to reports based on this data. This is known as the Community OnLine Database (COLD).

The SDB stores bio-data such as country of birth, date of birth and sex plus a variety of information items covering personal characteristics such as English Proficiency and languages spoken. It also stores items from which variables can be derived to classify this data, such as the dates of visa grant and of arrival plus intended or initial residential location.

Given the range of variables available in the SDB, it has been necessary to adopt standard reporting formats to describe the status of the migrant population. In particular, the SDB can categorise the time dimension based on date of visa grant or date of arrival in Australia and the standard adopted is 'date of arrival'. The SDB itself allows users to specify which basis to use or even a combination of both, however, in COLD only 'date of arrival' is implemented. The data used in this report is based on date of arrival.

It should be noted that data reported on the basis of 'date of arrival' does not fully capture all of the people granted permanent visas in a particular program year or set of years. It excludes people who were granted a migrant visa onshore after having arrived in an earlier period. Similarly, it does not count people granted migration visas offshore during the period under consideration but who have not yet, or may never, arrive. Consequently, for a given period, the counts will be less than the figures for the onshore and offshore components of the immigration program.

It should also be noted that the SDB only includes visaed migrants arriving under the Migration or Humanitarian Programs. The SDB figures exclude New Zealand citizens who settle in Australia under the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement. For this reason, all tables showing counts for specific countries of birth exclude New Zealand if SDB data is used.

The country of birth code stored by the SDB is sourced from the DIMIA operational systems referred to above. The SDB uses the same code set as these systems, a DIMIA specific four character code table implemented in the Department's Common Reference Table application. In most instances this set of operational codes aligns with the *Standard Australian Classification of Countries (SACC)* produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in 1998 for use in the classification of statistical data by country.

However, in some cases, particularly those relating to recently defunct political entities such as the former Yugoslavia and the former USSR, this does not apply. In instances where SDB data on country of birth cannot be

---

identified as relating directly to a particular country classification as set out in the SACC, a higher geographic area has been used as the basis for classification. For example, country of birth data relating to the former Yugoslavia which cannot be clearly assigned to the new countries of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia or Serbia and Montenegro (formerly the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) has been included under the higher level category of South Eastern Europe not further defined (nfd). This means that SDB data on country of birth for these new individual countries is likely to be understated.

## Appendix VIII: Establishment Dates of MRCs/MSAs

MRC/MSA	Part of original MRC program	Date incorporated into MRC/MSA	MRC/MSA Funding Withdrawn
<b>New South Wales</b>			
Inner West (Ashfield)		1996	2002
Auburn		1996	
Blacktown		1986	
Fairfield (Cabramatta)		1986	
Macarthur (Campbelltown)		1993	
Canterbury-Bankstown (Campsie)		1986	
Botany (Daceyville)	X	1981	
Newcastle and Hunter Region (Hamilton)	X	1981	
Migrant Network Services (Hornsby)		1998	
Liverpool	X	1979	
Parramatta	X	1979	1984
Baulkham Hills/Holroyd/Parramatta (Parramatta)		1996	
St George (Rockdale)	X	1981	
Illawarra (Wollongong)	X	1980	
<b>Victoria</b>			
Westgate Region (Altona North)		1992(a)	
South Eastern (Dandenong)		1993	
Geelong (Geelong West)	X	1979	2003
Northern Metropolitan (Glenroy)		1985	
Inner Western (Footscray)	X	1981	
Hoppers Crossing outreach of Inner Western MRC		1993	
Migrant Information Centre (Mitcham)		1998	
Gippsland (Morwell)		1984	
North East (Preston)	X	1980	
Melbourne	X	1979	1989
North West (St Albans)		1989	
South Central (Prahran)	X	1980	
Oakleigh outreach of South Central MRC		1992	

<b>MRC/MSA</b>	<b>Part of original MRC program</b>	<b>Date incorporated into MRC/MSA</b>	<b>MRC/MSA Funding Withdrawn</b>
<b>Queensland</b>			
Brisbane	X	1980	1998
Multicultural Development Agency (Stones Corner)		1998	
Cairns		1992	1998
Migrant Settlement Services (Cairns)		1999	
Logan & Beenleigh (Woodridge)		1996	
Townsville	X	1980	
<b>Western Australia</b>			
South Metropolitan (Fremantle)	X	1980	
North Perth	X	1980	1995
Northern Suburbs (Mirrabooka)		1994	
<b>South Australia</b>			
Adelaide	X	1980	
<b>Tasmania</b>			
Southern Tasmania (Hobart)	X	1979	
Northern Tasmania (Launceston)		1982	
<b>Australian Capital Territory</b>			
Canberra MRC/Queanbeyan Multilingual Centre	X	1980	
<b>Northern Territory</b>			
Central Australia (Alice Springs)		1992	2003
Darwin	X	1979	1993

