
Chapter Nine: The Community Settlement Services Scheme

The CSSS provides grants funding to not-for-profit community organisations and local government bodies to deliver settlement information and referral services to individuals, facilitate community capacity building, and promote client needs to mainstream service providers.

A range of ethno-specific, multi-ethnic and generalist organisations currently receive funding under the scheme. The growth in the number of smaller and more diverse migrant groups in Australia is likely to see generalist organisations playing an increasingly important role in service delivery as the small size of some communities in some locations will preclude ethno-specific or multi-ethnic services. Broadening eligibility for CSSS funding would enable a wider range of organisations to seek CSSS funding, opening up opportunities for more innovative partnerships in service delivery, streamlined access to services delivered from a single location, and greater efficiencies in making use of existing infrastructure.

A stronger needs-based planning framework for DIMIA settlement services, as outlined in chapter seven - Settlement Planning, should in the future inform the advertising and assessment criteria for the annual grants round and should result in better targeting of services to those most in need. In addition, application of the settlement services target group, described in chapter five - The Role of DIMIA-Funded Settlement Services, should limit CSSS-funded services for individuals to clients resident in Australia for up to five years, and should also focus funding for community capacity building on those communities most in need of assistance. Consideration could be given to creation of a separate grants program that assists longer-resident migrant communities to establish or maintain relationships with mainstream providers with a view to clarifying their needs, participating in the development of culturally-responsive mainstream services, and enhancing their willingness to access the available services.

A range of issues impact on the adequacy of grant levels, including the relatively higher costs of delivering services in regional areas. The report indicates that the better alignment of the size of grants with the actual cost of delivering work programs should result in an overall improvement in service delivery outcomes, but could mean a smaller number of grants overall to allow for an increase in the size of individual grants.

Introduction

DIMIA provides funding through grants for migrant community services to assist newly-arrived migrants and humanitarian entrants to settle in Australia. The funding is for grants to community organisations for service delivery or project work under the CSSS and core funding of MRCs/MSAs network. For the 2002-03 financial year, \$26.8 million was

made available for MRCs/MSAs and CSSS projects.

This chapter reviews the CSSS. The scheme provides a subsidy to competent, non-profit community organisations and local government bodies to deliver specific settlement assistance. It subsidises the provision of direct services as well as community participation in the planning and

delivery of services to meet identified settlement needs.

The history of the CSSS

The origins of the CSSS lie in the Grant-in-Aid (GIA) scheme and the Migrant Project Subsidy Scheme (MPSS) that were among its predecessors.

The GIA was established in 1968 in response to the high immigration levels and increasing diversity of the migrant intake of the 1960s. The aim of the scheme was to provide welfare services to migrants, with an emphasis on individual casework. The scheme provided a contribution to the salary and administrative costs of a designated worker employed by community organisations. Initially, only organisations that employed qualified social workers, were not dependent on departmental funding, and provided generalist services to migrants, were eligible to receive GIA funding. The grants were awarded for twelve months with the possibility of renewal. A total of twenty grants were awarded in the first year of the scheme's operation.

The 1978 Galbally report found that the GIA scheme was 'one of the most effective means of meeting migrants' needs, especially where multilingual workers are employed'.¹ The report found, however, that migrants were still experiencing difficulties with accessing mainstream services due to cultural and language barriers. These difficulties were exacerbated because many ethnic and community organisations had insufficient funds to deliver services effectively and were reliant on untrained volunteers.

The Galbally report also concluded that there was 'an urgent need for more specific welfare assistance for migrants'.² It made a number of recommendations that expanded and refined the GIA scheme, including:

- an increase in the role of ethnic and generalist organisations in the scheme;

- further employment of bilingual and welfare officers;
- a greater focus on direct welfare, community development and preventative activities;
- abolishing the ceiling on the number of grants awarded;
- relating the number of grants to the funds available;
- providing the scheme with an additional \$1.7 million over three years; and
- extending the funding term from one to three years to enable more effective implementation of programs.

In addition to its recommendations on the GIA scheme, the Galbally report recommended that the government fund a 'continuing program of part funding for specific once only projects initiated by ethnic and other voluntary organisations'.³ The aim of this program was to encourage self-help among ethnic communities. This recommendation led to the establishment of the MPSS in 1978.

In January 1979, new guidelines for the GIA scheme were announced. The revised objective of the scheme was to 'encourage self-help among ethnic communities'.⁴ By June 1981, 112 grants were in operation, with an annual allocation of approximately \$1.7 million.

¹ Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services to Migrants (Chairman F Galbally) *Migrant Services and Programs*, AGPS, Canberra, 1978, p. 68.

² Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services to Migrants, *Migrant Services and Programs*, p. 67.

³ Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services to Migrants, *Migrant Services and Programs*, p. 72.

⁴ Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs, (Chairman F Galbally), *Evaluation of Post-Arrival Programs and Services*, AIMA, Melbourne, 1982, p. 177.

Table 9.1: Agencies in receipt of Grant-in-Aid at June 1981

| State/Territory | Grants to Ethnic Agencies | Grants to Agencies to assist Indo-Chinese Refugees | Grants to General Agencies to Assist Specific Groups of Migrants | Grants to General Agencies to Assist all Migrants |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| New South Wales | 16 | 4 | 6 | 12 |
| Victoria | 22 | 3 | 3 | 14 |
| Queensland | 5 | 2 | - | 2 |
| Western Australia | 3 | - | 2 | 6 |
| South Australia | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Tasmania | - | 1 | - | - |
| Australian Capital Territory | - | - | - | 1 |
| Northern Territory | - | - | - | 1 |
| Total | 49 | 11 | 13 | 39 |

Source: AIMA, *Evaluation of Post-Arrival Programs and Services*, p. 178.

In assessing grants applications, DIMIA attempted to 'bring about a balance between States/Territories and between ethnic communities, and has had to ensure that services are accessible to the major concentrations of migrants in the urban areas of Sydney and Melbourne.'⁵ Other important factors included community support capacity and the availability of bilingual and welfare workers. Table 9.1 shows agencies in receipt of GIA grants in 1981.

In 1982, the evaluation of the implementation of the Galbally report conducted by the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (AIMA) found that the GIA scheme was 'predominantly casework orientated' and was working well.⁶ The AIMA recommended that the GIA scheme be extended and that funds be increased to support an additional twenty grants over the following three years.⁷

The AIMA also found that only one-sixth of the MPSS grants met the purpose intended by the Galbally report. The majority of grants were employed to augment existing services

or to provide funds to help developing organisations meet establishment costs. However, the AIMA acknowledged that the MPSS constituted a useful resource for migrant groups and recommended that funding be increased to \$200,000 per annum. In this context, DIMIA defined MPSS funding priorities more clearly. The MPSS was to provide funds for improvements in the design, planning and coordination of settlement services, for subsidising projects that aimed to improve migrant access to general community services or for equipment that would enable organisations to meet settlement needs. From 1988, the scheme became known as the Migrant Access Projects Scheme (MAPS).

⁵ Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (DIEA), *Review 80*, AGPS, Canberra, 1980, p. 18.

⁶ AIMA, *Evaluation of Post-Arrival Programs and Services*, p 183.

⁷ AIMA, *Evaluation of Post-Arrival Programs and Services*, pp. 174-191.

The GIA scheme continued to expand until 1997. In 1992, the allocation was \$10.4 million, with a total of 244 grants in operation. By 1996, eighteen years after the scheme was established, the number of full-time worker positions had grown from 49 to 261, the number of grants had increased from 20 to 321, and the program allocation had reached \$15.5 million.

Following a departmental review in 1997, DIMIA combined the GIA and MAPS schemes to form the CSSS. Under the CSSS, funding priorities corresponded more closely with priorities identified under the National Integrated Settlement Strategy (NISS), described in chapter seven of this report - Settlement Planning. The stated purpose of the CSSS was:

To assist recently arrived migrants and humanitarian entrants who have demonstrated settlement needs arising from their pre-arrival experiences, and/or cultural and language difficulties which they face on arrival in Australia. Within this broad target group, priority groups (those identified as having the greatest need) include humanitarian entrants, isolated migrants such as the aged and refugee women in difficult situations and new arrivals who belong to emerging communities.⁸

Grants awarded under the CSSS were originally similar to those awarded under the previous schemes and were either worker-based or project-based. Worker-based grants (usually ranging from \$40,000 to \$50,000) supported social and welfare worker positions.⁹ Project-based grants included minor projects (grants of up to \$10,000) such as the purchase of equipment or major projects (grants between \$10,000 and \$50,000) such as the planning and delivery of settlement services. For a short period from 1997, CSSS grants were limited to one year (with some roll-over arrangements) while the

Commonwealth Government conducted a broader review into discretionary grants across the Commonwealth.

Under the CSSS, organisations seeking funding provided details of their management structure to DIMIA. They also submitted a preliminary work program and budget for project-based funding and a work program for worker-based funding. In 1999, the department introduced further measures to ensure that the CSSS targeted service delivery needs for specific communities and regions more effectively. These measures included: re-introduction of one, two or three-year funding; simplification of the scheme to fund projects rather than workers or the purchase of equipment; and a tighter focus on the outcomes to be delivered by grant recipients.

The CSSS now operates in much the same way, although several administrative changes have strengthened its program management and accountability framework. Following a whole-of-government initiative in 1998, the principle focus of CSSS is now directed towards funding outputs and outcomes, to align it more closely with outcomes-based program management.

The CSSS funding year runs from 1 October to 30 September. The allocation for CSSS funding for the 2002 funding year (running from 1 October 2002 to 30 September 2003) was \$17.48 million. The scheme had a total of 332 grants in operation at the commencement of the 2002 funding period. This included new grants in 2002 and continuing grants from previous years. From

⁸ Australian National Audit Office (ANAO), *Provision of Migrant Settlement Services by DIMA*, audit report no. 29, performance audit, Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p. 54.

⁹ DIMIA determined the amount of funding. It was divided notionally in two parts: the first a salary component based on levels 1 to 4 and the second a loading for ancillary costs, which in 1997 was either 20% or 25%.

1 July 2004, the funding year will be aligned with the financial year.

The analysis in this chapter is based on the 2002 CSSS funding year, except for table 9.15 which is based on financial years. Likewise, CSSS funding figures for 2002 are based on new grants in the 2002 funding year and continuing grants from previous years, unless otherwise indicated.

Current arrangements

Who uses the CSSS?

The CSSS is intended to fund projects that will assist migrants and humanitarian entrants to settle in Australia. Commentary in public consultations and submissions to the review, however, has suggested that the client group, particularly in rural and regional areas, may be broader than this.

Because of geographic barriers in accessing assistance in terms of immigration information and other related matters CSSS Mackay has also provided direct client services to not only migrants and humanitarian entrants but to the general public. Consequently CSSS Mackay is seen as a de facto DIMIA, MRC or Migrant Services Development.

Submission from the Mackay Regional Council for Social Development, QLD

DIMIA has no data that is reliable for comparative purposes (ie across funded organisations) on CSSS client characteristics, numbers or services. While data is collected, it is not recorded systematically. This issue is addressed further in chapter thirteen of this report - Performance and Accountability. For the most part, the department relies on the Settlement Database for information on

potential client numbers. The recent pilot client survey of migrant community services, milestone reports from funded organisations, and feedback from DIMIA staff involved in managing CSSS grants provide qualitative information.

CSSS guidelines have for some years stated that priority is given to funding services for those in the settlement services target group, suggesting that the program's focus is on new arrivals with high needs. In practice, the services it funds are often open to all overseas-born, regardless of their length of residence. Unlike other DIMIA-funded settlement programs, no finite period has been specified within which clients may access CSSS-funded services. In part this may reflect the range of functions funded under the scheme, ranging from direct services to individuals to broader community capacity building and settlement planning. Nevertheless, for the reasons outlined in chapter five of this report - The Role of DIMIA-Funded Settlement Services, it is appropriate that CSSS-funded services should focus on individuals in the settlement services target group. They should also focus on communities that require assistance to organise, plan and work together to advocate for their needs and which continue to receive new arrivals who are in the target group.

The core functions of the CSSS

The core function of the CSSS is to provide grants funding to community organisations so that they can deliver services and implement projects which:

- provide information, orientation, referral and casework services to new arrivals, helping them to settle in Australia and gain access to mainstream services (*direct client services*);
- assist migrant communities to develop their capacity to organise, plan and advocate for their own needs (*community capacity building*); and

Table 9.2: CSSS service types, as identified by 2002 funded organisations

| Service Type | Description |
|--|---|
| Services to individual migrants | Settlement information, referral to mainstream services, and casework. |
| Post-IHSS services | Specific casework for humanitarian entrants, including providing support for victims of torture and trauma, and strategic planning for links between the IHSS, CSSS and other service providers. |
| Information sessions to groups of migrants | Providing information sessions about Australian society, the legal system, rights and responsibilities and how to gain access to government services - for example, the health system, Centrelink, Job Network and training/education system. |
| Community capacity building | Establishing/facilitating community groups, including for isolated women, youth, the aged, and developing community infrastructure, for example, through establishing and facilitating community radio programs. |
| Mainstreaming | Networking with mainstream providers to raise awareness of the diverse needs of their clients, training providers in relation to the delivery of linguistically and culturally appropriate services and/or raising cultural awareness, and developing links with other service delivery agencies. |
| Research/Strategic Planning | Researching client needs, and strategic planning, for example, for service delivery and service development. |
| Recruitment and training of volunteers | Recruitment of volunteers and establishment of volunteer networks, and training of volunteers, for example, in how to work with clients. |
| Promoting cultural diversity | Organising information sessions for the wider community to inform them about different cultures, and organising community events to celebrate diversity, such as cultural festivals. |
| Planning, coordination and management of settlement services | Coordinating delivery of settlement services, contributing to/establishing planning forums, for example, Settlement Planning Committees, supervising and supporting workers and outreach workers and providing team leadership. |

- develop settlement planning and service delivery networks to encourage delivery of culturally and linguistically appropriate services by mainstream service providers, including playing an advocacy role (service planning and development).

Table 9.2 is based on an analysis of project descriptions provided by CSSS organisations for 2002 grants and illustrates the types of services currently delivered under the scheme.

Not all CSSS organisations provide all the services outlined in the table above. Some provide only a single service. However, the majority provide four or more service types. In public consultations and submissions to the review, some stakeholders have stressed the importance of maintaining diversity and flexibility in CSSS projects.

...it is crucial that DIMIA continue to fund a whole variety of service types including individual casework and case-management as well community capacity building and service integration and development. This enables the workers to develop skills in a number of relevant areas but also be able to implement a systemic and holistic approach to service provision which at present characterises some of the best practice initiatives in service provision to refugees and humanitarian entrants.

Submission from the NSW Service for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture and Trauma Survivors.

While this diversity has some advantages in terms of educating workers and providing a more holistic service, it requires organisations to gain expertise in a range of different fields.

Anecdotal information suggests that some CSSS workers may be spreading themselves too thinly in delivering a range of services or may be overlapping with some of the work already being carried out by MRCs/MSAs within the same locality. This may highlight the need for better understanding of client needs as well as better coordination mechanisms in a given locality.

Direct client services

In public consultations and submissions to the review, stakeholders have supported a continuation of the direct service role undertaken through the CSSS, particularly in relation to information and referral services.

The following demonstrates the role of CSSS in Mackay region in providing individual direct client services to khelp migrants and humanitarian entrants: CSSS in the non-metropolitan area has become the link between mainstream services and migrants and humanitarian entrants who have settled in the region; [a]s settlement issues and needs of migrants and humanitarian entrants vary, direct individual CSSS settlement casework provides appropriate intervention or assistance individually; [e]nhanced access to services eg. telephone interpreter in particular in the context of health, information appropriate to migrants and humanitarian entrants individual needs such as housing...[a]s an information resource for the general public in regard to migrants and humanitarian entrants...[t]hrough direct client service, CSSS also act as an advocate for individual migrants and humanitarian entrants.

Submission from the Mackay Regional Council for Social Development, QLD

One commentator noted that CSSS workers have a key role to play in identifying client needs, due to the shortage of culturally and linguistically diverse mainstream services.

The absence of bi-lingual staff in professional areas - eg counselling, psychology, etc - creates difficulties for some settlers in terms of accessing effective services. This is more than just the lack of ethno-specific CSSS workers in the Region: it means that referrals to some services, particularly in relation to health issues, are not always as effective as they might be because there is no appropriately qualified staff member of a health service to directly address needs... It appears that in many cases, the main part of settlement work is being undertaken at the 'front end' in terms of identification of need by DIMIA-funded workers, with few appropriate services to which these clients can be referred being provided by mainstream organisations.

Submission from Migrant Network Services (Northern Sydney), NSW

The information and referral services provided through the CSSS can include a casework approach. This allows clients to develop a rapport with a single caseworker, promotes efficiencies by reducing the number of times that a client needs to explain their situation and provide their details to workers, and allows the caseworker to develop a tailored response to a set of known needs. Effective caseworkers work with clients over a relatively short time period to help them to understand and access mainstream services, encourage self-reliance and avoid dependency. This role remains appropriate within the general information and referral role of CSSS.

However, feedback in public consultations for the review has indicated concern that some

CSSS workers are undertaking work that is the responsibility of qualified health and welfare professionals. In some cases, clients are not being referred on to these professionals and the workers are taking on roles that require specialist knowledge.

While many CSSS workers are qualified social workers or welfare workers, they are not required to have qualifications in these fields and DIMIA funding is not intended to cover the provision of counselling services. CSSS management and workers have an important 'duty of care' to ensure that they do not take on counselling roles (even if they have qualifications) because they will not necessarily have the experience and specialist expertise to deal appropriately with complex issues in areas such as domestic violence. Services should have protocols in place that include provision of information and referral to relevant mainstream professionals.

Commentary in public consultations has suggested that the role of CSSS organisations in providing group information sessions is an appropriate extension of their individual client service role.

Community capacity building

CSSS-funded organisations are involved in community capacity building, often with support, information and advice from MRCs/MSAs in their local area.

There has been widespread support for CSSS organisations to continue working in this area.

Community capacity building should continue to be a priority for Settlement funding, with a particular focus on developing: strategies that are able to identify barriers to achieving community capacity coupled with; initiatives that assist and support groups to develop self-reliance and self-resilience and; a clear role for all DIMIA

funded service providers in working with CALD groups through this 'establishment' phase.

Submission from Community Information Whittlesea, VIC

Through the provision of grants to small ethnic organisations, DIMIA enables these organisations to learn about Australian society, project planning, implementation and evaluation, and associated accountabilities. They also learn about the nature and processes of incorporated associations and are likely to increase their capacity to utilise internal and access external resources in the future. This process can be highly empowering particularly for small and emerging refugee communities and can increase their ability and interest in social and economic participation in Australian society as a whole... Commonly, DIMIA grants are the first grants some of these small communities access... they often go on to accessing other funding sources and further developing internal community resources thus approaching participation in Australian society from the position of empowerment... Additionally, clients often take up involvement in these organisations, consequently moving from a position of dependence on service providers to one of community participation and responsibility.

Submission from the NSW Service for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture and Trauma Survivors

However, as shown in table 9.2, the types of projects funded under the community capacity building category are quite diverse. While not discouraging the potential for creativity, a clearer definition of the types of projects likely to be funded in this area and the kinds of

objectives they should seek to achieve would be helpful to applicants, particularly those from small and emerging communities.

In order to avoid duplication of services and to address client needs effectively in any given locality, information must be sought on what the needs are, what resources already exist to meet those needs and the gaps in service delivery. This issue is addressed in chapter seven of this report - Settlement Planning.

Service planning and development

Commentary from public consultations and submissions to the review has indicated general support among stakeholders for CSSS organisations to continue working with mainstream agencies to assist them to provide more responsive mainstream services.

In addition to invaluable direct ‘client’ services, DIMIA funded agencies have a critical role in encouraging and assisting mainstream organisations to meet their responsibilities to migrants and refugees. SACOSS acknowledges the role of specialist agencies in providing a bridge between mainstream providers and new arrivals by assisting with: education and training of staff in mainstream agencies; being a role model on how to engage with communities; delivering information and consultancy advice.

Submission from the South Australian Council of Social Service

There is potential to expand the reach of CSSS services by working with local governments and by establishing closer links with IHSS and AMEP services.

[We recommend] greater interaction between AMEP - CSSS projects; English Class course structure should include visits and familiarisation with local services for migrants, accessing multilingual web sites of mainstream organisations.

Submission from the Gympie Community Aid and Information Service, NSW

Some stakeholders have suggested placing CSSS workers in AMEP centres or local government organisations.

An option for DIMIA to consider would be to fund a CSSS position within a local government organisation, such as LGCSA, Lgov, or ROC to ensure linkages between Local Government and DIMIA, and to identify appropriate links at a local level to settlement services for MRCs, IHSS providers and CSSS workers.

Submission from the Local Government Community Services Association, NSW

The links between MRCs/MSAs and the CSSS are generally strong because MRCs/MSAs are often recipients of CSSS funding. However, this is not always the case.

Current service delivery arrangements through MRCs/MSAs and CSSS providers [could] be improved...[by] further development of closer working relationships between MRCs/MSAs and CSSS workers.

Submission from Migrant Network Services (Northern Sydney), NSW

Table 9.3: CSSS service types by funding amounts as identified by 2002 funded organisations

| Category (b) | \$ | % |
|--|---------------------|----------------|
| Services to individual migrants | 5,463,957 | 31.5 |
| Post-IHSS services | 785,910 | 4.5 |
| Information sessions to groups of migrants | 2,480,715 | 14.3 |
| Community capacity building | 2,760,801 | 15.9 |
| Mainstreaming | 3,731,319 | 21.5 |
| Research/Strategic planning | 940,997 | 5.4 |
| Recruitment and training of volunteers | 639,571 | 3.7 |
| Promoting cultural diversity | 105,843 | 0.6 |
| Planning/Coordinating services | 394,729 | 2.3 |
| Other | 46,487 | 0.3 |
| Total (a) | \$17,350,329 | 100.00% |
| <i>National grant</i> | <i>125,000</i> | |
| Total CSSS funding | \$17,475,329 | |

Source: Based on an analysis of the project descriptions provided by CSSS organisations for 2002 CSSS grants. (a) All percentages have been rounded.

Table 9.4: Breakdown of a hypothetical \$60,000 grant

| Category | \$ |
|--|---------------|
| Services to individuals | 18,895 |
| Post-IHSS services | 2,718 |
| Information sessions to groups of migrants | 8,579 |
| Community capacity building | 9,547 |
| Mainstreaming | 12,903 |
| Research/Strategic planning | 3,254 |
| Recruitment and training of volunteers | 2,212 |
| Promoting cultural diversity | 366 |
| Planning/Coordinating services | 1,365 |
| Other | 161 |
| Total | 60,000 |

Source: Based on 2002 CSSS project descriptions and funding proportions set out in table 9.3

Funding allocation by service type

As illustrated in table 9.3, project descriptions provided by CSSS organisations suggest that casework services to individual migrants currently represent the most significant component of CSSS project work. Around 32% of services are provided to individual migrants. If services delivered to post-IHSS clients are added to this figure then the overall proportion of direct services to individuals rises to 36%. Some commentators have indicated that this may not be an accurate representation of the proportion of casework undertaken by CSSS organisations, and that 60% or 70% would be a more realistic figure. The discrepancy between the data and feedback from stakeholders again highlights the lack of reliable statistical information about the services that CSSS organisations actually provide.

Interestingly, post-IHSS services are identified as representing only a small proportion of the work of CSSS projects. This is despite the fact that IHSS providers in every State/Territory are located in proximity to an MRC/MSA or a CSSS project. In fact, ten IHSS contractors providing the service delivery types most likely to progress to MRC/MSA or CSSS direct client service provision (Initial Information and Orientation Assistance, Accommodation Support and Household Formation) are MRCs/MSAs or MRC/MSA consortia, all of which also have CSSS grants. The apparently small proportion of former IHSS clients receiving assistance from the CSSS may be due to CSSS organisations not identifying post-IHSS clients as a separate client group and classifying them as falling into one of the other groups.

However, it may also indicate that clients do not require CSSS services or that former IHSS clients are not gaining access to CSSS services and that there is a need for better referral mechanisms between the IHSS and the CSSS.

The diversity of the work that CSSS organisations undertake demonstrates the versatility of the organisations. However, this diversity also suggests that the funding may of necessity be spread very thinly across each of the service types, hampering effective service delivery. For example, table 9.4 shows how thinly this funding would be spread by a typical CSSS grant of \$60,000 attempting to provide all of the service types in line with the proportions above.

Recommendation 37

That projects funded under the CSSS do not include counselling requiring specialist qualifications and skills, and continue to focus on one or more of the following activities:

- delivering settlement information and referral services to individuals and groups;
- building community capacity by helping communities to be self-reliant in planning, organising and working together to advocate for their needs to be met; and
- promoting/representing individual client needs to service providers and networking/building strong relationships with local settlement and mainstream agencies.

The characteristics of CSSS-funded organisations

Just over half of the organisations receiving funding under the CSSS are organisations that represent either one ethnic community, such as the Vietnamese community, or multi-ethnic

groups such as Arabic-speaking people. The others are generalist organisations providing services to migrants from diverse backgrounds. Each approach has advantages and disadvantages.

Ethno-specific

The main advantage of providing an ethno-specific service is that the community itself can target its own needs and provide services in its own language with an understanding of its particular culture and issues. This can be particularly important where the community has been in conflict with other communities.

However, as some stakeholders have commented, providing such specific services requires the employment of appropriately skilled and educated workers, which stakeholders have noted does not always occur. For example, in the case of small and emerging communities, as well as communities that are settling in rural and regional areas of Australia, there may not be suitably trained or experienced workers available.

There are...concerns about the capacity of some ethnic organisations and their capacity to support workers and to ensure that workers they recruit are adequately screened in terms of qualifications, skills and experience in project management. More emphasis should be placed in service agreements towards skills and experience, and adherence to EEO and access and equity principles.

Submission from the Migrant Resource Centres Forum of New South Wales

Public consultations have also highlighted concerns that ethno-specific services can encourage community divisions and are not always able to deal effectively with cross-cultural issues.

Multi-ethnic

Multi-ethnic organisations servicing a number of communities have similar advantages to ethno-specific organisations in terms of understanding of and responsiveness to linguistic and cultural issues. However, like ethno-specific organisations they may lack the networks and flexibility that generalist organisations can offer. They also necessarily draw from a smaller pool of potential workers and management committee members than generalist agencies.

Generalist

The advantages of generalist services are that they usually exist within an established infrastructure and can therefore have more skilled and educated workers with established networks and support systems. By providing assistance to several diverse groups they achieve economies of scale and therefore lower costs. They may also have a broader vision for settlement outcomes and greater connections with the mainstream. A generalist worker may be perceived as being more impartial or neutral in the provision of services than an ethno-specific worker (for example, some female clients affected by domestic violence may have fewer concerns about privacy and being judged by their community).

One of the problems that may occur with the provision of generalist services is that communities that need specific help may become 'invisible', leading to further isolation. Generalist workers may lack depth of knowledge about particular communities, and may not be able to establish the necessary trust or links with these communities in order to provide the services that are most needed. Generalist services are more likely to need

interpreters for service delivery, which can create greater distance between the service provider and the client.

As discussed in chapter six of this report - Mainstream Services, a variety of service delivery strategies is likely to be necessary to meet the range of needs of new arrivals.

Funding allocation by organisation type

Generalist services, many of which are delivered by MRCs/MSAs, currently receive more than half of all CSSS funding. In 2002, the CSSS funded a total of 231 organisations to deliver 332 projects. As shown in table 9.5, around 46% of the organisations funded were generalist organisations and they attracted more than half of all CSSS funding. A further 40% of the organisations funded were ethno-specific, but these attracted a much smaller proportion of the funding (around 33%). Only 14% of the organisations funded were multi-ethnic.

Table 9.6 illustrates how funding was distributed to generalist, multi-ethnic and ethno-specific organisations across States/Territories in 2002.

New South Wales had the largest number of ethno-specific organisations funded and, contrary to the overall national picture, there were significantly more ethno-specific than generalist organisations funded. This may reflect New South Wales's greater cultural diversity and larger numbers of small and emerging communities but is primarily a reflection of the greater flexibility available within a larger budget allocation. Although South Australia had fewer organisations receiving CSSS funding than NSW, it also had significantly more ethno-specific than generalist organisations funded. Victoria also had slightly higher numbers of ethno-specific than generalist organisations funded. Significantly, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia also had the highest number of CSSS grants to longer-resident communities.

Table 9.5: Generalist, multi-ethnic and ethno-specific organisations funded in 2002

| | Generalist organisations | Multi-Ethnic organisations | Ethno-Specific organisations | Total funded organisations |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Number of organisations funded | 106 | 33 | 92 | 231 |
| Number of organisations funded as a % of total funded organisations | 46% | 14% | 40% | 100% |
| Level of funding provided | \$9,488,471 | \$2,173,559 | \$5,813,299 | \$17,475,329 |
| Level of funding provided as a % of total funding | 54.30% | 12.40% | 33.30% | 100% |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding.

Table 9.6: Distribution of generalist, multi-ethnic and ethno-specific organisations funded in 2002

| | Generalist | | Multi-Ethnic | | Ethno-Specific | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Number of organisations funded | Level of funding provided \$ | Number of organisations funded | Level of funding provided \$ | Number of organisations funded | Level of funding provided \$ |
| NSW | 37 | 3,423,516 | 13 | 804,999 | 48 | 3,227,053 |
| VIC | 22 | 2,933,286 | 10 | 891,960 | 24 | 1,870,356 |
| QLD | 16 | 1,297,560 | 1 | 55,000 | 1 | 30,000 |
| WA | 10 | 940,470 | 4 | 299,600 | 4 | 135,490 |
| SA | 9 | 259,000 | 5 | 122,000 | 13 | 529,000 |
| TAS | 2 | 102,000 | - | - | 1 | 1,000 |
| ACT | 8 | 310,839 | - | - | 1 | 20,400 |
| NT | 1 | 96,000 | - | - | - | - |
| National Grant | 1 | 125,000 | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 106 | \$9,488,471 | 33 | \$2,173,559 | 92 | \$5,813,299 |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding.

The demographic trends outlined earlier in this report indicate that there are increasing numbers of smaller and more diverse migrant groups in Australia. In this context, the current funding pattern which sees generalist organisations attracting a higher proportion of funding is likely to continue. Indeed, generalist organisations are likely to have an

increasingly important role to play in service delivery to diverse groups as the small size of some communities in some locations will preclude funding of ethno-specific or multi-ethnic organisations. Generalist organisations will therefore need to adapt more readily to cater for a wider range of communities.

Table 9.7: Breakdown of organisations receiving grants targeted at small and emerging communities for 2002

| State/Territory | Generalist organisations | Multi-Ethnic organisations | Ethno-Specific organisations |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| New South Wales | 8 | - | 11 |
| Victoria | 12 | 1 | - |
| Queensland | 9 | 1 | - |
| Western Australia | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| South Australia | - | 2 | 1 |
| Tasmania | 2 | - | - |
| Australian Capital Territory | 4 | - | - |
| Northern Territory | 1 | - | - |
| Total (a) | 38 | 5 | 14 |
| % of total number (57) of organisations receiving grants targeted at small and emerging communities | 67% | 9% | 24% |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding. (a) As CSSS projects are generally aimed at meeting the needs of more than one of the CSSS priority groups, many of these grants are also targeted at humanitarian entrants and migrants in rural and regional communities.

As table 9.7 illustrates, fifty seven organisations received grants in 2002 which were targeted at small and emerging communities. A significant proportion (67%) of the organisations receiving funding for this purpose were generalist organisations. In all States/Territories other than New South Wales and South Australia, more generalist organisations are funded to deliver services targeted at small and emerging communities.

Eligibility for CSSS funding

Consideration of issues arising from submissions and in the review generally, suggest that there would be value in broadening the eligibility for CSSS funding to enable a wider range of organisations to provide settlement services under the scheme.

Eligibility is currently restricted to not-for-profit organisations and local governments.

While the current eligibility is likely to remain sufficient for the majority of CSSS-funded projects, some broadening of the eligibility may be useful in particular circumstances or locations. In some instances, greater co-location of services may offer an improved service to clients. In other instances, depending on the nature of the proposal, joint management of a project may be appropriate depending on the contributors and their areas of expertise. In forming partnerships for joint management of CSSS-funded projects or co-located services, care would be required to ensure partners are able to contribute to decision making and direction setting on an equitable basis. The effect of opening up

eligibility is likely to have particular value in regional areas where proposals involving service co-location and partnerships may prove more viable than proposals under the current arrangements and effectively widen access to existing resources and infrastructure.

Recommendation 38

That DIMIA broaden eligibility for CSSS funding, particularly in rural and regional areas, to encourage more innovative and flexible service delivery arrangements which make better use of existing infrastructure.

The funding process

CSSS grants are awarded at the discretion of the Minister. They are advertised annually and are offered for one, two or three years. However, in 2003, CSSS grants will be advertised for nine months and twenty-one months to align the funding year with the financial year from 1 July 2004.

The advertised priority client groups for CSSS funding are humanitarian entrants, small and emerging communities, migrants living in rural and regional areas and migrants characterised as having 'additional needs' (see later discussion).

The CSSS service priorities include helping clients to gain access to mainstream services, undertaking settlement planning and promoting culturally responsive mainstream services, and encouraging self-reliance. These priorities are very broad, allowing a great deal of flexibility in interpretation. The onus is on the organisations, rather than DIMIA, to identify settlement needs.

Some commentators have expressed the view that the submission-based model of funding is inadequate.

CSSS funding should be based on the Department clearly identifying the settlement needs and then inviting proposals to meet those needs. The fact that there is no CSSS funding for a 'Chinese based service in Perth' but there are CSSS projects for the Italian and Greek communities (also large and long standing communities) demonstrates the weakness of the current system.

Submission from the Ethnic Communities Council of WA

...funding should be needs rather than community politics based and should not favour the communities which are more able to write a good funding submission.

Submission from the NSW Service for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture and Trauma Survivors

The fact that DIMIA does not require applicants to submit project proposals responding to specified types and locations of services creates the potential for critical needs to be overlooked. It can also mean that better organised and established organisations acquire a greater share of the funding, because organisations representing small and emerging communities can have less capacity to research and analyse settlement needs. Commentary in public consultations has noted that the high need African communities, in particular, find it difficult to compete with larger and longer-resident communities for an equitable share of funding.

There should be more regular and rigorous identification of client needs on a geographic and demographic basis through the new regionally-based, needs-based planning process outlined in chapter seven - Settlement Planning. This would in turn inform the

advertising and assessment criteria of the yearly CSSS funding round, and would result in better targeting of services overall. It would also contribute to transparency in the funding process.

Funding allocations by State/Territory

Each year, the Minister approves the notional allocation of CSSS funding available for each State/Territory. Notional allocations are based on the size of the settlement services target group in each State/Territory. The larger the number of target group arrivals residing in a particular State/Territory, the greater the funding allocated to that State/Territory. The amount of funding available for award in any given year is the notional allocation less commitments from two and three-year grants awarded in previous years.

Some stakeholders have commented that particular States/Territories receive a smaller proportion of funding than they consider to be equitable.

Western Australia has been generally disadvantaged with regard to funding under the Community Settlement Services Scheme (CSSS). On a proportionate basis, the funding that Western Australia receives does not reflect the new arrival statistics. This inequity has to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

Submission from the Ethnic Communities Council of WA

[I]t would appear that there is a funding discrepancy/inequity within the CSSS between Victoria and NSW... The inequity... is magnified by statistics which state that NSW received 41% of new settler arrivals between 1997-2002 whilst Victoria received 23% in the same time period.

Submission from the Settlement Services Coalition of NSW

Table 9.8 shows the breakdown, by State/Territory, of arrivals as percentages of the national total, and the CSSS funding outcomes for each State/Territory for the year 2002.¹⁰

This table indicates that the overall outcome for CSSS grants funding in 2002 closely reflects the proportion of settlement services target group arrivals in each State/Territory. The minor differences are due to: a high proportion of ongoing grants in some States/Territories; a lack of suitable applications for funding; and, to some extent, the inevitable time-lag in ceasing existing services in one State/Territory as the number of arrivals increases in another.

Funding to CSSS priority groups

CSSS projects are generally aimed at meeting the needs of more than one of the CSSS priority groups, and for this reason it is difficult to identify the level of funding being directed to each group. The following analysis of funding to CSSS priority groups is based on what the CSSS organisations have identified as priority groups for their projects. Since many of them identify multiple priority groups, there is an overlap in the attribution of project dollars.

Humanitarian entrants

As shown in table 9.9, an analysis of CSSS funding in 2002 shows that projects directed at humanitarian entrants received the largest proportion of CSSS funding. This is appropriate given the high and long-term settlement needs of these entrants.

Small and emerging communities

As illustrated in table 9.10, approximately 22% of CSSS funding in 2002 was directed to small and emerging communities to assist in community capacity building and the delivery of direct client services.

Table 9.8: Funding allocations for the 2002 CSSS round

| State/Territory | Total new arrivals 2001 - 02 | % of national total new arrivals | Settlement services target group arrivals (Humanitarian and EP3 & 4 Family) 2001-02 | % of national total settlement services target group arrivals | Funding for 2002 (a) | % of national total funding (a) |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| New South Wales | 25,584 | 38.2 | 8,522 | 43.8 | 7.46 m | 42.7 |
| Victoria | 16,350 | 24.4 | 5,646 | 29 | 5.70 m | 32.6 |
| Queensland | 8,313 | 12.4 | 1,701 | 8.7 | 1.38 m | 7.9 |
| Western Australia | 8,639 | 12.9 | 1,581 | 8.1 | 1.38 m | 7.9 |
| South Australia | 3,003 | 4.5 | 1,101 | 5.7 | 0.91 m | 5.2 |
| Tasmania | 567 | 0.8 | 254 | 1.3 | 0.10 m | 0.6 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 999 | 1.5 | 285 | 1.5 | 0.33 m | 1.9 |
| Northern Territory | 375 | 0.6 | 154 | 0.8 | 0.10 m | 0.6 |
| Unknown | 3,113 | 4.7 | 221 | 1.1 | - | - |
| National Grant | - | - | - | - | 0.12m | 0.7 |
| Total | 66,943 | 100.00% | 19,465 | 100.00% | \$17.48 m | 100.00% |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding. (a) Figures have been rounded and this results in a slight inconsistency in the total.

While this is a sizeable proportion of funding, it is still less than the \$4.2 million funding provided for the 'additional needs' category (see later discussion), despite small and emerging communities having higher priority for CSSS funding.

In the 2002 CSSS grants round, the following small and emerging communities were identified nationally: Afghani; Eritrean; Ethiopian; Somalian; Sudanese; Sierra Leonean; Kuwaiti; and Kurdish speakers. DIMIA State/Territory offices identified other small and emerging communities that were specific to their State/Territory.

In order to ensure that services are targeted appropriately, an analysis of small and emerging communities on a State/Territory basis should be undertaken regularly and advertised as part of the funding criteria.

Small and emerging communities are identified at the national level by applying the following criteria:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Population | Between 1,000 and 15,000 |
| Growth Rate | 30% or more of population arriving in last five years |
| Settlement services target group | Yes |

Similar criteria could be used to identify small and emerging communities at the State/Territory levels as outlined below:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Population | Less than 5,000 |
| Growth Rate | 30% or more of population arriving in last five years |
| Settlement services target group | Yes |

Rural and regional communities

As noted in chapter five of this reports, an estimated 9.5% of new arrivals over the five year period 1997-2002 settled in non-

Table 9.9: CSSS funding for humanitarian entrants in 2002 compared with total CSSS funding (a)

| State/Territory | Humanitarian \$ | Total funding \$ | Humanitarian funding as % of total funding for State/Territory |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| New South Wales | 2,744,643 | 7,455,568 | 36.8 |
| Victoria | 3,314,379 | 5,695,602 | 58.2 |
| Queensland | 678,600 | 1,382,560 | 49.1 |
| Western Australia | 670,380 | 1,375,560 | 48.7 |
| South Australia | 242,000 | 910,000 | 26.6 |
| Tasmania | 30,000 | 103,000 | 29.1 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 138,185 | 331,239 | 41.7 |
| Northern Territory | 0 | 96,800 | 0 |
| National grant | - | 125,000 | Not applicable |
| Total | \$7,818,187 | \$17,475,329 | 44.70% |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding. (a) As CSSS projects are generally aimed at meeting the needs of more than one of the CSSS priority groups, there is an overlap in the attribution of project dollars across the different priority groups.

Table 9.10: CSSS funding for small and emerging communities in 2002 compared with total CSSS funding

| State/Territory | Small & Emerging \$ | Total funding \$ | Funding for small and emerging as % of total funding for State/Territory |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| New South Wales | 1,564,059 | 7,455,568 | 21 |
| Victoria | 972,599 | 5,695,602 | 17.1 |
| Queensland | 1,043,800 | 1,382,560 | 75.5 |
| Western Australia | 262,490 | 1,375,560 | 19.1 |
| South Australia | 62,000 | 910,000 | 6.8 |
| Tasmania | 0 | 103,000 | 0 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 8,240 | 331,239 | 2.5 |
| Northern Territory | 0 | 96,800 | 0 |
| National grant | - | 125,000 | Not applicable |
| Total (a) | \$3,913,188 | \$17,475,329 | 22.40% |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding. (a) As CSSS projects are generally aimed at meeting the needs of more than one of the CSSS priority groups, there is an overlap in the attribution of project dollars across the different priority groups.

metropolitan Australia. Table 9.11, shows that in 2002, the proportion of funding to rural and regional communities (approximately 16%) was significantly more than the estimated newly-arrived migrant population in these areas. The larger proportion of grants in rural and regional areas compared with arrival numbers was due to issues around distance, intensified social isolation and lack of access to other social support services.

The Australian Capital Territory (which for CSSS purposes services southern New South Wales), Queensland and Tasmania had the highest proportion of non-metropolitan grants. Only approximately 11% of funding went to non-metropolitan grants in New South Wales and 14% of funding went to non-metropolitan grants in Victoria. In both the latter cases, however, this was proportionately in excess of arrival patterns in these States, with New

South Wales having only an estimated 6.5% of new arrivals going to non-metropolitan areas and Victoria having only an estimated 5.4% of new arrivals going to non-metropolitan areas.

Table 9.12 shows the total grants and funding in metropolitan and non-metropolitan Australia, by State/Territory. Overall, the coverage of grants to rural and regional areas seems satisfactory. Some CSSS coverage exists in all non-metropolitan areas of relatively high migrant settlement. As discussed earlier, settlement patterns and needs should be reviewed regularly to ensure that appropriate coverage is maintained.

Despite a satisfactory coverage of grants in rural and regional areas, there are, however, some issues around the low value of some grants in these areas. These issues are explored later in this chapter.

Table 9.11: CSSS rural and regional funding in 2002 compared to total CSSS funding

| State/Territory | Rural & Regional \$ | Total funding \$ | Funding for rural and regional as a % of total funding for State/Territory |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| New South Wales | 789,300 | 7,455,568 | 10.6 |
| Victoria | 780,262 | 5,695,602 | 13.7 |
| Queensland | 478,760 | 1,382,560 | 34.6 |
| Western Australia | 369,890 | 1,375,560 | 26.9 |
| South Australia | 137,000 | 910,000 | 15.1 |
| Tasmania | 39,000 | 103,000 | 37.9 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 183,304 | 331,239 | 55.3 |
| Northern Territory | 0 | 96,800 | 0 |
| National grant | - | 125,000 | Not applicable |
| Total (a) | \$2,777,516 | \$17,475,329 | 15.90% |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding. (a) As CSSS projects are generally aimed at meeting the needs of more than one of the CSSS priority groups, there is an overlap in the attribution of project dollars across the different priority groups.

Table 9.12: Total CSSS grants and funding in 2002

| State/Territory | Metropolitan | | Non-metropolitan | |
|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | Number of grants | \$ | Number of grants | \$ |
| New South Wales | 123 | 6,666,268 | 20 | 789,300 |
| Victoria | 85 | 4,915,340 | 12 | 780,262 |
| Queensland | 13 | 903,800 | 9 | 478,760 |
| Western Australia | 21 | 1,005,670 | 4 | 369,890 |
| South Australia | 22 | 773,000 | 6 | 137,000 |
| Tasmania | 3 | 64,000 | 2 | 39,000 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 5 | 147,935 | 5 | 183,304 |
| Northern Territory | 1 | 96,800 | - | - |
| National Grant | 1 | 125,000 | - | - |
| Total | 274 | \$14,697,813 | 58 | \$2,777,516 |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding.

Additional needs

The intention of this category has been to ensure that migrants who have settlement needs that are not addressed in the other CSSS funding categories and who have particular characteristics or experiences that may complicate the settlement process have access to CSSS-funded settlement services. The proportion of this funding is generally expected to be lower than that directed to the priority groups considered to have particularly high needs for settlement assistance. In 2002, however, as illustrated in table 9.13, \$4,228,426, or just under a quarter of available CSSS funds, were allocated to grants in the additional needs category.

As shown in table 9.13, South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria had a significant proportion of their overall funding directed to clients in this category. More than half of South Australia's funding fell into this category.

The majority of funding for additional needs was to ethno-specific, rather than generalist organisations. This pattern was consistent in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. In Queensland and Western

Australia, the generalist organisations predominated.

As discussed below, a significant proportion of funds in this category support services to longer-resident, established communities which received large numbers of new arrivals in the post-war period of the 1950s and 1960s. There are also a number of grants in the additional needs category to communities whose arrivals peaked in the 1970s and 1980s. Their numbers have been bolstered through subsequent waves of family stream migration. These new arrivals would form part of the settlement services target group and may still require access to CSSS services. However, provision of services to this group does not require the retention of an additional needs category as an area of priority.

Longer-resident communities

This report has highlighted the importance of targeting settlement services towards the highest needs groups among recent arrivals. An analysis of ethno-specific grants (new awards) in 2002 according to the arrival period of the communities concerned shows

Table 9.13: CSSS funding for additional needs in 2002 compared to total CSSS funding

| State/Territory | Additional | Total funding | Funding for additional needs as % of total funding for State/Territory |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| New South Wales | 2,307,566 | 7,455,568 | 31 |
| Victoria | 1,235,060 | 5,695,602 | 21.7 |
| Queensland | 30,000 | 1,382,560 | 2.2 |
| Western Australia | 186,800 | 1,375,560 | 13.6 |
| South Australia | 469,000 | 910,000 | 51.5 |
| Tasmania | 0 | 103,000 | 0 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 0 | 331,239 | 0 |
| Northern Territory | 0 | 96,800 | 0 |
| National grant | - | 125,000 | Not applicable |
| Total (a) | \$4,228,426 | \$17,475,329 | 24.20% |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding. (a) As CSSS projects are generally aimed at meeting the needs of more than one of the CSSS priority groups, there is an overlap in the attribution of project dollars across the different priority groups.

that the majority of new awards in the additional needs category is going to longer-resident communities. These communities have had a majority of their population arrive in Australia over thirty years ago, include significant numbers of aged people, and tend to have well established support networks for new arrivals. As shown in table 9.14, longer-resident communities were awarded twenty-three new CSSS grants in 2002.

Over half of the grants to longer-resident communities were in New South Wales. The Greek and Italian organisations received the highest number of grants and were represented in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia. The Italian community was also represented in South Australia.

Communities that showed the greatest decline in community numbers between the 1996 Census and the 2001 Census comprised

migrants born in Poland (-10.8%), Portugal (-10.1%), Italy (-8.2%), Greece (-8%) and Malta (-7.7%) (refer to table 1.3).

As noted earlier in this report, stakeholders have emphasised that longer-resident migrants still have needs. However, most of these needs are shared with the wider Australian community. Mainstream services should be meeting these needs by employing delivery mechanisms that are responsive to the cultural and linguistic diversity of their clientele.

Many CSSS-funded services to longer-resident communities are not specifically related to settlement needs. These include services for:

- the frail aged;
- migrants with physical and mental disabilities;
- respite care;
- women's health;

Table 9.14: Breakdown of additional needs grants by ethnicity (based on new grants awarded in 2002)

| State/Territory | Target Ethnicity | Grants |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| New South Wales | | |
| Longer-resident communities | Jewish; Greek; Italian; Russian; Armenian; Maltese; Polish; Portuguese; Ukrainian | 12 |
| Others | Lebanese/Muslim | 10 |
| | Spanish/Latin American | 3 |
| | Cambodian/Lao | 2 |
| | Chinese | 2 |
| | Turkish | 2 |
| | Maronite/Melkite | 2 |
| | Vietnamese | 1 |
| | Korean | 1 |
| | Palestinian | 1 |
| | Coptic | 1 |
| | Generalist | 9 |
| | Total | 46 |
| Victoria | | |
| Longer-resident communities | Greek; Italian; Maltese; Jewish; Russian | 8 |
| Others | Spanish/Latin American | 2 |
| | Timorese | 1 |
| | Lao | 1 |
| | Turkish | 1 |
| | Chinese | 1 |
| | Generalist | 8 |
| | Total | 22 |
| Queensland | | |
| Others | Chinese | 1 |
| | Generalist | 12 |
| | Total | 13 |
| South Australia | | |
| Longer-resident communities | Italian | 1 |
| Others | Vietnamese | 2 |
| | Chinese | 2 |
| | Spanish Speaking | 1 |
| | Total | 6 |
| Western Australia | | |
| Longer-resident communities | Greek; Italian | 2 |
| Others | Generalist | 6 |
| | Total | 8 |
| Australian Capital Territory | | |
| Others | Generalist | 1 |
| Total | | 96 |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS grants.

- migrants experiencing social and geographic isolation;
- migrants with deteriorating English language skills due to age and inability to communicate with health professionals and carers; and
- home-visiting services to hostels and nursing homes.

As already observed in chapter six of this report, the funding of these types of services though the CSSS increases the potential for duplication of services and reduces the incentive for mainstream services to respond appropriately to the needs of migrant clients. For example, the Department of Health and Ageing funds and facilitates the planning and delivery of aged care services to longer-resident migrant communities through its Ethnic Aged Care Framework, with some organisations currently being funded by both DIMIA and Health and Ageing to deliver similar services.

It is not always clear whether the needs that these organisations seek to address through CSSS funding represent a preference for ethno-specific service delivery, a failing of access or equity in the mainstream or simply a demand for rationed services. It may be the case that services provided by mainstream agencies have not been communicated clearly to these communities. It is beyond the scope of this review to research these needs. Further joint analysis with mainstream service agencies is needed to better understand the underlying issues.

In the short-term, it may be necessary to fund some of these services to ensure that the needs of these communities are being met. Consideration could be given to the creation of a separate grants

program which would be made available to longer-resident migrant communities, which are no longer receiving a significant number of new arrivals, and which are not in receipt of funding under the CSSS to assist them to establish and build relationships with mainstream service providers with a view to:

- clarifying the needs of their particular community;
- identifying the shortcomings in existing services; and
- participating in the development of culturally responsive services.

The purpose of the grants would be to not only improve the responsiveness of mainstream services, but to promote a better understanding within migrant communities of the services which are available and to enhance the willingness of these communities to access those services.

Recommendation 39

That consideration be given to the creation of a separate grants program that assists longer-resident communities to establish or maintain relationships with mainstream providers, with a view to:

- clarifying their needs;
- participating in the development of culturally responsive mainstream services; and
- enhancing their willingness to access the available services.

The adequacy of CSSS funding

In public consultations and submissions to the review, many stakeholders have commented on perceived inadequacies in the level of CSSS funding.

Whilst the annual immigration intake has substantially increased in recent years the funding for settlement services has not. Furthermore there has also been a steady diminution in the direct services provided by DIMIA and other government agencies since the 80s. Consequently in real terms the funding and service provision levels are substantially lower than what they were, a decade ago. This has to be addressed as a matter of priority.

Submission from the Ethnic Communities Council ofWA

Under-funding of CSSS positions is a clear DIMIA strategy. It enables the Department to stretch its resources to as many agencies and projects as possible at the same time as encouraging cost sharing. However the impact such a strategy is having on some agencies needs to be understood by the Department. Agencies, such as ours, are finding that both the financial and in-kind contributions made to support CSSS programs are becoming unbearable. Management support, supervision and administration are unfunded. Additionally, funding for some of our positions barely meets salary costs, requiring the agency to support all other project and on-costs from our own resources. The longer we keep a worker in position the greater the gap between funding and actual costs. If these circumstances do not change it will become increasingly difficult (or impossible) for some agencies to continue with CSSS funded positions.

Submission from Community Information Whittlesea, VIC

As table 9.15 illustrates, the CSSS share of the total community grants appropriation has decreased from 80% in 1991-92 to 64% in 2002-03. The proportion of community grants

funding allocated to MRCs/MSAs has increased substantially. This is due to a number of factors, as discussed in chapter ten of this report - Migrant Resource Centres and Migrant Service Agencies. However, the net result is that, in real terms, proportionately less CSSS funding is being distributed across a broad range of settlement needs and geographic locations.

In addition, the CSSS client base has continued to diversify and increase, as Australia's population has become more culturally diverse. The CSSS continues to service communities that have been in Australia for up to half a century, while attempting at the same time to meet the needs of new and emerging communities. The result is that funding appears to be thinly spread, in an attempt to ensure the widest possible coverage. The average value of individual grants has, therefore, been necessarily low, making it difficult for organisations to attract quality staff and deliver quality services. In addition, the large number of funded organisations leads to a relatively high proportion of funds going to cover the cost of overheads. The wide range of tasks that DIMIA has encouraged CSSS organisations to undertake has exacerbated these funding issues.

Unsuccessful applications

In 2002 there were 312 applications for CSSS grants. Of these applications, 187 (or around 60%) were successful while 125 (or around 40%) were unsuccessful.

Over the last four years the proportion of unsuccessful applications has averaged 46% of applications. The pattern from one year to the next has been fairly consistent, with 2002 having the lowest number of unsuccessful applications. The 2002 grants round was unusual, however, because an additional \$1.4 million was provided for CSSS funding.

CSSS grant values

In 2002, the average dollar value of CSSS grants for continuing (awarded in 2000 and 2001) and new (awarded in 2002) grants was \$52,418. An analysis of grants by State/Territory is provided in table 9.16.

Excluding the Northern Territory, which had only one grant, this table also demonstrates that the average grant amount was highest (in descending order) in Queensland, Victoria, Western Australia and then New South Wales. For States/Territories such as Tasmania, South Australia and the Australian Capital Territory, the average value of the grants was significantly less than the average value of grants awarded to other States/Territories.

The majority of grants in 2002 fell within the \$50,000 to \$60,000 range. However, nearly 40% of grants fell at or below the \$50,000 level.

Of the fifteen CSSS grants of \$20,000 or less, eleven were for one year only. These grants were awarded to provide casework and referral services or to fund one-off projects such as the purchase of equipment, the production of a needs analysis for a particular region or the development of specific programs such as education or youth activities. Eight of these small grants were for ethno-specific organisations and three were awarded to Jewish Community Services, the Fifth Greek Orthodox Archdiocesan District of WA and the Italo-Australian Welfare and Cultural Centre to provide services to longer-resident communities. The fifteen grants under \$20,000 alone represent a total funding amount of almost \$150,000, of which \$50,000 was directed to longer-resident communities. Of the seven generalist projects, three were delivered through MRCs/MSAs and another three were funded to provide outreach services or to produce a needs analysis for rural and regional areas.

Table 9.15: Community grants appropriation, 1991-2003

| Financial Year | Total appropriation \$ | CSSS awards \$ (a) | MRC/MSA awards \$ | CSSS % of total | MRC/MSA% of total |
|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1991-92 | 15.18 m | 12.10 m | 3.09 m | 80 | 20 |
| 1992-93 | 17.43 m | 13.03 m | 4.40 m | 75 | 25 |
| 1993-94 | 19.50 m | 13.93 m | 5.49 m | 71 | 28 |
| 1994-95 | 22.13 m | 16.05 m | 6.01 m | 73 | 27 |
| 1995-96 | 24.68 m | 16.11 m | 7.82 m | 65 | 32 |
| 1996-97 | 24.38 m | 15.55 m | 8.46 m | 64 | 35 |
| 1997-98 | 23.68 m | 14.57 m | 8.75 m | 62 | 37 |
| 1998-99 | 23.36 m | 14.50 m | 8.68 m | 62 | 37 |
| 1999-2000 | 23.28 m | 14.16 m | 8.75 m | 61 | 38 |
| 2000-01 | 24.07 m | 15.22 m | 8.90 m | 63 | 37 |
| 2001-02 | 25.08 m | 15.75 m | 9.18 m | 63 | 37 |
| 2002-03 | 26.88 m | 17.35 m(b) | 9.53 m | 64 | 36 |

Source: DIMIA Community Programs Program Management Data (a) Includes GIA/MAPS (until their discontinuation in 1999). (b) This figure is based on the 2002-03 financial year and as such is slightly different from figures for the 2002 CSSS funding year used elsewhere in this chapter.

Table 9.16: Average dollar value of CSSS grants in 2002

| State/Territory | Number of grants | Average of continuing and new grants in 2002 \$ |
|------------------------------|------------------|---|
| New South Wales | 143 | 52,137 |
| Victoria | 97 | 58,718 |
| Queensland | 22 | 62,844 |
| Western Australia | 25 | 55,022 |
| South Australia | 28 | 32,500 |
| Tasmania | 5 | 20,600 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 10 | 33,124 |
| Northern Territory | 1 | 96,800 |
| Nationally | 331 (a) | 52,418 |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS grants. (a) This is not including one national grant.

Table 9.17: Dollar ranges for CSSS grants in 2002

| Grant range \$ | Number of Grants |
|-------------------|------------------|
| <20,000 | 15 |
| 20,001 - 30,000 | 50 |
| 30,001 - 40,000 | 14 |
| 40,001 - 50,000 | 50 |
| 50,001 - 60,000 | 138 |
| 60,001 - 80,000 | 41 |
| 80,001 - 100,000 | 9 |
| 100,001 - 150,000 | 10 |
| 150,001 - 200,000 | 3 |
| 200,000+ | 1 |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS grants. Does not include one national grant

The low value of the grants, particularly those providing casework and referral services, raises questions as to the capacity of these funded organisations to deliver services in an effective way, given employment and infrastructure costs. The significant

administrative cost to both the recipient organisations and to the department of managing grants of less than \$30,000 must also be questioned. At the other end of the spectrum, fourteen grants were in excess of \$100,000 in 2002. Eight of these grants were

to generalist organisations, including five MRCs/MSAs. Three of the largest grants were awarded to provide services in rural or regional locations. The other six grants of over \$100,000 were to ethno-specific organisations, two of which (the Greek Welfare Centre of Victoria and Co. As. It, the Italian Assistance Association) were servicing longer-resident communities.

Comparison between amounts requested and received

Organisations currently receive only about half of the amounts they request in CSSS funding. They received 51% of their requested amounts in 2000, 55% in 2001 and 45% of their requested amounts in 2002. This outcome is likely to impact on their service delivery capacity. Table 9.18 shows the difference between the amounts requested by successful applicants in each State/Territory and the amount each State/Territory received in new awards under the CSSS in 2002.

Costing the services to be delivered

DIMIA costs CSSS services based on the proposed project budgets submitted by applicants. When determining an appropriate funding level for a grant, the department generally considers costs such as salaries, on-costs, rent, insurance and information technology support. It also takes into account the skills and qualifications required of the worker and issues such as whether the project will provide full or part time services when estimating salary levels. Other factors such as higher costs for travel and information technology in rural and regional areas can be taken into consideration.

While DIMIA considers these factors in estimating an appropriate grant level, the level of the grant awarded to organisations is frequently adjusted downwards to maximise the number of grants that can be made, in order to assist a wide range of communities within the overall level of CSSS funding available. The method does not necessarily

produce an accurate measure of the value of the service delivered, and work programs often need to be re-negotiated to reflect the mismatch between funding sought and amount awarded.

The value of grants in rural and regional areas

A major issue that has been identified with rural and regional projects is the low value of the majority of grants awarded and the level of service provision required in rural areas.

The cost of service provision in different areas needs to be taken into account in funding levels. For example Darwin has a lot to offer as a place for humanitarian entrants to settle, but it must be recognised by funding bodies that the cost of service provision is more expensive than in other places as a consequence of its small size; remote location; high cost of living; transient population, which makes it difficult to attract and retain good staff, and means it is a constant effort to educate other services to be sensitive to the needs of humanitarian entrants and migrants...

Submission from the Melaleuca Refugee Centre, Torture and Trauma Survivors Service of the NT

CSSS workers provide a very broad range of services. In regional/rural areas they are in fact Jacks of all Trades since they are the only workers both the service providers and clients seek help from on migrant matters. They deal not only with newly arrived migrants but with all multicultural issues... The few CSSS projects in regional/rural NSW are poorly funded. Most of them are funded only for a part-time worker and are not given enough resources to do their job properly and to break down the barrier of distance. Hardly any funding is

Table 9.18: CSSS funding for new awards compared to requests in 2002

| State/Territory | Funding requested \$ | Funding of new awards \$ | Difference | Amounts awarded as % of amounts requested |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---|
| New South Wales | 6,949,574 | 3,853,126 | 3,096,448 | 55.4 |
| Victoria | 6,394,468 | 3,109,975 | 3,284,493 | 48.6 |
| Queensland | 2,795,424 | 1,019,500 | 1,775,924 | 36.5 |
| Western Australia | 3,208,641 | 1,131,570 | 2,077,071 | 35.3 |
| South Australia | 832,702 | 440,000 | 392,702 | 52.8 |
| Tasmania | 245,697 | 30,000 | 215,697 | 12.2 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 316,341 | 146,425 | 169,916 | 46.3 |
| Northern Territory | 59,303 | 59,303 | 0 | 0 |
| National Grant | 128,000 | 125,000 | 3,000 | 97.7 |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding.

allocated for travel cost (worker's time and actual transport costs).

Submission from the Bathurst Information and Neighbourhood Centre, NSW

An analysis of the current fifty-eight grants to non-metropolitan areas referred to in table 9.12 indicates that twenty-two of these grants or around 40% have a value of \$30,000 or less.

Grants in non-metropolitan areas with a value of \$30,000 or less amount to over \$500,000, with an average value of \$22,792 per grant. Half of these grants are in New South Wales. The low dollar value of these grants is compounded by the additional costs of operating in rural and regional areas. In contrast, in non-metropolitan Victoria there are no grants of less than \$30,000 and the average grant value in these areas is \$65,022.

Of the twenty-two currently funded grants with a value of \$30,000 or less, just under half are funded to provide three or more different types of services, with most of these

organisations providing direct client services, as well as undertaking community development and mainstreaming work. Only four of these twenty-two grants focus on one type of service delivery. The expectation that funded organisations will deliver multiple service types exacerbates the problems of the low dollar value per grant, and the additional costs of operating in rural and regional areas.

Larger grants covering more extensive areas and client groups, as has been the trend in Queensland, would promote more efficient use of resources. However, broadening the scope of grants would not necessarily be appropriate in relation to grants awarded to small and emerging communities for the purpose of community capacity building.

The cost of service delivery in rural and regional Australia could arguably be reduced if CSSS organisations were not required to cover infrastructure costs such as rent. CSSS workers are currently attached to a range of different service delivery organisations in rural and regional Australia. Many stakeholders have commented that this strategy should be enhanced and that existing infrastructure such as local government, neighbourhood

Table 9.19: CSSS grants in rural and regional areas with a value of \$30,000 or less in 2002

| State/Territory | Grants of \$30,000 or less | Funding \$ |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| New South Wales | 11 | 274,000 |
| Victoria | 0 | 0 |
| Queensland | 2 | 56,520 |
| Western Australia | 0 | 0 |
| South Australia | 6 | 137,000 |
| Tasmania | 1 | 1,000 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 2 | 32,899 |
| Northern Territory | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 22 | \$501,419 |

Source: Based on an analysis of 2002 CSSS funding.

centres, and AMEP centres could host CSSS services.

A smaller number of larger grants which more accurately reflect the cost of delivering work programs to meet identified needs, may result in an overall improvement in service delivery outcomes.

Recommendation 40

That grants funding levels better reflect the cost of delivering work programs to meet identified needs.

The duration of funding

Commentary from a number of public consultations and submissions to the review has requested an extension to the duration of CSSS funding.

Limited period funding makes it difficult and impossible for organizations to make long term plans

or recruit experienced staff. Short term funding is at best a band aid attempt at addressing specific needs and does not create an environment of stability for the clients and the program.

Submission from the Maltese Community Council of Victoria

DIMIA’s reluctance to fund services for more than 1 year at a time for provision of core settlement services causes uncertainty for employees and creates an atmosphere of instability for the community in question. Other government departments offer, as a norm, 3 year contracts which allow for some security of employment and trends and issues are more readily identifiable. This also enables time to be allocated to developing worthwhile activities outside of the basic service provision which adds value both to the community and to the funding body.

Submission from Frontier Services, WA

There is already capacity within the CSSS to award three-year grants and organisations submitting applications for longer-term needs have generally received funding for a longer timeframe. The capacity to award CSSS grants for shorter periods has increased the flexibility of the scheme, allowing a timely response to changing client profiles in order to address settlement needs as they arise. It also enables DIMIA to provide funding for ‘one off’ projects and to fund new, less experienced organisations in order to establish their capacity to manage grants.

Management committees

The management committees of CSSS-funded organisations are volunteers and so the level of expertise and participation varies significantly. Current CSSS service agreements do not specify the skills and qualifications

required of management committee members. The agreements stipulate only that members should 'possess and maintain the competence to implement their roles and responsibilities.'

The role of management committees often goes beyond that of managing funding and carrying out the CSSS project. In public consultations, stakeholders pointed out that the management committee structure builds capacity within grant recipient communities. However, a number of CSSS organisations have suffered from inexperienced or incompetent management committees, resulting in poor outcomes for the project and for clients. Under-performance by management committees can also place undue responsibility on employees delivering CSSS services. DIMIA staff may be invited by the management committees on occasion in an ex-officio capacity to provide information or guidance as required.

Management committees work best where members understand how the services their organisation is providing relate to the wider service network.

If the management [committee] has a good understanding of welfare provision, then support is adequate. If the management has a limited understanding of the system, then the clients also receive inadequate service, the community does not progress and funding needs to be kept in place for longer in order to settle the group adequately.

Submission from the Australian and Khmer Consultancy Service, NSW

Commentators have agreed on the need for regular training and updating of management committees.

DIMIA in its training programs should exercise its duty of care more adequately and once a year update management committees on all legal changes in OHS, Industrial Relations, privacy/confidentiality acts and so on. This applies particularly to small CSSS organisations.

Submission from the St George Migrant Resource Centre, NSW

DIMIA is currently implementing a national training strategy that includes a separate module for training management committees. DIMIA is delivering some training, however, self-paced learning manuals are also available to assist organisations (such as those in rural and regional areas) that cannot participate in formal training sessions. The National Training Strategy will be evaluated post-implementation, but at this stage feedback from organisations is positive.

It would be difficult to impose prescriptive criteria on management committee membership given the diversity of organisations funded under CSSS and the varying managerial expertise of those organisations. As some commentators have noted, participation on the committee itself may in some cases contribute to community capacity building. A more appropriate approach for organisations in receipt of CSSS grant funding would be to ensure that management committees with inexperienced members receive adequate training and support. The DIMIA National Training Strategy should address a number of these training needs. More experienced organisations, particularly MRCs/MSAs, are well placed to deliver support and guidance to less experienced management committees to enable them to build capacity within their organisation and their community.

Further discussion on management committees for migrant community services is held in the following chapter - Migrant Resource Centres and Migrant Service Agencies.

Conclusion

The CSSS is generally an effective and flexible model of service delivery and this has been reflected in comments from the public consultations and submissions to the review. However, in a number of cases, CSSS services have simply been stretched too thinly. DIMIA should take a greater role in defining and advertising areas of settlement need. In addition, a more intensive focus on servicing the settlement services target group and on core activities would improve CSSS outcomes. A more strategic use of existing infrastructure would also assist in making better use of existing resources.