



JESUIT SOCIAL SERVICES SUBMISSION

Melbourne, Lets Talk About The Future – Discussion Paper

Plan Melbourne

March 2013

For further information, contact:

Julie Edwards, CEO, Jesuit Social Services

Tel: 03 9421 7600 Email: julie.edwards@jss.org.au

Introduction

Jesuit Social Services welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on the discussion paper 'Melbourne, Let's Talk About the Future.'

Jesuit Social Services works to build a just society by advocating for social change and promoting the health and wellbeing of disadvantaged people, families and communities. For over 35 years we have worked with disadvantaged people and communities in Melbourne including people involved in the criminal justice system, young people with mental illness and drug and alcohol problems, refugee and migrant communities, people disengaged from employment and mainstream education, and people living in communities with high concentration of public housing.

From our experience we have come to understand the value of the truism that cities exist for people, and not people for cities. For Jesuit Social Services, this forms the indispensable starting point for our thinking about and planning the development of cities. Cities should provide the conditions and environment in which people can realise their hopes and aspirations; and their design and resources should be directed towards encouraging this.

At the most basic level Melbourne in 2050 must be a city that provides for the basic needs of all of its people. This means the provision of adequate shelter, safe and secure places for people to live and walk freely, easy access to medical care and other essential services. From our experience working with people at risk of homelessness, Jesuit Social Services understands the need for housing justice and in this submission outlines how it should be incorporated into the Metropolitan planning strategy.

At a more personal level, Melbourne must strive to be a city that provides real opportunities for people to learn and develop skills, a sense of responsibility and of self worth and to contribute to society through work. It should also provide opportunities for people to give direction to their lives, to build friendships, to engage in shared activities, and to raise families, to worship, to be creative through art and their bodily skills. And finally they allow people to take responsibility for the way in which their society is organised and led at its various levels.

In order for Melbourne to be a city for all of its people, we cannot think of people simply as individuals, nor of the task of the city as simply to maximise their range of choices and to balance the conflicts between choices. Most of the conditions which favour human thriving involve relationships with other people through families, friendships, care and protection, study, shared responsibility, social, sporting and political activities. In fact people are defined by relationships, and healthy people by good relationships to others and the world around them. A good city is one which favours good relationships.

From this it also follows that if individuals are to thrive in a city, others must also thrive. All economic activity demands trust and cooperation at a basic level, in which the good of each individual depends on the thriving of the family, the local community and society as a whole. Research by Jesuit Social Services' outlined later in this submission demonstrates how weak levels of community cohesion in disadvantaged communities can further entrench disadvantage and social exclusion. In light of this, solidarity, rather than a competitive ethos needs to be enshrined in the shaping of a city. The test of the quality of any city is the way in which it is a home for its most disadvantaged citizens.

Jesuit Social Services believes that Melbourne will be a more liveable and prosperous city when its people thrive together and look out for one another, and that the future Metropolitan planning strategy can help or hinder this thriving. The heart of any city lies in its ability to connect people easily and so facilitate the relationships on which their thriving depends. The connections are primarily local – ensuring that the design of residential communities encourage connection, and that there are local centres with spaces where people can work, play, meet and will be attracted to do so. We also note that these connections extend across the city. Given that access to opportunity can often be dependent on location, the ability to access different parts of the city whether through private or public transport is vital. So too is IT infrastructure which can facilitate connection between people and groups, and will continue to do so in coming years.

Beyond these physical connections, there is also a need for people, community groups, government and business to work more closely together to develop and lead initiatives that provide opportunities for the people of Melbourne. This will involve building on existing networks and initiatives as well as the exploration of innovative partnerships stretching from the delivery of basic services through to the economic development of communities.

This submission will draw from Jesuit Social Services experience and research and identify areas for development and ways forward to build the type of Melbourne outlined above. In doing so, it will explore how the Metropolitan planning strategy might ensure the basic needs of Melbourne's people are met, how we can enhance opportunities for social and economic participation, and how community life throughout Melbourne can be strengthened. Initially, we will briefly provide some background to Jesuit Social Services and our work.

Who we are and what we do

Jesuit Social Services works to build a just society by advocating for social change and promoting the health and wellbeing of disadvantaged people, families, and communities.

Jesuit Social Services works where the need is greatest and where it has the capacity, experience and skills to make the most difference. Jesuit Social Services values every person and seeks to engage with them in a respectful way, that acknowledges their experiences and skills and gives them the opportunity to harness their full potential.

We do this by intervening directly to address disadvantage and by influencing hearts and minds for social change. We strengthen and build respectful, constructive relationships for:

- Effective services - by partnering with people most in need and those who support them to address disadvantage
- Education - by providing access to life-long learning and development
- Capacity building - by refining and evaluating our practice and sharing and partnering for greater impact

- Advocacy - by building awareness of injustice and advocating for social change based on grounded experience and research
- Leadership development - by partnering across sectors to build expertise and commitment for justice

The promotion of **education, lifelong learning and capacity building** is fundamental to all our activity. We believe this is the most effective means of helping people to reach their potential and exercise their full citizenship. This, in turn, strengthens the broader community.

Our service delivery and advocacy focuses on the following key areas:

- **Justice and crime prevention** – people involved with the justice system
- **Mental health and wellbeing** – people with multiple and complex needs and those affected by suicide, trauma and complex bereavement
- **Settlement and community building** – recently arrived immigrants and refugees and disadvantaged communities
- **Education, training and employment** – people with barriers to sustainable employment

Currently our direct services and volunteer programs are located in: Victoria, New South Wales and Northern Territory. Services include:

- ***Brosnan Services***: supporting young people and adults in the justice system, and assisting them to make a successful transition from custody back into the community. Within the suite of services are Perry House, Dillon House and Youth Justice Community Support Services.
- ***Jesuit Community College***: increasing opportunities for people constrained by social and economic disadvantage to participate in education, work and community life and reach their full potential.
- ***Community Programs***: working with people on public housing estates across metropolitan Melbourne, including the African Australian and Vietnamese communities, and supporting remote Aboriginal communities in governance and capacity building initiatives in Central Australia
- ***Connexions***: delivering intensive support and counselling for young people with co-occurring mental health, substance and alcohol misuse problems.
- ***Artful Dodgers Studios***: providing pathways to education, training and employment for young people with multiple and complex needs associated with mental health, substance abuse and homelessness.
- ***The Outdoor Experience***: offering an alternative treatment service through a range of outdoor intervention programs for young people aged 15 – 25 years, who have or have had issues with alcohol and/or other drugs.

- **Support After Suicide:** supporting people bereaved by suicide, including children and young people.
- **Community Detention Services:** delivering case management support to asylum seekers, including unaccompanied minors, in community detention.
- **Western Sydney Program:** delivering social enterprise and other community building that provide affordable food, training and employment opportunities to people living in the area of Mount Druitt, Western Sydney.

Research, advocacy and policy are advanced through our Policy Unit, coordinating across all program and major interest areas of Jesuit Social Services.

Responses to Questions in Discussion Paper

1. A Melbourne that fosters social and economic participation

Questions from discussion paper:

In relation to outcome principle four:

Question 1: What do you think of the outcome principles?

Question 2: What do you think is needed to achieve these outcome principles?

Question 4: What do you think of the idea of identifying and reinforcing employment and innovation clusters across Melbourne?

Question 10: How can all levels of government, business and community work together to create the city you want?

The goal of boosting social and economic participation with a particular focus on extending opportunities for employment across Melbourne is welcomed, as is the identification of the need to enhance access to education. These aims are especially pertinent for disadvantaged people and communities with a wide range of research demonstrating the link between low educational attainment, poor labour market attachment and disadvantage (Pawson, Davison, & Wiesel, 2012). Planning, development and the provision of services are all factors that can influence social and economic participation. However, it is important to understand that there are a range of influential factors that impact upon social and economic participation including the structure and dynamics of the economy and labour market, support and resources available in the education systems and other public services, as well as unique individual factors throughout the community. It will be beyond the scope of the Metropolitan Planning Strategy to address all of these factors, however, in the section that follows we will outline how planning and development can impact upon the prospects for social and economic participation across the Metropolitan area.

The nature of social and economic disadvantage in Melbourne

The discussion paper identified the need to enhance social and economic participation across Melbourne, particularly amongst disadvantaged people and communities. In identifying the prospect

of 'two Melbourne's' the discussion paper identified differences in opportunities between communities. Jesuit Social Services accepts the notion of 'two Melbourne's' but believes that patterns of disadvantage within the Metropolitan areas are more complex than a distinction between a choice rich inner Melbourne and a fringe with few choices, or in simple dichotomies between growth and established suburbs. A major challenge is to identify disadvantage within communities and take steps to build the capabilities of people and communities and provide pathways to inclusion.

Jesuit Social Services has systematically and formally studied the nature of different dimensions of disadvantage at the level of social geography via a series of three studies authored in partnership with Professor Tony Vinson (*Unequal at Birth*, 1999; *Community Adversity and Resilience: the distribution of social disadvantage in Victoria and New South Wales*, 2004; *Dropping Off the Edge, the distribution of disadvantage in Australia*, 2007). These three studies charted areas in which there were high concentrations of disadvantage on a range of indicators. *Dropping Off the Edge* analysed indicators of disadvantage in several thousand communities throughout Australia including social distress, health, community safety, economic factors and education. In the light of our findings one or two of the above indicators add little to one's understanding of disadvantage but the overall impression is of the inter-connectedness of the variables. They appear to describe a web-like structure of disadvantage in extreme cases which is illustrated by the degree of vulnerability of the 3% most disadvantaged localities in each jurisdiction compared with the remaining 97%. In *Dropping Off the Edge*, several localities within Melbourne were identified amongst the 40 most disadvantaged postcode areas within Victoria, these included:

- 3061 – Campbellfield
- 3060 – Fawkner, Fawker East, Fawkner North
- 3019 – Braybrook, Braybrook North, Robinson
- 3047 – Broadmeadows, Dallas, Jacana
- 3081 – Heidelberg West, Heidelberg Heights, Bellfield

The study also allowed for identification of major characteristics of the most disadvantaged postcode areas. These included low family income, early school leaving, limited computer use, no internet access, disability/sickness support, criminal convictions, and lack of qualifications.

The findings of *Dropping off the Edge* complement other research which demonstrated the increasing entrenchment of disadvantage in Australia between 1970's and 1990's (Pawson, Davison, & Wiesel, 2012). The fact that 4 of the 6 Melbourne postcodes identified as amongst the most disadvantaged in *Dropping Off the Edge* (2007) were also identified as amongst the most disadvantaged in an earlier 2004 study supports this. It is also important to understand the non-static nature of disadvantage and the fact that it can worsen in some areas and improve in others. This is evident in the changing location of disadvantage in Australia resulting from changes to housing and labour markets which has seen a shift in disadvantage from the inner city and the 'suburbanisation' of poverty (Pawson, Davison, & Wiesel, 2012). Significantly, decisions made under the Metropolitan Planning Strategy will seek to lower levels of disadvantage, but there is also a potential for them to displace or, at worst, to exacerbate disadvantage. An example of this is the phenomenon of displacement, in which urban regeneration initiatives, particularly in areas with high

density public housing, have not addressed disadvantage and instead have displaced it to other urban areas (Pawson, Davison, & Wiesel, 2012).

Building capability and promoting inclusion

A major component in efforts to overcome social exclusion is provision of services. The Australian Social Inclusion Board has recognised this arguing that ‘just as the minimum income people need for inclusion needs to be considered, the ‘basket of services’ people need should also be calculated’ (Australian Social Inclusion Board, 2010). The board went on to recognise that this should lead to a focus on ensuring services were available in developing communities in the outer suburban areas of Australia’s cities. The discussion paper has picked up on this need through the identification of the potential for high level service centres that co-locate services in an accessible way for communities throughout Melbourne. Co-location offers a promising means to enhance service delivery that could be promoted through the regional plan. Initially, it is important to note, that there will be limits to what any Metropolitan Planning Strategy can achieve, factors outside of the scope of the strategy such as the resources allocated to services, service design and the approach taken in delivering them will also influence their effectiveness.

The idea of co-location of services is not new, and attempts to put it into practice have been made by governments at different levels. A prominent recent example of this is the *Local Connection to Work* initiative which was piloted by the Commonwealth Department of Human Services and co-located Centrelink services with a range of other social services including Medicare, Child Support, health, housing, training and employment services. Available information on the results of this program has outlined positive outcomes in terms of engaging with disadvantaged people and in achieving employment outcomes (Taskforce on Strengthening Government Service Delivery for Jobseekers, 2011). In addition to improving the quality and effectiveness of services, there is also some potential to enhance efficiency through co-location. The *Total Place* pilot initiatives in the United Kingdom explored the potential gains that could be achieved through a more collaborative approach to capital investment and found that significant cost savings in capital construction and ongoing operating costs could be achieved through better alignment and coordination of the service delivery estate (HM Treasury, 2010). However, it is important to note that efficiency and savings were a primary aim of this efficiency so the dividends of increased collaboration were not reinvested into better quality services for the community.

Measures to promote the co-location and integration of social services should be taken into account in any future planning strategy for Melbourne. In addition to the examples outlined above, thinking and experimentation of what this means in practice taken place in Victoria over the past two decades through initiatives such as Primary Care Partnerships, Child First, and Neighbourhood Renewal Schemes, and the recent Services Connect reforms within the Department of Human Services. Whilst these initiatives have focused on the provision of different types of services, all have had some focus on specific geographic communities.

Community involvement in services

At a national level, the Social Inclusion Board (2010) has explored in some detail the mechanics of enhancing service delivery in disadvantaged communities. Of particular relevance to any future

Metropolitan Planning Strategy is the identification of the need to change the nature of relationships between government, services, service users, and the community in order to overcome entrenched disadvantage. In practice, this means providing the means for service users and providers to take an active role as agents in the production of services and social outcomes (Australian Social Inclusion Board, 2010). The need for more active role by communities in the development of services, particularly in disadvantaged areas, has been identified in a range of literature and initiatives focusing on area based solutions to disadvantage (Pawson, Davison, & Wiesel, 2012), (Morris & Gilchrist, 2011).

A major practical challenge that has been identified by the Social Inclusion Board is putting in place appropriate governance structures and building the capacity and leadership within communities to effectively play a role in these processes. Community leadership and capacity building will be explored in more detail later on in this submission. Focusing on governance structures, the Social Inclusion Board (2010) made specific recommendations regarding the development of local governance structures that would promote engagement and coordination and also provide a means for community input and participation in decision making. Victoria has some experience here, *Neighbourhood Renewal* projects promoted local involvement and leadership through locally managed teams and stakeholder involvement in planning. The whole of government *Community Engagement Network* and *Communities of Practice* have also provided mechanisms for community involvement in the design and delivery of services. However, the Social Inclusion Board takes this a step further and recommends that governance arrangements evolve over time, in line with the development of community capacity, to a point where responsibility for design, funding and delivery of local services is devolved to local institutions. This type of approach can be seen in the *Community Budget* initiative currently being piloted in the United Kingdom. Through this initiative, decisions on service priority, funding allocation and delivery within local areas are being transferred from Central Government to governance institutions at a local level (National Audit Office (UK), 2013). The implications of this initiative on the effectiveness of local services is yet to be fully evaluated, however it demonstrates one approach through which local decision making on services design can be implemented. We believe that governance processes which allow for community involvement in identifying problems and developing solutions to them should be encouraged. Whether this extends to direct control over funding decisions and service design in areas based funding models, should depend upon the circumstances of the problems that services seek to address.

Rethinking the nature of services

Jesuit Social Services believes that a Melbourne that fosters social and economic inclusion for disadvantaged people required more than community involvement in services. There is also a need to rethink the nature of services and how they build relationships with service users and, in turn, promote relationships between service users and the community. There is a significant body of evidence that demonstrates how interactions and relationships play an important role in the process of people dealing with disadvantage (Morris & Gilchrist, 2011). The quality of relationships between workers in a variety of services has been identified as a key factor, so too has factors such as the strength of social connections and informal networks within a community which are often more influential on peoples' capacity to deal with disadvantage than formal services (Australian Social Inclusion Board, 2010). A commonly recognised approach to building connections for people within

and across communities is through volunteering (Haski-Leventhal, 2009); this is explored in more detail below.

In light of the evidence above, Jesuit Social Services believes a major challenge for service planning is to promote more effective engagement with disadvantaged people and social connections across communities. Our own experience and research has demonstrated both the benefits and challenges of a relationship based approach to service provision. An example from our practice is the Mount Druitt Community Enterprise in Western Sydney. Located adjacent to the Holy Family school and parish, 'The Store', operated as a community enterprise by Jesuit Social Services provides a work place based training model, while the Store itself provides sustainable food to the Mount Druitt community. An example of a different kind is provided by the Young Men's Assertive Outreach Program ('YMAOP') which provides intensive assertive case-management and outreach support to young men at risk of chronic homelessness. Key elements of the approach of workers on this program include persistent, long term and meaningful engagement to build relationships of trust, flexible working engaging with young people in environments in which they were comfortable, a focus on developing connections to family, peers, community and education, and underlining this work was a therapeutic approach focusing on strengths based practice (Jesuit Social Services, 2012). Services like YMAOP often operate in challenging environments characterised by limited funding, complex administrative processes, and the absence of coordinated efforts. In planning future service provision across Melbourne, the location, structure and resourcing of services will impact upon their capacity to engage with people and communities. Of equal importance is the nature of services themselves.

Recommendation 1: Metropolitan plan should outline principles for service delivery to promote more inclusive Melbourne. These should include:

- **Locating services according to the needs of communities as identified through data on the locational nature of disadvantage**
- **Provision of infrastructure and funding and service models that enable the co-location and joining up of services in disadvantaged communities driven by strong local leadership and involvement of the local community**
- **The medium term aim of enhancing community involvement in decision making on service design and delivery**
- **Services for disadvantaged communities to focus on building strong and genuine relationships and promoting community connections**

Appropriate learning and educational opportunities

Jesuit Social Services strongly believes that planning for the provision of education facilities and opportunities is not enough, and that consideration must also be accorded to the nature of the opportunities that are available and how they are linked into wider pathways to participation. For the majority of learners, traditional campus delivery of education and training works well, be it in schools, colleges, TAFE or university environments. Clearly, the planning strategy must consider the future development of these educational opportunities and how they will link in with wider economic and social development. However, Jesuit Social Services believes that the planning

strategy also must take into account the fact that, for a significant number of disadvantaged people throughout our community, traditional models of education and training delivery does not work so well. Our experience has convinced us that many of the most disadvantaged learners lacked key foundational skills needed to enter and successfully navigate the training system and achieve learning outcomes that lead to sustained employment – including basic literacy, numeracy and communication skills. Similar problems have been documented by other organisations working with disadvantaged people. The Brotherhood of St Laurence has noted *‘there are risks however, of over-reliance on training provision, including training churn, credentialism and poor matching of skills development to available jobs’* (Brotherhood of St Laurence, 2011).

In response to these issues, Jesuit Social Services, through the Jesuit Community College, is focusing on providing disadvantaged people with flexible learning opportunities that focus on building their core skills. Our approach is characterised by flexible and appropriate engagement with learners, often in community settings; tailoring teaching methods and learning environments so that they are suitable for disadvantaged learners; and providing ongoing support, mentoring, and counselling so that our learners can realise their aspirations. The approach taken through Jesuit Community College is supported by evidence from programs and interventions from around the world that work with disengaged learners. In a review of effective models for supporting disengaged learners, Davies, Lamb and Doecke (2011) identified four key influences on successful programs - these were outreach, learner well-being, pedagogy and pathways. Their review outlined how effective programs provided flexible, individualised, and ongoing support that took into account the personal and environmental factors that influenced learners. The Melbourne strategic plan should encourage future investment in education and training infrastructure that takes into account the need for more appropriate educational and training opportunities for disadvantaged members of our community. Importantly, the plan should also emphasise the importance of embedding pathways to participation within local educational and training initiatives. These pathways will be considered in the following section.

Recommendation 2: The Metropolitan Planning Strategy should include principle and framework for investment in the skills and knowledge of Melbournians. This must also recognise the need for flexible and appropriate learning opportunities for people disengaged from mainstream education.

Pathways to participation

The identification in the discussion paper of the need to develop hubs of learning and employment is welcome. Jesuit Social Services’ believes that planning and investment in infrastructure can be a spur for economic development. In making decisions on investment in infrastructure and jobs, attention should be accorded to the nature of opportunities created, particularly those for disadvantaged people and communities. Jesuit Social Services believes that these opportunities should include a range of pathways that build skills and provide opportunities in both the formal labour market, as well as intermediate steps to participation such as social enterprises and volunteering. A cornerstone of this should be a focus on linking education and training initiatives to economic and social participation opportunities.

From our experience, we have observed how too often funds have been spent on training in the absence of a clear pathway to employment or participation. This has also been recognised as a need

by the Brotherhood of St Laurence, '*better integration of training with support and paid work experience is essential, with training tailored to individual job seeker needs and job prospects.*' (Brotherhood of St Laurence, 2011). Pathways to employment were one of the key elements to effectively engaging with disengaged learners identified by Davies, Lamb and Doecke (2011). Elements of a pathways approach can include embedding pathways in learning programs, integration with work opportunities, or utilisation of intermediate labour market programs such as social enterprises (discussed below).

Jesuit Social Services also believes that non-paid employment opportunities provide a means to promote inclusion for disadvantaged people and move them closer towards economic participation. It also has benefits for volunteers with its positive impacts on physical and psychological wellbeing, building social network, reducing loneliness, and also opening up potential pathways into employment (Haski-Leventhal, 2009). In addition to its benefits for people and their work prospects, volunteering is also seen as an activity that builds community, trust and reciprocity (Bates & Davis, 2004).

A role for social enterprises

A key means through which Jesuit Social Services promotes participation is through the 'living classrooms' of our social enterprises in New South Wales and Victoria. In Melbourne, we have recently won the tenders to operate two Ignite Cafe Social Enterprises within local government buildings in the City of Boroondara. Social Enterprises, particularly those providing intermediate labour market opportunities have been recognised both in Victoria, nationally and internationally as effective mechanisms through which economic participation can be promoted. Evaluations of social enterprise initiatives worldwide have found that they assist disadvantaged jobseekers in achieving employment outcomes, improve 'soft skills' of participants, reduce recidivism amongst prisoners and enhance community wellbeing and the environment (Nockolds, 2012). Key elements to successful social enterprises include strong leadership and administrative systems, links to community, flexibility in training and support, as well as the level of support required. Major challenges include overcoming productivity deficit that result from the need to provide support to disadvantaged jobseekers and linking people into the formal labour market (Nockolds, 2012).

The development and viability of social enterprises worldwide has been influenced by factors including local cultural and economic contexts as well capacity and will within the different communities (Barraket, 2006). Importantly, a role for government has been recognised including through promotion, partnerships, regulation, and financial and capacity building support (Barraket, 2006). Victorian experience emphasises the role that government can play in supporting social enterprises, this has included direct investment in social enterprise development and through funding social enterprises through the *Neighbourhood Renewal* initiative, capacity building through Social Traders, and promotion through the Victorian Government Social Procurement Guidelines for local councils. These initiatives provide a solid starting point from which to overcome challenges including the productivity deficit and linking disadvantaged jobseekers to the formal labour market. The Metropolitan Planning Strategy provides an opportunity to build on this and further promote a role to be played by social enterprise in the future development of Melbourne. In particular, the strategy could clearly outline a role for social enterprise in promoting economic and social

participation as well as a clear commitment from State and local governments to support local social enterprises. The Social Procurement Guidelines provide a starting point but the role of social enterprises can be built on. One key area for development is partnerships; which have been identified as an important factor to the success of social enterprises internationally (Barraket, 2006). Examples of how partnership can enhance the impact social enterprise already exist. Jesuit Social Services social enterprise in Mt Druitt, Western Sydney, has entered into a partnership with one of its suppliers, Harris Farms (a major perishable food distribution business in New South Wales). Through this partnership, people on work experience and training placements in the store have been offered permanent employment with Harris farms upon their graduation. In the planning the future development of Melbourne, consideration should be given to the role that social Enterprise might play in providing pathways to economic participation.

Generating employment opportunities

The previous sections have outlined the importance of linking employment opportunities into education, training, unpaid and social enterprise work experience. This is a significant challenge, especially in areas with limited employment opportunities and significant numbers of people with limited skills and experience in the formal labour market. Other factors such as the structure of the economy and labour market are also influential. Nonetheless, a focus on economic participation in the Melbourne Planning Strategy is welcomed, and progress must be made to avoid the entrenchment of economic exclusion in parts of Melbourne. Jesuit Social Services believes that planning strategy should promote partnership with employers in order to grow local economies and provide new opportunities for economic participation.

For Jesuit Social Services, the need to engage and build partnerships with business is underpinned by an emerging body of thinking and practice within business and management theory and literature that is reconceptualising the role of businesses within society. The concept of shared value which was explored in detail in the Harvard Business Review by Porter and Kramer links together economic and social progress and argues that the health of communities in which they operate is vital to the success of business and that business should focus on generating both economic and social progress (Porter & Kramer, 2011).

An example of this shared value approach in action is the African Australian Inclusion Program (AAIP). The program is a highly successful and award winning partnership between Jesuit Social Services and the National Australia Bank (NAB) that provides a professional bridging and training program for qualified African-Australians, including six months paid workplace experience. The program aims to provide commercial experience and learning opportunities for participants, including enhancing their business networks. The need for the program was identified by the African-Australian community who noted that lack of local experience in the Australian business sector was a significant barrier to employment for qualified African-Australians. The outcomes have been significant. Since its inception in 2009, 93 African-Australians have had six month, paid workplace experience at NAB; 14 are still completing their 6 month placement; and 54 have progressed to ongoing employment within NAB. There are 13 who have secured ongoing employment in other companies outside NAB, bringing a total of 67 who have progressed to ongoing employment. The program has also generated benefits for the employer through opportunities to develop its own staff, as well as benefits for African Australian communities in Melbourne.

Development and planning strategy should include mechanisms to engage with business and encourage their involvement in local employment generation initiatives, including links into development projects (an example being the construction of services hubs) and local skills development initiatives.

There is also a need to consider how enterprise can be promoted within local communities. Recent research for the Commonwealth Department of Education, Employment and Workplace relations by Burkett (2012) has looked at how impact investing in disadvantaged communities can promote economic inclusion. Burkett presented evidence that disadvantaged communities are underserved by investment. That is, the complex and entrenched disadvantage in these communities also leads to a process through which there is little investment (Burkett, 2012). This impacts on the viability of small and medium enterprises who play a key role as employers and job creators but are unable to attract investment. Drawing on American examples of effective models for investing in local SME's, Burkett outlines the potential for innovative investment approaches in particular communities that aim to promote local economic opportunities as well as generate returns for investors, this includes investment in start-ups, capital for expansion of fast growing small businesses and property investment (Burkett, Place-Based Impact Investment in Australia - Building Blocks for Action, 2012). The overarching approach under which this investment takes place is 'impact investment' an evolving form of private finance focusing on both economic and social returns. Internationally and in Australia, governments are playing a role in exploring and promoting the development of impact investment. The Melbourne Metropolitan Strategy should consider how economic participation, particularly through SME's might be promoted by this type of investment, and how it could be encouraged.

Recommendation 3: Key components and processes for promoting economic participation should be outlined in the planning strategy. Where infrastructure investments and economic growth areas are identified, there should be clear strategies for promoting local employment opportunities. This should include frameworks for partnership between business, government and the community within a model of reciprocal social values and benefits to all parties.

Recommendation 4: The strategy should promote the role of social enterprise in promoting economic and social participation in the future development of Melbourne. In particular, the strategy should clearly outline a role for social enterprise and a clear commitment from State Government that encourages local government to support.

Recommendation 5: Employment opportunities for disadvantaged people should be proactively pursued. These should involve employers and seek out innovative ways of financing small and medium enterprises in communities.

2. Building stronger communities

Questions from discussion paper:

In relation to outcome principle five:

Question 1: What do you think of the outcome principles?

Question 2: What do you think is needed to achieve these outcome principles?

Question 10: How can all levels of government, business and community work together to create the city you want?

The discussion paper noted that strong and cohesive communities are the building blocks of successful cities. Jesuit Social Services experience and research supports this view, and draws on evidence that the way a community operates, and the social environment thereby created – particularly with respect to identifiable aspects of social cohesion and an orientation to community improvement – can make a positive contribution to community well-being over and beyond the benefits wrought by effective services to individuals and households. Internationally, research on the wider community level impacts of disadvantage identify contributing factors including negative peer influences, weak social norms/control, limited resources networks and the effects of stigmatisation (Pawson, Davison, & Wiesel, 2012).

In Australia, research on ‘neighbourhood effects’ of disadvantage is still evolving. However, *Dropping Off the Edge* analysed survey data from the Victorian Department of Communities that captured indicators of the degree of social cohesion in Victorian communities. These indicators included levels of volunteering, participation in local groups and attendance at local events, feelings of safety, help from neighbours, levels of trust in others, whether people feel valued by society, and whether they have taken action to promote the common good (Vinson, 2007). Analysing the results from these measures on a postcode basis, *Dropping off the Edge* was able to identify postcode areas with low, medium and high levels of cohesion. A concerning finding in relation to Metropolitan Melbourne was the low number of postcode areas with high levels of cohesion– Metropolitan Melbourne made up 43.8% of the total sample but had only 5.2% of high cohesion postcodes (Vinson, 2007). Further analysis exploring the correlations between levels of cohesions and indicators of disadvantage found that social cohesion exerted a strong buffering effect on indicators of disadvantage and lead to the conclusion that strengthening social bonds could play a role in minimising the harmful effects of disadvantageous social and economic conditions (Vinson, 2007). A parallel finding was central to the European review of the social determinants of health and the health divide, with Marmot and colleagues finding that creating or re-asserting societal cohesion was one of the most effective actions to greater health equity at a societal level (Marmot, Allan, Bell, Bloomer, & Goldblatt, 2012).

There is also evidence that supports four attributes of practice ‘which in combination help to sustain effective community functioning’ (Vinson 2010 in (Australian Social Inclusion Board, 2010). These attributes are based on a long established tradition of sociological theorising and the findings of classical experimentation by Bales (1950),ⁱ as well as Australian research. Two of those attributes relate to the substance and style of decision-making (particularly in relation to the community’s goal

setting) and resource generation and allocation. The other two relate to the inner state of the community, especially social cohesion, the containment of inevitable tensions, and the maintenance of collective motivation. In combination these points of reference enable the social 'pulse' of a community to be taken, communal strengths and limitations identified, and activities to be ordered and modified with an eye to the needs of the community *as a system in its own right*.

The key community attributes:

External pattern

- (i) Substance and style of decision making: Includes arrangements for generating an action agenda and the identification and development of local leadership
- (ii) Resource generation and allocation: equitable funding and delivery of services for all community members and a local contribution to community initiatives

Internal pattern

- (iii) Integration of people, groups and community organisations: a stronger sentiment of attachment to the local area, participation in community affairs, and strong relationships between local organisations and the community
- (iv) Maintaining direction, energy and motivation: processes to bring people together with different opinions and contain tensions.

Jesuit Social Services has observed and also been directly involved in delivering community building initiatives that demonstrate the attributes outlined by Vinson (2010), in particular through our experience working with public housing communities in Melbourne and partnering in the delivery of neighbourhood renewal programs. We have previously outlined initiatives that have elements of the resource generation and allocation attribute, particularly efforts to enhance local involvement in the design of public services. Jesuit Social Services programs facilitating community involvement, engagement and leadership also demonstrate elements of the approach. We seek to develop leadership within the communities that we work with. Jesuit Social Services' African Leadership programs support young members of Melbourne's African communities to develop their capabilities to lead their communities through skills building workshops and ongoing mentoring and support. At the heart of this approach is recognition that the young leaders themselves must identify and take responsibility for the issues that their community face, our programs support them to develop the skills to be able to accomplish this.

In the area of community engagement and support the work of Jesuit Social Services's workers in the Konnect program which provides support to Aboriginal men and women exiting prison is instructive. A central principle of Konnect's practice is to look for ways to reconnect people in need with relationships with family, friends and communities. A number of our Koori staff have an intimate knowledge of families and communities throughout the state. Workers develop links between people, organisations and communities, often in situations where these links and wider community connections are absent or have broken down. In a recent case reported by Konnect staff, a man in his mid-thirties who had returned to his community was struggling with a range of issues:

poor self-care, heavy drinking, family conflict and failure to show up at appointments for medical and housing needs. Local service providers and locals had become frustrated with the man and relations were frayed. It was very likely that his downward spiral of behaviour would culminate in reoffending. The Konnect staff member was able to liaise with family and service providers to ensure the man received the care required and to improve his relationships. To date, his condition has improved on numerous fronts and he has not reoffended. This example demonstrates the challenges that can be overcome where individuals and wider communities are brought together. Importantly, this requires resources, skills, knowledge and time to develop relationships of trust within communities.

Recommendation 6: Strategies that promote social cohesion are imperative to minimise harmful impacts of disadvantage and promote improved social and health outcomes within communities.

Housing Justice

We welcome the recognition, in the discussion paper, of the importance of housing and the need for neighbourhoods across Melbourne to have a diverse mix of housing that can cater for people's needs and economic capacity. We also welcome the recognition of the need for leadership by government in regards to social housing. These needs are supported by the broad evidence base which makes clear the benefits of accessible and affordable accommodation as opposed to the social and economic costs that result from housing problems and homelessness (Australian Social Inclusion Board 2010a, Hulse, Jacobs, Arthurson & Spinney 2011, Flatau, Zaretsky et al, 2008). The housing market and its processes directly impact upon patterns of disadvantage, as made clear in recent decades through the processes of 'gentrification' of formerly low socioeconomic inner city areas and the 'suburbanisation' of poverty (Pawson, Davison, & Wiesel, 2012). Within the market, affordability is a critical factor with the decline in affordability of property prices and rents, particularly over the past two decades, limiting choices over where people can live and the types of property available to them.

It is important to note that the property market is not the only influence on housing justice and that government also plays an influential role through planning laws, incentives and its policies towards social housing. Jesuit Social Services believes that Metropolitan planning strategy should promote diversity and affordability of housing as core principles, and focus on how this can be achieved. This focus can include investment in and the promotion of neighbourhoods with a variety of types of tenure and property types. Similar initiatives have already been justified on the grounds of the case for socially balanced communities (Pawson, Davison, & Wiesel, 2012) with evidence suggesting that disadvantaged residents of more socially balanced neighbourhoods are likely to benefit from positive role modelling, stronger social norms and the elimination of geographic stigma (Pawson, Davison, & Wiesel, 2012). Melbourne already has some experience with mixed development on housing estates with the introduction of more diverse range of properties and tenants into the public housing estates in Carlton already underway and moves afoot for similar developments in Richmond and Fitzroy. We note the focus on increasing the mix within existing public housing areas, and while we welcome more diversity within these neighbourhoods we are concerned that these developments are being driven by the need to rationalise public investment in the much needed regeneration of these areas (Pawson, Davison, & Wiesel, 2012). We are also concerned that these developments may impact upon the built environments within these communities that are

important to health of community (for example through building on public space). The current focus on mixing developments in existing public housing estate should be replaced with a broader view for diverse and affordable neighbourhoods. We understand that the issue of housing affordability is being explored through the Strategy for Growth and also the Housing Affordability Unit. The Metropolitan Planning Strategy should link into these initiatives and outline goals for specific mix of tenure types and affordability levels across all Metropolitan Melbourne.

Another key feature of housing within Melbourne will be social housing. Again, significant change has occurred over the past generation. A range of policy changes both within the housing sector (segmented waiting lists), but also other areas (such as de-institutionalisation of mental health services)(Australian Social Inclusion Board 2010a, Lewis 2006), has seen the nature of public housing change. Public housing tenants are no longer predominantly working families who then transition into the private market. Instead public housing provides accommodation to vulnerable and marginalised individuals and families including lone parents, the elderly, people living with disability, and people suffering from mental illness (Hall & Berry 2007). These changes, along with a diminished rate of real investment by government, have resulted in a system that is not able to meet demand and a stock of public housing which is increasingly unsuitable for tenants. Linked to wider reforms of housing development (outlined above) is a need to reaffirm the role of social housing and support its development. Some promising developments in this area include the growth of social housing providers who contribute to a more diverse social housing system, and are able to attract a wider range of investment into social housing. A major challenge that remains is to support the many people with complex needs within the current segmented priority housing system in Victoria. The Metropolitan planning strategy should outline the role of social housing and how it might be promoted and linked into wider development throughout Melbourne in the coming years.

Recommendation 7: The Metropolitan planning strategy should have diversity and affordability of housing as core principles, and outline how the development of more diverse housing can be promoted throughout Melbourne.

Recommendation 8: The future role of social housing should be clearly articulated in the strategy, including the exploration of options for expanding and better integrating social housing with new and existing developments.

Conclusion

Jesuit Social Services believes that the Metropolitan Planning Strategy provides an opportunity to outline a vision for Melbourne to develop into a more prosperous and inclusive city. This submission has outlined how, through adopting a wide notion of social and economic participation, and by promoting stronger communities and housing justice the strategy can set a clear direction for an inclusive Melbourne. If the strategy achieves this, then it will provide a platform for Melbourne to develop into something truly great - a city that is for its people and their hopes and aspirations.

Bibliography

Australian Social Inclusion Board. (2010). *Governance Models for Location Based Initiatives*. Canberra: Australian Social Inclusion Board.

Australian Social Inclusion Board, 2010a, 'Breaking Cycles of Disadvantage'

Bales, Robert Freed (1950) *Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups*. Cambridge, Mass. : Addison-Wesley.

Barraket, J. (2006). *Community and Social Enterprise: What Role for Government?* Melbourne: Department for Victorian Communities.

Bates, P., & Davis, F. (2004). Social Capital, Social Inclusion and Services for People with Learning Disabilities. *Disability and Society* , 196-207.

Brotherhood of St Laurence. (2011). *Line of sight: better tailored services for highly disadvantaged jobseekers*. Melbourne: Brotherhood of St Laurence .

Brown, J., & North, S. (2010). *Providing support to disadvantaged learners in the Australian VET system: A report to the National VET Equity Advisory Council*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Burkett, I. (2012). *Place-Based Impact Investment in Australia - Building Blocks for Action*. Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR).

Burkett, I. (2012). *Place-Based Impact Investment In Australia: A Literature Review Exploring Opportunities for Place-based Impact Investment in Australia*. Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR).

Cottom, H. (2011, Summer). Relational Welfare. *Soundings* , pp. 134-144.

Paul Flatau, Kaylene Zaretsky, Michelle Brady, Yvonne Haigh and Robyn Martin, 2008, 'The cost effectiveness of homelessness programs: a first assessment' AHURI Final Report no.119

Guenther, J., Falk, I., & Arnott, A. (2008). *The role of vocational education and training in welfare to work*. National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER).

Hall, J & Berry, M. 2007, 'The financial impact of welfare targeting in public housing', AHURI Research and Policy Bulletin Issue 89.

Haski-Leventhal, D. D. (2009). *Addressing social disadvantage through volunteering* . The Centre for Social Impact .

HM Treasury (UK). (2010). *Total Place: a whole area approach to public services*. London: HM Treasury (UK).

HM Treasury. (2010). *Total Place: a whole area approach to public services* . HM Treasury.

Kath Hulse, Keith Jacobs, Kathy Arthurson & Angela Spinney, 2011, 'At home and in place? The role of housing in social inclusion', AHURI Final Report no. 177.

Institute for Government (UK). (2011). *Community Budgets: Briefing Note*. Institute for Government.

Jesuit Social Services. (2012). *Young Men's Assertive Outreach Program - Interim Evaluation Report*. Melbourne: Jesuit Social Services.

Lewis, J, 2006, 'How does security of tenure impact on public housing tenants?' AHURI Research and Policy Bulletin, Issue 78.

Marmot, M., Allan, J., Bell, R., Bloomer, W., & Goldblatt, R. (2012). WHO European review of social determinants of health and health review. *www.thelancet.com*, vol 380 , 1011-29.

Morris, D., & Gilchrist, A. (2011). *Communities Connected: Inclusion, Participation and Common Purpose*. RSA Action Research Centre.

National Audit Office (UK). (2013). *Case Study on Integration: Measuring the Costs and Benefits of Whole-Place Community Budgets*. Department for Communities and Local Government (UK).

Nockolds, D. (2012). *Exploring success for intermediate labour market social enterprises - a literature review*. Melbourne: Brotherhood of St Laurence.

OECD. (2012). Australian Active Labour Market Programmes. In OECD, *Activating Jobseekers: How Australia Does it*. OECD Publishing.

Pawson, H., Davison, G., & Wiesel, I. (2012). *Addressing concentrations of disadvantage: policy, practice and literature review*. Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI).

Porter, M., & Kramer, R. (2011). Shared Value - how to reinvent capitalism and unleash a wave of innovation and growth. *Harvard Business Review* .

Seyfang, G. (2004). Working Outside the Box: Community Currencies, Time Banks and Social Inclusion. *Journal of Social Policy* , 44-71.

Taskforce on Strengthening Government Service Delivery for Jobseekers. (2011). *Report to the Secretary of the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations and the Department of Human Services*. Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.

Valentine, K., & Hilferty, F. (2012). *Why don't multi-agency child welfare initiatives deliver? A counterpoint to best practice literature*. Sydney: Social Policy Research Centre.

Vinson, T. (2007). *Dropping off the edge*. Melbourne: Jesuit Social Services.