

Social Work Review Report & Proposal feedback summary July 2018

Feedback theme	Response
<p>1. Positive feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the additional roles (YJ, GOM, SWISS) • Support for the additional 11 SW-AE fte to address caseload pressure • Case closure / escalation guidelines welcomed • Clear parameters for SW-AE role positive • Support for clear expectations of sites and escalation processes 	
<p>2. Additional recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assigning all SW-FF fte to SW-AE role instead of specialist positions – resourcing those positions from another funding source 2. Staff needing implementation plan and potentially further training to take up new roles 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data indicates that there are poorer educational outcomes for Guardianship children and those in the youth justice system and this is a system priority that needs to be addressed 2. A draft implementation plan has been developed to implement any recommendations ratified. The Service Delivery Model and competency framework will guide the PD required for all staff
<p>3. New Truancy role title</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Punitive connotation that does not acknowledge the complex reasons why a child/student may not attend • The title is pejorative and out of date • Remove the confusion of 2 different role titles by combining them into 1 • Include the title ‘Truancy’ in the current role title to become SW-Attendance, Engagement & Truancy 	<p>It has been confirmed that as this title was part of the current government’s election promise it will need to stay. The current government is committed to addressing truancy and the only alternative would be to convert all existing Social Work – Attendance & Engagement roles into Social Work – Truancy.</p>
<p>4. Service provision to vulnerable families in rural and regional areas or Partnerships currently actively using the SW-FF role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all sites or areas have access to the Child Wellbeing Program • Referral to other agencies is limited in some rural areas • Issues affecting children, students and families not easily addressed by sites or local agencies 	<p>The review report recommends that due to the small number of SW-FF, the inconsistent service delivered and an increasing overlap with CWP practitioners, SW-FF be redeployed to address the system pressure points. Data collected indicates that although the CWP focus has been clarified there is still considerable overlap in case referrals between SW-FF and CWP practitioners.</p> <p>All schools have Student Wellbeing Leadership time allocated</p> <p>The Principal Social Worker will undertake an analysis of the cases SW-FF are currently working with in rural and regional areas to understand the service they are providing, whether the service is appropriate and alternate service options</p> <p>There are very few referrals from preschools and a significant number are either a Children’s Centre or provided a service by the Child Wellbeing Program</p>

Social Work Review Report & Proposal feedback summary July 2018

<p>5. Purpose and sustainability of new roles – Youth Justice & Guardianship Advocate</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Youth Justice role will have limited impact across the state GOM roles in the rural/regional space – effective? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The YJ role is currently being scoped in 2018 and trialed to determine the priorities and most effective use of this role. The Children in Care advocacy positions are still to be scoped and effective deployment of this resource yet to be determined. These roles will provide a strategic service response and will be designed to ensure appropriate scope
<p>6. Perceived loss of FTE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns that allocation of FTE to Channel 3 based on inaccurate or out-of-date data Concern that travel requirements were considered in overall allocation of FTE Review using out-of-date data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The data used highlighted the significant demand for Social Work – Attendance & Engagement and low demand for Social Work – Family Focus. More recent data is comparable. The Social Work Review did not consider the allocation of FTE across the state. Data on schools with less than 80% annual attendance rates and high numbers of chronic non-attenders was used to allocate the 11 new positions There is no overall loss of Social Work positions in Student Support Services
<p>7. Proactive work Loss of proactive role with sites to enhance wellbeing of children and students</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce sites capacity to focus holistically on wellbeing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The SW-AE role has a proactive component and will continue to do so There are other roles in the department that address whole school improvement including wellbeing. There has been an increase in Student Wellbeing Leaders across the system and they now lead wellbeing for students in their sites
<p>8. Review consultation concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> SSW, SW-AE and SW-FF not consulted prior to recommendations going to SEG Parent, student, carer voice not accessed in consultation process EDs and Principals in Channel 3 not consulted prior to reduction in FTE Allow sites to endorse the new roles and role descriptions to increase ‘buy in’ from sites 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The review report went to the Senior Executive Group (SEG) for approval to proceed to consultation. The outcomes of the consultation will go to SEG for endorsement A representative group of Principals, Preschool Directors and Education Directors were consulted as part of the Review process. Further consultation with schools, preschools and Education Directors occurred at the same time as consultation with staff. All Education Directors and site leaders were given an opportunity to provide feedback on the review recommendations during the consultation process Planned communication and consultation with sites, Partnerships and EDs will address this

Social Work Review Report & Proposal feedback summary July 2018

Additional PSA questions:

1. How many of the 11 new positions announced will be SWT and how many will be going to SWAE
 2. What is the definition, reach and responsibility of the new SWT position?
 3. Will all SWAE become SWT?
 4. Why is FTE going to SWISS (2FTE), GOM Advocacy (4.6FTE) and Youth Justice (1FTE)
 5. Why isn't this 7.6FTE going to be allocated to address the need with Attendance / Truancy
 6. In particular why are there 2 positions being created with such low FTE (GOM Advocacy and Youth Justice), when they will become as highly inundated as FF was due to the low levels of staffing?
 7. The review states that FF are no longer required due to the introduction of CWP, but CWP have redefined their service model and no longer have the same cross over.
 8. Members are concerned with the gaps in services particularly for sites who don't have a Student Wellbeing Leader or a Child Wellbeing Practitioner. Some of these sites are small, rural sites. Only eight have access to the services of a CWP.
 9. Members have concerns that there won't be capacity for proactive work such as capacity building work with educators.
 10. Members are also concerned about preschools no longer having access to Support Services Social Work now that the Social Work (Family Focus) role will not exist. Not all preschools are located near a Children's Centre and therefore could access a Family Services Coordinator.
1. All 11 new positions will be SW – Truancy
 2. The new SW-T positions have the same role description as the SW-AE and will have a focus on whole site work with schools with 80% or less annual attendance rate and high rates of chronic non-attendance
 3. No, the existing SW-AE roles will remain SW-AE. It is proposed that the SW-FF positions become SW-T
 4. Data collected indicates that the SWISS workload requires 2 more service providers. All data on the educational outcomes for children under guardianship and in the youth justice system indicates they need to be a priority for resourcing and response
 5. The need for extra resourcing for attendance and truancy is being addressed by the 11 additional positions. The pressure points indicated within the system are young people in the juvenile justice system and children under the guardianship of the Minister
 6. The Youth Justice position is currently being scoped and trialled to determine the priorities of the role and the most effective use of this role. The GOM advocacy positions are still to be scoped and effective deployment of this resource yet to be determined. These roles will provide a strategic service response and their scope will be reasonable.
 7. The review recommends that due to the small number of SW-FF, the inconsistent service delivered and an increasing overlap with CWP practitioners, SW-FF positions are redeployed to address the system pressure points.
 8. All government sites are allocated Student Wellbeing Leader FTE and should have a site plan that encompasses the wellbeing of children and students. The data collected from SW-FF indicates that the service providers have been engaging in long term therapeutic work with children, young people and families which is not within the roles scope or appropriate.
 9. The SW-AE role currently has proactive work as part of its scope and will continue to do so
 10. The data indicates that only a limited number of preschool sites accessed the SW-FF role across the state and the service delivery was not consistent or equitable.