

## South East Corridor Youth Partnership Project

# 1<sup>st</sup> Belmont Youth CAN (Collaborative Action Network) w/ participation from the City of South Perth & the Town of Victoria Park

Wednesday 5 August 2015

10:00-12:00PM

Centenary Park Community Centre

---

**Chair:** Andi Dackins (AD), City of Belmont

**Co-Facilitators:** Ross Wortham (RW) & Anania Tagaro (AT), Save the Children

**Minute Taker:** Natalie Chiari (NC), Save the Children

Item No.	Item	Action/Outcome	By Whom	By When
Agenda Items				
1.	<b>Acknowledgement of Country/ Welcome &amp; Roundtable Introductions/ Apologies/Morning Tea</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AD provided an Acknowledgement of Country and welcomed the group and Save the Children on their first Youth CAN.</li> <li>• The Youth CAN group members presented themselves by mentioning their role and organisation. AD briefly explained the format of the meeting.</li> </ul>		
2.	<b>Youth Partnership Project Presentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RW outlined the presentation being an information session about the YPP, hoping for open dialogue to occur.</li> <li>• YPP founded in Community Development, targets the South East Corridor as it has significant challenge in comparison to other communities.</li> <li>• YPP video presented to group</li> <li>• Discussion of Collective Impact Theory. RW asked group if they were familiar with theory. 1/3 group acknowledged they had some knowledge of the theory.</li> </ul>		

Item No.	Item	Action/Outcome	By Whom	By When
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues mentioned: community safety, school readiness, communication, shared measurement.</li> <li>• Discussion of Vision and Objectives – as directly linked to the rights of the child.</li> <li>• Discussion of YPP structure – Operational Structure, Strategic Response, Operations</li> <li>• AT announced as of today’s meeting, this new structure has been activated, all CANs have commenced.</li> <li>• AT announced YPP as case study ‘model for best practice’ by DPC (Department of Premier and Cabinet).</li> <li>• YLR (Youth Leadership Roundtable) Members Abdi and Rachel provided context on youth issues pertinent to their lives which guide the project. YLR currently is devised of 13 young people, casual paid staff, represent diversity, provide background on key youth issues. The group is recruiting new members. Mentioned to group if they knew of any possible applicants.</li> <li>• Discussion of Youth Summit: largest advocacy event in Perth at National Youth Week. The Youth Summit provided the Youth Recommendations, which inform the report being devised.</li> <li>• Mention of Youth Affairs Council of Western Australia</li> <li>• Mention of City of Armadale: adopting a majority of the action plan into their youth strategy</li> <li>• Mention of Cannington workshop – Community Directives Forum, approx. 3 attendees at today’s CAN meeting also attended that forum, with the aim of developing a regional youth action plan.</li> <li>• Discussion of YPP Evaluation model &amp; program logic. Contracted KPMG to conduct this survey independently. Relevant questions in survey; Have we had an influence on a policy/macro level? Have we become more effective and aligned? Are we being client focused?</li> <li>• Mention of YPP branding: Independent project brand. Mentioned that YPP is very open to other brands joining/being recognised on the website as a means of officially registering. Put to the group, if they are interested in sending their logos to be put on website.</li> </ul>		
3.	Discussion on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Floor opened for questions</li> </ul>		

Item No.	Item	Action/Outcome	By Whom	By When
	<b>Gosnells/Canning Youth CAN TOR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Q1) Will there be recommendations involved in this report, from the Youth Summit Report?  AT: Yes. The Youth2Youth Consultations from the Summit, formed the Youth Recommendations which directly influence/form the report. Every focus area, eg) Education, has a specific recommendation attached. YPP planning on providing two reports: One lengthy version and one more community/youth friendly short version.  RW: The knowledge base that came from the day derived from service users  AT: It came from a context specific space</li> <li>Q2) What is the targeted age group for this action plan? 16+?  RW: We see children as young as 7 exhibiting behaviour expected from 15+  All: Consensus that deciding this age bracket was a contentious issue/challenge  AT: Expanding the youth age bracket is something the YPP want to advocate to government about  Rachael: Mentioned discussion as Youth Summit as identifying this as an issue, suggestions made that the bracket be expanded 8-25+  AD: Mentioned, children aged 11years &amp; 6months (high school transition) were particularly important in engaging and targeting in services.</li> </ul>		
4.	<b>Discussion on Key Youth/Community Issues within Gosnells/Canning - Tabled for Next Meeting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AD highlighted information sharing as a key issue: a delicate issue eg) how much information is accessible to who <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RW responded; this is something attendance at the CAN meetings can better facilitate eg) continued communication</li> </ul> </li> <li>AD highlighted making clearer guidelines as important <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AT responded; this is something identified as a key recommendation, pertinent to the Action Plan (which is a living document, to be worked on in CAN meetings)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Kent School attendee mentioned that information sharing would play a beneficial role in early execution of action plans for individual clients/cases.</li> </ul>		

Item No.	Item	Action/Outcome	By Whom	By When
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RW responded by asking the group if this was a common issue among the attendees, consensus in group was yes, this was a major issue and point of concern.</li> <li>- Special mention was made of situations in which a young person is incarcerated. School teachers/workers need to know where they are, however, communication is lacking with juvenile justice officers, is very much dependant also on caseworks workloads and their own initiative for continued communication. Internal follow-ups were mentioned as an issue.</li> <li>- AT highlighted the value of groups like the CANs for mediating these issues, in terms of fostering relationships with those people as a means of removing these issues. Mutual understanding of each other's challenges is an aim.</li> <li>- RW highlighted this as a common issue, which comes up consistently in other meetings. An issue is middle management who need to support and encourage members to attend.</li> <li>• Attendee mentioned issue of overlapping semiotics 'at-risk', 'disadvantage' – what does this actually mean? Who is it we are targeting? Need to develop a common language. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rachael: Term 'at-risk' not encouraging</li> <li>- NT: The YLR has guided us on this common language, desire to adopt and come from a strength-based perspective. This is something that needs to be managed, particularly to people who understand youth from lens of disadvantage and vulnerability.</li> <li>- All concluded that understanding poverty and perceptions of it, is a challenge. Attendee mentioned within educational system, 'at-risk' pertains to 80% attendance</li> <li>- Rachael provided personal context for attendance dropping, due to illness. Labels such as 'wagger', is a challenge she faced with an invisible disability.</li> <li>- Attendee mentioned link between attendance and suicide, often not enough follow up done with those individuals.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Attendee asked about mutual communication, can there be one person who mediates between all other people, as a link? Attendee mentioned transitional coordinators.</li> </ul>		

Item No.	Item	Action/Outcome	By Whom	By When
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendee mentioned lack of common assessment mode: Particularly in regards to components of well-being, mental health.</li> <li>• RW mentioned 'No Wrong Door' policy: warm referrals, making sure that young person gets into the right service. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AT mentioned young people are frustrated by the current model which requires them to re-tell their stories over and over, leads them to be disengaged and distrust the system.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Attendee Belmont College mentioned limitations of confidentiality with therapists as an issue. External psychologists, internal counsellors, school teachers all saying the same thing to young person.</li> <li>• RW asked group to discuss examples of services in community that have collaborative frameworks. Some services mentioned as follows: Youth Directory. Communicare Pling (App) YACWA My Community Directory: New South Wales Human Services Net <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rachael mentioned online services as appealing to young people as geography and travel can be challenges.</li> <li>- AT mentioned that all these services are available, however, it is about utilising them effectively. The CANs can workshop asset-mapping if that will benefit the group.</li> <li>- Consensus from group attendees that the sharing of service-mapping information was happy to be shared.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
5.	<b>Wrap-Up, Next Steps &amp; Close</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RW proposed for next meeting – to address critical gaps in service mapping</li> <li>• AD will be the chair for next meeting and will liaise regarding agenda. Alerted group to opportunity for inclusion in an e-mail distribution list for sharing of localised knowledge, events and information.</li> <li>• AD asked group – Bi-monthly meetings or monthly meetings? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agreed by group – Bi-monthly meetings are preferred.</li> <li>- AD asked group – Same time for meeting suitable to group?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Item No.	Item	Action/Outcome	By Whom	By When
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agreed by group – Yes, Wednesday 10:00-12:00 is preferred. Suggested that an extra hour for further discussion was required.</li> <li>-Momentum was decided as important by group, thus, next meeting to be scheduled for a month's time was decided, and then all following meetings are to be bi-monthly.</li> <li>• Groups outlined as desirable/needed for the next CAN meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DCP</li> <li>WA Police</li> <li>Department of Housing</li> <li>Communicare</li> <li>YMCA</li> <li>PCYC</li> <li>Noongar Patrol</li> <li>Jacaranda House</li> <li>Corridor Houses</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
6.	<b>MEETING Closed 12.00PM</b>			
<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Tuesday 15 September 2015 9.00AM-12.00PM, The Training Room, The Belmont Youth &amp; Family Services Building 275 Abernethy Road Cloverdale</b>				