

1. Are the main ideas right? Do you agree with the description of the overall goal, principles, strategic elements and framework? Would you change or add anything?

It is time for there to be far more real, collective and collaborative walking, and far far less just talking for appearances sake.

It is time for the government to actually lead the multitude of departments and agencies towards a single, united and well supported outcome.

There needs to be:

- No buck shifting – The State has an obligation under UN conventions to protect the rights of First Nations people, and People with Disabilities, yet we have no genuine plan for either. Often an Aboriginal person may have both, yet are seen as one or the other.
- No silos – across Government departments
The Stronger Families model under the old DCP was an effective tool that allowed a whole of person/whole of situation to be developed, supported and monitored by the individual, their support and the relevant agencies
- No silos across the not for profits and service agencies who are often reluctant to refer somebody elsewhere for fear of losing their own funding.
- No competing priorities and KPI's that allow a department to avoid, deflect or reduce their responsibility. It is a collective ownership, of a statewide issue

How will this proposal align to the State Disability Plan?

Has long term funding been factored into forward budgets to reduce failure risks?

What real and measurable mechanisms will be in place to meet the needs of local communities, and provide local on country solutions, regardless of location that have a direct and positive influence on community members capacity and capability?

Justice Reinvestment is more successful, more cost effective and more practical than the increasing cost associated with increasing prison populations.

Do not repeat the same mistakes, learn from them

2. Are we using the right words? You might broadly agree with the main ideas, but want to see them expressed using different language. We welcome your recommendations. In particular, we are interested in whether the term "Aboriginal people" should be used or whether other terms such as "First Nations" would be more appropriate.

On the whole the words (and there are a lot of them) seem to cover the majority of the well meaning intent.

However, mere words have been used for a long time and yet despite lots of promises, rhetoric and countless discussion papers, reports and projects they continue to hide the reality and we continue to go backwards in nearly all measures.

With the Aboriginal Policy Co-ordination Unit (APCU) section of DPC focussing on the Kimberley suicides, who is ultimately responsible for delivering on the 2 existing priorities, and on the proposed path forward? Who has responsibility for co-ordinating these priorities, and how will the success be measured?

What role will the Aboriginal Advisory Council and Policy Reform units play in any co-ordination?

3. *What else should we be thinking about? You may have a view on how the strategy should be implemented in a particular region or subject area, or examples of current good practice.*

Multiple comparable projects are being undertaken by multiple groups/agencies concurrently, usually acting in isolation across similar jurisdictions and cohorts. This endless cycle has added to the wider community's sense of "Consultation" overload and created an illusion of action and movement, without the tangible benefits of any actions being undertaken to address the key issues.

- There is an ever increasing disconnection between family, community and support services. You need to support and grow the family in order to create more sustainable outcomes – for them and the communities they live in
- There is an increasing sense of hopelessness and despair regarding intergenerational trauma and the associated impacts.

Create a "Way Out" of the system and real opportunities for people to remain in their community, and contributing to its growth.

I know of employment agencies, with identified positions vacant, but people are not engaging with resources in prison as they are seen as tokenistic, white man business and not relevant for our mob when they return to community. The status quo remains.

If a prison sentence is < 12 months the training programs aren't accessible, or if accessed they aren't meeting the potential needs or actual employment opportunities in the community.

Remove the minimum time requirement and make prison programs available to people regardless of sentence length – If a person wants to improve their situation they MUST be able to, in real time not in 3 months when a place becomes available..

- Build programs that grow the individual, create positive opportunities for them to become role models and build on a local communities capacity and capability

- Family, Community and Personal breakdowns and child removal continue at increasing rates. "Removal of our young people, is the first engagement with they have with the "justice system", and it doesn't address the underlying contributing factors

Early identification of mental or cognitive impairments can have a long lasting and life changing benefit.

- There is a widespread acceptance and "Normalisation" of incarceration. By all ages! With no alternatives, motivation or access to programs in a timely manner the incentive to participate is minimal. Make it meet the needs post release.

There is also a constant movement, or lack of;

- Co-ordination of initiatives – There is universal acknowledgement that government department, and rigid agency silos have significantly decreased the ability to provide a "whole of person" service and have increased the number of potential service gaps.

- Lines of responsibility – Not one department currently has ownership of anything beyond their own "silo".

In addition, there is often dispute between departments as to responsibility due to several factors, including cost, time, skills

This is often leading to a disjointed, impractical and often unreasonable and onerous

burdens on the person with a disability and/or their carer.

- Accountability for outcomes – Notwithstanding the publicly stated 2018 WA Premiers Priorities in this area, and the Department of Premier and Cabinet having an Aboriginal Policy Co-ordination Unit, and a State Disability plan there is no clear overall accountability for the whole. There is an overwhelming sense of a complete lack of transparency, AND accountability.

Each department has its own, often competing priorities and KPI's that are held in isolation, and relate moreso to service numbers, than the support and growth of the individual and/or family/community.

- Sustained funding – Current funding models and the associated processes are resulting in high staff and agency turnover in the community. This repetitive cycle of bidding by agencies to get the role, and the money to survive, and the various associated issues create doubt, mistrust and are active contributors to the decline in overall mental health within the Aboriginal community
- Service provision delivery – The turnover, or the absence of direct one on one service, and a reliance on call centre type processes by state and federal departments, as well as an increasing number of service agencies has greatly decreased engagement and the overall confidence in the whole process.
Do not engage from afar, use your existing reports to develop sustainable processes, that are based on community needs, input and ownership.

END