

## REVIEW OF SETTLEMENT SERVICES FOR MIGRANTS AND HUMANITARIAN ENTRANTS - TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Settlement Policy Objective

The objective of the Government's settlement policy is to enable migrants to participate equitably in Australian society as rapidly as possible. In the Government's view, this objective is best met through a coordinated mix of responsive mainstream services and of services that are specifically targeted to migrant, refugee and humanitarian entrant needs.

Consistent with the Government's policy in relation to mainstream social support systems, DIMIA settlement services:

- aim to equip people with the skills to participate equitably in Australian society;
- recognise that many people in a period of transition adjusting to a new society require particular assistance to help them through this period; and
- seek to understand individual circumstances that impact on that person's capacity to participate and target support to match those needs.

### Impetus for the Review

The outcome of equitable participation by migrants in Australian society cannot be achieved by settlement services alone. DIMIA's settlement services, and their integration within the broader social support network, have not been reviewed since the introduction of the *Charter for Public Service in a Culturally Diverse Society* in 1998. It is timely to examine settlement services in this context, against the settlement policy objective, to ensure that the services offered enable migrants to participate equitably as rapidly as possible.

### Objectives of the Review

The objectives of the Program Review of Settlement Services are to:

- improve integration between settlement and mainstream services;
- strengthen partnerships among and between service providers and the government;
- promote innovation and flexibility in funding models;
- develop principles for future distribution of settlement services; and
- enhance the performance and accountability framework for the delivery of funded outcomes.

### Scope of the Review

The review will acknowledge the place of the Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) and the Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS) in the range of DIMIA's settlement services and will draw on existing review materials in its analysis of these services.

New analysis under the review will focus on:

- Migrant Resource Centres (MRCs) and Migrant Service Agencies (MSAs);
- The Community Settlement Services Scheme (CSSS); and
- The Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy (IHSS).

The review will build on the success of current programs and funding models in order to enhance the settlement experience of migrants.

While the National Integrated Settlement Strategy (NISS) is not a settlement service, its role in the integration of settlement services with mainstream human services funded by all three spheres of government will be examined within the review.

The review will not re-visit the Government policy that settlement services funded by the Commonwealth are available only to permanent entrants.

### **Terms of Reference:**

1. *The review will identify strategies for improving service integration and enhancing mainstream service providers' responsiveness to migrant clients, including:*

- enabling improved whole of government responses to migrants' service delivery needs in accordance with access and equity principles;
- in that context, developing strategies for more effective service provision to migrants in rural, regional and remote Australia;
- enhancing the performance of the NISS framework for service integration with other human service providers, whether they are funded by Commonwealth, state or local governments;
- strengthening partnerships among and between service providers and the government; and
- developing performance measures within funding agreements to reinforce service integration.

2. *The review will explore options for innovation and flexibility in funding models and develop an enhanced performance and accountability framework for the delivery of funded outcomes, taking into account:*

- the strengths and weaknesses of the current funding models;
- the effectiveness of current models in delivering outcomes;
- comparisons with other human service delivery models;
- the scope for harmonising funding models across programs;
- the relationship between the funding model and the performance and accountability framework;
- the promotion of best practice in service delivery through accreditation or other quality assurance mechanisms;
- linking performance to multiyear funding agreements;
- the adequacy of funding (including such factors as stability of staffing, rent, insurance and other cost drivers), equity in terms of dollar amount per client, and equity in terms of service priority; and
- opportunities for strengthening the role of volunteers in the delivery of services.

