

The Smith Family

Submission to

Advisory Group on Reform of Australian
Government Administration

regarding

Reform of Australian Government Administration

November 2009



everyone's family

Introduction

The Smith Family welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Australian Government's discussion paper on *Reform of Australian Government Administration – Building the world's best public service*. This review is a timely and important undertaking for Australia to remain competitive on the international stage, and to enable the innovation in policymaking and service provision that the challenges of the 21st century knowledge era require.

This submission outlines some of the key points arising from The Smith Family's experience of working with government for many decades, and from the growing international evidence base around the changing role of the public sector in the contemporary environment. It begins with a discussion of the factors that have led to reform in the corporate and nonprofit sectors over recent decades, and some of the paradigms that have emerged that will be influential in shaping government reform. It then discusses what The Smith Family see to be five key principles that the evidence suggests will provide a solid foundation for achieving an improved Australian public service. These are:

- *Co-production*
- *Innovation*
- *Outward-oriented culture*
- *Alignment*
- *Leadership*

The submission also includes a set of recommendations that will support the greater adoption of these principles within the Australian Public Service.

If you require further information on any of the issues discussed in this submission, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,



Elaine Henry
Chief Executive Officer
The Smith Family

The case for reform

The uncertainty that the future holds means that the public sector cannot predict many of the challenges that it will confront.¹

The chief challenge facing government in a liberal and open society is to create public goods – like a well educated population, with an appetite to learn, an elderly population that feels well cared for – in a society with a democratic ethos, which prizes individual freedom and wants to be self-organising and ‘bottom-up’.²

Over the last decade, societies all over the world have experienced an unparalleled pace of change in how different individuals and institutions in society connect, communicate and collaborate at the global, national and local levels. In the 20th century industrial age, everything was about building big things that did things for others – national rail systems, hospitals and schools for example. But in the 21st century knowledge era, all the economic success stories are about helping people to help each other. From Google and eBay to communities of practice, this is a century built on people and communication, the century of contribution rather than consumption.

Different sectors have embraced these changes with varying degrees of success. The business world has been quick to recognise the power of technology in achieving greater efficiencies and penetrating new markets, but has also been confronted by the need for a deeper and more sophisticated commitment to corporate community investment, as the same technology allowed consumers to make more informed decisions about the kind of companies they wished to support.

For many in the nonprofit sector, the shift into the knowledge era required a total reassessment of their mission and vision in an environment where the shortcomings of welfare-based approaches were being exposed through research into the root causes of disadvantage. At The Smith Family, it was clear in 1998 that to remain relevant and effective in the 21st century, our organisation would need to undergo a comprehensive transformation, overhauling all of our systems, processes and most importantly culture to bring to life our mission of unlocking opportunities for those who had been previously marginalised through a preventive model based on human capital development.

At that time, the term ‘social inclusion’ had not yet become part of the contemporary lexicon. While The Smith Family was perhaps one of the first in the sector to consciously undertake what became a seven year journey of comprehensive transformation, many others soon began a similar process of change, providing momentum for broader shifts in the status, focus and role of the nonprofit sector as a whole as Figure 1 below summarises:

¹ Demos (2007) *Agile Government – A Provocation Paper*.

² Leadbeater, C. (2008) *Making it Personal*, p79.

Figure 1: Changing paradigms for the nonprofit sector

	20 th Century	21 st Century	Shift
Status	<i>Outsiders</i>	<i>Insiders</i>	From challenging the system to being part of it
Focus	<i>Problems</i>	<i>Solutions</i>	From spotlighting problems as symptoms of market failure to focusing on solutions delivered through markets
Structure	<i>Institutions</i>	<i>Networks</i>	From operating as isolated institutions to integrated networks
Funding	<i>Guilt</i>	<i>Investment</i>	From appealing to public anger or guilt, to persuading supporters to make good investments
Accountability	<i>Ad hoc</i>	<i>Strategic</i>	From self-defined accountability to shared transparency and governance systems

Adapted from: SustainAbility (2003) *The 21st Century NGO: In the Market for Change*

These new paradigms in the corporate and social sectors have also put pressure on the public sector to change and enhance its contribution. Not so long ago, it was relatively easy for a small group of policymakers to define the public good and seek to deliver collective solutions from on high. The values that were accepted and promoted within the public sector were of hierarchy, specialisation, efficiency and standardisation, and tight performance targets discouraged managers from taking the risks associated with experimentation or innovation. Now, as we approach the end of the first decade in a century where the population has greater power than ever before to shape their own lives, the pressures on government have changed dramatically. The economic crisis may have provided governments with a powerful focus for this reflection, but the implications extend far beyond economic management, as the latest issue of the *McKinsey Quarterly* reminds us:

“Just as current conditions are compelling governments to play a more active role in the economy, they have also given government leaders an unprecedented opportunity to intensify their efforts to transform the way the public sector works... To address the short and long-term economic and social challenges governments face, they must make themselves far more efficient and effective.”³

It seems that today, Australia - like many other nations – has now arrived at a tipping point in the evolution of government where reform is now a necessity, not a choice, as it was for The Smith Family ten years ago.

³ Killefer, N. (2009) ‘The New Business of Government’ *McKinsey Quarterly* 2009, Number 3, p7.

Principles for reform

1. Co-production

It is timely in the context of this next phase of reform to reflect on the vision of Nugget Coombs' Royal Commission in 1974, which anticipated a more 'porous', collaborative bureaucracy that "...is not an island unto itself, but a living part of Australian society, reflecting the strengths and weaknesses of the society". Put another way, a contemporary and relevant public sector is not one that presides over community, but is required instead to be part of community, working in partnership with its members to help solutions emerge from within society rather than imposing them upon it.

This way of working requires change in how government policies and programs are designed, developed, coordinated and delivered. The change should occur across major policy areas of government from health and education through to infrastructure, law and justice, financial services and other portfolios. It requires a greater focus on the needs of disadvantaged groups and places, on prevention and early intervention, and on the building of individual and community strengths.

Adopting a whole-of-government approach, planning for sustainability, using place-based approaches, developing tailored and 'joined-up' services, and monitoring and evaluating the effects of these policies and services on the wellbeing of disadvantaged groups are critical elements in achieving and measuring progress. We know that our current public service systems and models are at breaking point, and unsustainable in the short term. What is needed now is innovation to develop new and more collaborative approaches that activate the knowledge networks, resources and creativity across society, not just within the public service professions and institutions.

This is not about becoming more efficient in the services we already provide. Rather, we need to invest in a paradigm of *co-production* in which public goods and services are created interactively through partnerships between professionals and users, and by user collaboratives.

The concept of co-production that was first introduced as part of the 'network governance' model proposed by Mark Considine in his 2001 book *Enterprising States*, with the following characteristics:

<i>Source of rationality</i>	=	<i>relationships</i>
<i>Form of control</i>	=	<i>co-production</i>
<i>Primary virtue</i>	=	<i>flexibility</i>
<i>Service delivery focus</i>	=	<i>brokerage</i>

At the time, Considine singled out Australia as being more prepared than most other Western countries to implement this model, and made a point of asserting that while the nonprofit sector was more likely to embrace it than corporates or government, there was a need for all to play their role in making it work.

Considine's paradigm was also confirmed in the same year by Don Edgar in his book *Patchwork Nation: Rethinking Government; Rebuilding Community*, which concluded that:

“Government has to become governance – increasingly, self-governance – because the days of top down, one-size-fits-all solutions are gone.... intelligent government will become polycentric, adept at resourcing networks.”

In the years that have since passed, a number of convergence models have been developed by government to inform more collaborative, evidence-based policymaking, bringing a range of sectors together as this slide shows, including Cooperative Research Centres, the Prime Minister’s Community-Business Partnership and the Australian Business and Community Network (see Figure 2 below).

Figure 2: Examples of social innovation convergence models in Australia

CONVERGENCE MODEL	DATE	COLLABORATORS
Cooperative Research Centres (CRC)	1991-present	Business + Academia (with government as enabler)
Stronger Families & Communities Strategy (SFCS) Phase One	2000-2004	Government + Nonprofit
The Prime Minister’s Community Business Partnership (PMCBP)	1999-2007	Business + Nonprofit (with government as enabler)
Stronger Families & Communities Strategy (SFCS) Phase Two -Communities for Children	2004 onwards	Nonprofit + Community (with government as enabler)
The Australian Business and Community Network (ABCN)	2004 onwards	Business + Education

The Australian Government’s *Communities for Children* initiative (now being carried forward under the umbrella framework of the Family Support Program) has been the most successful of these models, if only in terms of catalysing real cultural change in the way government and nonprofits work together to achieve real and lasting social inclusion outcomes.

A key part of the model’s success lies in bringing together large community organisations (who have expertise in ‘backroom’ capabilities such as research, policy design and facilitation) with grassroots service delivery agencies (who have the local knowledge and relationships to work with the community). The former act as banker, broker and leverage agent to ensure that the service delivery provided by the latter is well coordinated, resource-efficient (avoiding duplication of effort and funding so as to maximise impact), and is embedded in the community for sustainability.

Communities for Children has produced remarkable outcomes in the seven sites where The Smith Family acts as the Facilitating Partner, and with the recent evaluation reports compiled this year, has provided policymakers at all levels and across a wide variety of portfolios with the evidence base they need to make decisions for tomorrow.

But there is still a long way to go in terms of truly giving credence to Considine's model of 'network governance', which reflects the importance of bringing together the strengths and resources of all sectors within a single framework. Our intractable social problems, referred to by the Prime Minister as the nation's "systemic challenges" are multifaceted and have multiple causes, and as such demand a 'whole of community' approach that includes government, business, nonprofits, academia and community working together.

Significantly, we now have the technology to enable this kind of 'participative democracy' and exchange of ideas – the challenge is now to ensure the different sectors are brought together in new ways to connect and share their intelligence more effectively with others.

In 2006, The Smith Family commissioned The Boston Consulting Group to conduct, on a *pro bono* basis, a feasibility study to investigate the need and characteristics of a new model of sectoral convergence through which innovative solutions to a number of social issues could be developed. A *Social Incubator* emerged as a possible vehicle for these collaborative outcomes, and a detailed process to attract commitment to the concept was then developed by the Foresight Group at Swinburne University of Technology through a synergy grant with The Smith Family.

A Social Incubator seeks to foster collaboration between individuals with different skill sets and backgrounds, from a range of sectors, to drive towards innovative solutions to existing problems. It works in two broad stages:

1. The Incubator Thought Process

The initial 'thought process' phase involves the collocation of selected team members within an intensive "hot house" environment where research combines with practice to create practical initiatives and solutions. This process leverages the individual skills and expertise of government, business, nonprofit, academia and community through teams working together to create one or more innovative initiatives addressing the issue identified within the community. The process takes place over a confined period of time (which could be days, weeks or months depending on the issue being addressed) with experts seconded into the Incubator to focus exclusively on the outcomes being sought.

2. Skills Transfer in the Field

The second 'skills transfer' phase is where members of the Incubator move into the field and work alongside practitioners in order to transfer the necessary skills and knowledge to the community members/groups tasked with piloting the initiatives. In this way, the Incubator goes beyond the traditional 'think tank' research/advocacy model, and is premised upon strong community involvement in the entire process, from identification of the problem to be addressed to the development and implementation of a response.

The flexibility of the Incubator model allows it to target a range of issues affecting particular communities, in different ways and at different times. It may be the case that an 'isolated' Incubator is created around one particular issue in a community, and then dissolved following the implementation of successful initiatives; or the Incubator may be 'ongoing' in the sense of addressing a number of priority issues in the community one by one, changing the range of stakeholders involved as appropriate. Part of the value of the Incubator therefore lies in its broader potential to provide a formative and systematic structure to community interventions that have through circumstance to date been ad hoc and piecemeal in their success.

An inherent benefit of this model is also the social capital that is built up through the creation of collaborative relationships between multiple sectors – relationships that are strengthened through a process of negotiation, skills development and a shared commitment to achieving more. Importantly, this collaboration is sustainable beyond the Incubator itself, and remains one of the most important elements for making collective change happen.

This social capital also has a cumulative effect, whereby effective interactions with others results in increased confidence and trust encouraging further collaboration. If communities have been able to develop these collaborative networks through initiatives such as the Incubator, they will be able to continue to work together to both envision a better future and meet their objectives for a range of opportunities. In this way, the incubation of social capital underpins our society's capacity to maximise economic, technical and social performance more generally.

While all sectors will play a part in these social incubators, the Public Service will play the most critical role in helping such a model 'cross the innovation chasm' from being an isolated initiative to a core strategy embedded in the culture of how this nation seeks to address intractable social issues. It will require Ministers and Senior Executives from the Public Service to look beyond the specificities of portfolios and internal politics and embrace the paradigm of horizontal connectivity and co-production that is the driving force for the future. A practical way to begin embedding this concept in the public service culture is to enable staff at various levels and from a range of portfolios to be seconded into nonprofits, businesses and academic institutions (and vice versa) to facilitate the more fluid and expedient transfer of skills and intelligence between these sectors. These secondments might be short, medium or long-term and ideally reciprocal in nature to allow for the more efficient and continuous flow of information from key stakeholders into policymaking circles. It will be necessary to ensure at the same time that the collaborative efforts and outcomes of these groups are not held back in any way by inflexible regulation or excessive 'red tape'.

If we are to reach our potential as a nation, we should no longer be content to be shaped by circumstance and instead proactively invest in opportunities for co-production such as the Incubator that will take us to the next level of a more caring and cohesive community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Australian Public Service:

- Introduce opportunities for staff at various levels and across a range of portfolios to undertake internships / periods of secondment to nonprofits, businesses and academic institutions to understand the trends influencing different sectors and how best government can work with them in defining and achieving shared outcomes.
- Set up a Taskforce within the public service to drive professional development opportunities for staff to more efficiently share and communicate knowledge internally (through a whole of government / interdepartmental approach) and externally (cross-sectorally), with a focus on outcomes and changing practice.
- Trial the Social Incubator model as part of a broader move to demonstrate the process of co-production in addressing a particular intractable social issue.

2. Innovation

Innovation is a critical ingredient to any organisation in addressing the intractable social issues that Australia continues to struggle with. As Einstein put it, *'today's significant problems cannot be solved by the same level of thinking that created them'*. In delivering the 2009 Paterson Oration in Canberra, Prime Minister Kevin Rudd reiterated the importance of innovation in defining the need for the Australian public service to:

- *"Develop a culture of policy innovation, becoming more creative and not just reactive"*
- *"become bolder in its thinking, doing more to consider the big picture"*
- *"develop high quality programs that put the citizen first"*
- *"provide flexible, agile responses to changing realities"*
- *"develop great ideas...grounded in the real world"*⁴

Australia does not lack creativity – in fact, we have plenty of great ideas and innovative thinkers, many of whom are within the Public Service – but we too often fall short in successfully translating these into scalable practice, or as Geoffrey Moore, the US management consultant put it, 'crossing the chasm', with the vast majority of innovations falling into the gulf between early adopters and the mass market. Innovative policymaking requires the insights and collaboration of those from a variety of sectors, particularly nonprofits, where much innovation already occurs naturally through balancing the demands of community needs with the limited resources we have available. At The Smith Family, developing great ideas grounded in the real world is part of our bread and butter in continuously looking to provide the best assistance to disadvantaged children and their families that we can; the challenge is that we, like most of those in the sector, do not have the resources or support to spread them.

To fully embrace this new paradigm, government needs to become more comfortable in embracing risk, which is an unavoidable part of any innovation, and accept the fact that not everything that is tried will work perfectly or in some instances, work at all. As confirmed in the 2008 Review of Australia's National Innovation System prepared by Terry Cutler, in many cases "innovators will need to tentatively grope towards a solution, trying new things to see if they work out." The majority of innovations do succeed, when the outcomes that they contribute to are allowed to emerge and be measured over time. To this end, we might do well to consider the words of Rosabeth Moss Kanter in this regard, who reminds us that *'Every success can look like a failure in the middle.'*

To effect real innovation, we therefore have to more closely connect those organisations on the ground (such as nonprofits) with the larger institutions such as government who have the resources (if perhaps not yet the incentive) to bring these innovative ideas to fruition – a process that Geoff Mulgan, one of the world's leading authorities on social innovation, calls 'connecting the bees with the trees'. This will then begin to change the situation we currently find ourselves in, where, as Geoff reminds us:

*"...the absence of institutions and funds devoted to social innovation means that too often it is a matter of luck whether ideas come to fruition, or displace less effective alternatives. As a result, many social problems remain more acute than they need to be."*⁵

In the UK, considerable progress has been made through the establishment of the Social Enterprise Investment Fund and Social Finance Ltd, both of which build the capacity of the non-

⁴ Rudd, K. (2009) *The John Paterson Oration 2009*, delivered at the Australia and New Zealand School of Government annual conference in Canberra, 3 September 2009.

⁵ Mulgan, G., with S. Tucker, R. Ali & B. Sanders (2007) *Social Innovation: What it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated*. Said Business School, University of Oxford: Basingstoke Press, p5.

profit sector to invest in more innovative forms of service delivery and collaboration. A similar model for the non-profit sector in Australia would embrace the role of government, business and non-profits in stimulating social innovation, each contributing resources and expertise according to their means for the creation of our own 'Social Enterprise Investment Fund'.

The establishment of such a fund (which has already emerged as a key recommendation from the 2006 and 2008 Australian Social Innovation Summits hosted by the Macquarie Group Foundation), may see, for example, the non-profit sector contributing \$5 million, business \$50 million and government \$500 million, to enable collaborative testing of new and more innovative ways of working for societal impact. There are many in the non-profit sector, including The Smith Family, who would have the capacity to work closely with government and business to champion the creation of this fund, and coordinate the disbursement of its resources in a strategic manner.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Australian Public Service:

- Establish a 'Social Enterprise Investment Fund' or a similarly flexible funding pool overseen by a cross-departmental Taskforce as part of the Budget cycle, to support innovative, cross-sectoral and scalable solutions to specific intractable social issues.

3. An outward-oriented culture

The role of the public service is not only about responding to current challenges as and when they emerge, but also about anticipating emerging issues and proactively shaping society in the public interest through adopting an outward-oriented culture. This involves evaluating the real results that the public service achieves in the everyday lives of its citizens, identifying the drivers of change and continuously scanning the environment so that it can capitalise on new opportunities and intervene early.

This involves the public service developing three kinds of capacity that will enable it to become more 'agile' in its operations:

1. **Scanning** – gathering information and analysis that allows government to spot emerging trends and issues in the environment.
2. **Responding** – being sufficiently flexible to respond to new challenges at both the tactical level of day to day service provision, and the strategic level of innovating new approaches and adapting policy and strategy.
3. **Shaping** – understanding how to drive change in the external environment to influence future opportunities and minimise future risks.

An outward focus also implies that governments need to be able to shift resources between different priorities with relative ease. Governments are generally very good at starting new programs, but less successful at stopping them, except through efficiency drives and expenditure reviews. Taking stock of changes in the external environment will help to answer questions such as, 'is this program still achieving its original purpose or are we doing it simply because we always have?'; 'are others delivering similar programs in a more effective way?'; or 'has this program ceased to be valuable and relevant?'

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Australian Public Service:

- Provide incentives and recognition / reward for outward-oriented policy and practice within and across portfolios.
- Encourage greater ‘agility’ within the public service by reflecting the three core components of an outward oriented culture – scanning, responding and shaping – within position descriptions, KPIs and performance management processes.

4. Alignment

“The characteristic of high-performing organisations is ‘alignment’: their proposition to the market is compelling, their strategy to deliver this is clear and comprehensive; their whole structure is built around the proposition; their systems, incentives and performance measures all point in the same direction; and a set of shared value supports the whole.”⁶

To achieve sustainable outcomes for intractable issues, the public service needs to more closely integrate and align its policies, systems and processes – including strategy, budgeting, human resources, service delivery, information management, project management, communications, monitoring, reporting and evaluation – that at present are determined by individual departments. Public service staff therefore need to be attentive and responsive to changes occurring in other departments and sectors and to have the capacity to make any changes to their own systems, policies or processes accordingly.

This is no small task given the size and scope of the Australian public service, and it will require a stepwise approach focused initially on building awareness of the work being carried out across different departments. A good example of how this has worked in the past was the on-line Innovation Forum for Public service staff in Victoria introduced in 2008 by Helen Silver, Secretary of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. This forum provided an accessible platform for all public service staff Victoria to share information and ideas in the areas of policy development, service delivery, processes and collaboration. Although only five days in duration, the interactive site was visited by 3,000 people and included a two hour “live” session with the Secretary and Deputy Secretaries of the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

The next step is to bring other sectors and the community itself into such a forum, and to begin the broader process of aligning key metrics, programs and reporting frameworks to give tangible expression to the principle of co-production in achieving shared outcomes. This will involve transparent discussion around the different strengths and weaknesses of community organisations, business and government (as well as other relevant stakeholders) in addressing particular issues, and the creation of shared templates and measurement frameworks for the effective allocation and subsequent monitoring of Key Performance Indicators for each.

This will require public service staff (and those from other sectors) to become skilled in and accustomed to managing a dynamic matrix of relationships both internally and externally that are multilayered and interdependent. Technological advances in recent years, particularly those

⁶ Straw, E (2004) *The Dead Generalist*, Demos, London.

associated with 'Web 2.0' networking, are likely to be of significant benefit in efficiently and effectively connecting individuals across these participative platforms.

The greater alignment, collaboration and coordination that will result from these initiatives will help to catalyse change by allowing a greater flow of new knowledge into the public service to shape new policies and programs, and by shifting the focal point of these new services to goals and outcomes associated with the end-user, rather than the inputs and outputs of professionals. This is aligned to the recommendations of the 2008 Review of Australia's National Innovation System prepared by Terry Cutler, which highlighted the importance of introducing "a process by which agencies within government, and also firms outside it, are able to challenge established practices, administrative arrangements, or regulation that obstructs beneficial innovation" (Recommendation 10.3).

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Australian Public Service:

- Evaluate the success of initiatives such as the 2008 online Innovation Forum for public service staff in Victoria, with a view to determining their potential replicability more broadly across staff in the public service and other sectors across Australia.
- Provide opportunities / platforms for organisations from different sectors to begin aligning their key metrics, programs and reporting frameworks around shared outcomes
- Embed professional development opportunities for staff around managing a dynamic matrix of relationships, both internally and externally.

5. Leadership

“To create the required momentum and support for change, government leaders must relentlessly engage with agency managers, civil servants, frontline staff and professionals. And that’s not all – the leaders must also educate consumers of public sector services and the citizen body as a whole about the need for reform and for tough decisions on priorities.”⁷

Any process of change management requires strong leadership to be successful. Staff need to feel connected to the overall strategy that is guiding reform, and understand its worth. Public service leaders therefore need to be fast and flexible problem solvers, able to mobilise others to diagnose problems, process data, generate effective solutions and marshal the resources and energy necessary to implement those solutions quickly. They need to be cognizant of the fact that in a world of imperfect and asymmetric information, leaders cannot always wait until they have ‘all the facts’, some of which might be unknowable, to make decisions. This is why a ‘whole of community’ approach involving all relevant government agencies, community organisations and community members is so important in ensuring such decisions are based on the best possible evidence.

Equally, senior staff within the public service will need to recognise that true leadership often requires handing the reins to others. Governments do not control all the levers that allow them to reach their outcome goals, so they need a broader sense of the way their actions will interact with those of others and the ability to at times identify and encourage players from other sectors who may be able to play a more effective leadership role in their stead.

Like the nonprofit sector, the public service is challenged in attracting the ‘best and the brightest’ to their workforce, which means many future leaders may need to be nurtured from within the existing pool of talent. Identifying individuals with potential and providing them with access to training opportunities (e.g. through institutes such as the Australia and New Zealand School of Government) to develop the managerial tools they will need to perform at the highest level will therefore be crucial.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Australian Public Service:

- Support the establishment of reciprocal, cross-sectoral and multi-disciplinary mentoring opportunities between leaders in the public service, nonprofit and corporate sectors.

⁷ Bouvard, F. et al. (2009) ‘The case for government reform now’, *McKinsey Quarterly*, No 3 2009.

List of Recommendations

- Introduce opportunities for staff at various levels and across a range of portfolios to undertake internships / periods of secondment to nonprofits, businesses and academic institutions to understand the trends influencing different sectors and how best government can work with them in defining and achieving shared outcomes.
- Set up a Taskforce within the public service to drive professional development opportunities for staff to more efficiently share and communicate knowledge internally (through a whole of government / interdepartmental approach) and externally (cross-sectorally), with a focus on outcomes and changing practice.
- Trial the Social Incubator model as part of a broader move to demonstrate the process of co-production in addressing a particular intractable social issue.
- Establish a ‘Social Enterprise Investment Fund’ or a similarly flexible funding pool overseen by a cross-departmental Taskforce as part of the Budget cycle, to support innovative, cross-sectoral and scalable solutions to specific intractable social issues.
- Provide incentives and recognition / reward for outward-oriented policy and practice within and across portfolios.
- Encourage greater ‘agility’ within the public service by reflecting the three core components of an outward oriented culture – scanning, responding and shaping – within position descriptions, KPIs and performance management processes.
- Evaluate the success of initiatives such as the 2008 online Innovation Forum for public service staff in Victoria, with a view to determining their potential replicability more broadly across staff in the public service and other sectors across Australia.
- Provide opportunities / platforms for organisations from different sectors to begin aligning their key metrics, programs and reporting frameworks around shared outcomes
- Embed professional development opportunities for staff around managing a dynamic matrix of relationships, both internally and externally.
- Support the establishment of reciprocal, cross-sectoral and multi-disciplinary mentoring opportunities between leaders in the public service, nonprofit and corporate sectors.