

From: s 22(1)(a)(ii)
To:
Cc:
Subject: NDIS media [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, 20 May 2015 9:01:42 AM

UNCLASSIFIED

NDIS media:

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

- [NDIS Citizens' Jury scorecard finds gaps in the ACT's disability services market](#) (Fairfax), shortage of disability service providers in the ACT is limiting the choices of participants in the National Disability Insurance Scheme, a review of the national rollout has found.

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii) | Adviser

Disability, Housing and Aged Care | Social Services and Immigration Branch
Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

s 22(1)(a)(ii) [@pmc.gov.au](mailto:s 22(1)(a)(ii)@pmc.gov.au)

Andrew Fisher Building, 1 National Circuit, Barton ACT 2600

From: s 22(1)(a)(ii)
To:
Cc:
Subject: FW: NDIS Citizens Jury Scorecard for the NDIA and PwD Australia [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Monday, 29 June 2015 1:06:02 PM
Attachments: [ndis_citizensJuryScorecard.pdf](#)
[National Disability Insurance Scheme Citizens' Jury Scorecard Report Summary 20150520.docx](#)

UNCLASSIFIED

Hi s 22(1)(a)(ii)

There are four recent inquiries reporting on NDIS experiences to date, which the NDIS team have been able to start to analyse; useful about what the scheme is achieving in outcomes for people. A important counter to quantitative info - and potentially useful for the NDIS s 47C. Reference: Joint Standing Committee hearings, NDIS Citizens Jury Scorecard, Vic Ombudsman report on abuse in the disability sector. s 22(1)(a)(ii) has sent through info on the Senate inquiry into residential care.

s 22(1)(a)(ii) has also summarised the Citizens Jury for me, attached. This highlights the significant task for NDIA in setting up the scheme and processes, and the need for adjustment. It also provides concrete suggestions. It is being circulated widely across the NDIA, governments and service providers.

Note NDIS benefits cited in the report:

- It is evident that many of the participants we heard from are feeling more included in their communities, and are participating more actively as a result of the NDIS.
- For some this meant that they feel, for the first time, that they are making choices about their lives.
- This long-term stability enables goal setting and growth, as opposed to a 'getting by day-to-day' attitude.
- ...able to purchase equipment to improve their mobility, and being able to perform more tasks independently. Innovative options available to planners enable more scope for this in the NDIS than under traditional models. For example, parents of a child with an acquired brain injury were able to use NDIS funding to purchase a modified three-wheeled bike that enabled him to become involved in play and assist in his social development as he was included with other children in their street.
- Other innovative options have enabled at least one participant to achieve greater independence and become employed in a field of her choice. A young woman, who has cerebral palsy and learning difficulties, loves dolls and with the help of her mother and post-school options government funding, has begun setting up a micro-business.

We will also do notes on the Joint Standing Committee and Vic Ombudsman's report.

Regards, s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii) | Adviser and NDIS Team Leader
Social Services and Immigration Branch
Social Policy Division | Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

s 22(1)(a)(ii)
@pmc.gov.au

w: www.dpmc.gov.au

One National Circuit, Barton, ACT 2600

The Department acknowledges the traditional owners of country throughout Australia and their continuing connection to land, sea and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures and to their elders both past and present

From: s 22(1)(a)(ii)
Sent: Wednesday, 20 May 2015 11:47 AM
To: s 22(1)(a)(ii)
Cc: s 22(1)(a)(ii)
Subject: NDIS Citizens Jury Scorecard for the NDIA and PwD Australia [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

UNCLASSIFIED

Hi s 22(1)(a)(ii)

Please see the summary of the NDIS Citizens' Jury report attached.

As discussed, the report is somewhat difficult to read/digest. If you plan to have a browse I'd recommend reviewing the Situation and Complication columns in the tables (p.23-50) because they provide interesting insight into the experiences of participants in trial sites.

s 22(1)(a)(ii) | Adviser
Disability, Housing and Aged Care | Social Services and Immigration Branch
Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
s 22(1)(a)(ii) @pmc.gov.au
Andrew Fisher Building, 1 National Circuit, Barton ACT 2600

From: s 22(1)(a)(ii)
Sent: Tuesday, 19 May 2015 9:41 AM
To: s 22(1)(a)(ii)
Cc: s 22(1)(a)(ii)
Subject: FW: NDIS Citizens Jury Scorecard for the NDIA and PwD Australia [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

UNCLASSIFIED

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

Can you please review this and do a quick dot point summary of conclusions/overall themes and key issues?

By tomorrow morning?

Thanks, s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii) | Adviser
Social Services and Immigration Branch
Social Policy Division | Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

s 22(1)(a)(ii)
@pmc.gov.au

w: www.dpmc.gov.au

One National Circuit, Barton, ACT 2600

The Department acknowledges the traditional owners of country throughout Australia and their continuing connection to land, sea and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures and to their elders both past and present

From: PATON, Kath [<mailto:Kath.PATON@dss.gov.au>]

Sent: Monday, 18 May 2015 1:32 PM

To: s 22(1)(a)(ii)

Cc: s 22(1)(a)(ii)

Subject: FW: NDIS Citizens Jury Scorecard for the NDIA and PwD Australia [SEC=UNOFFICIAL]

Just in case you're interested.

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

National Disability Insurance Scheme Citizens' Jury Scorecard

Background

The National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) Citizens' Jury Scorecard Project was the first user led evaluation of the scheme. The project was led by People with Disability Australia (PWDA) in collaboration with Max Hardy Consulting, with the support of the National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA) between September 2014 and May 2015. The aim of the project was to evaluate the progress of the rollout of the NDIS through six of its trial sites by engaging trial participants and other Australians who helped fund the scheme.

Methodology

Twelve Australians were randomly selected to serve as non-specialist jurors. The jurors heard evidence directly from NDIS participants over three and a half days and considered a number of key questions against a number of thematic areas.

Using a combination of group deliberation processes to form consensus, and processes which reviewed and rated the evidence against the key assessment questions, the jury were guided to look for consistencies and inconsistencies before drawing conclusions and making a series of recommendations.

Key findings – successes and challenges

- Several successes were identified by the jury as having been achieved by the NDIS. These fit under the themes of: inclusivity; choice and control; an enhanced sense of security; and improved options for participants through use of a long-term funding vision.
- The NDIS has not been without challenges. The rapid timeframe from passing of legislation through to the NDIA's inception, then roll out of trial sites has understandably caused teething problems.

Detailed recommendations

Putting people at the centre and increasing choice and control (Themes 1 & 2)

- Planning meetings – participants should receive additional information about the planning process and other scheme processes to improve efficiency and participant planning experience.
- Planner skill sets and training – planners should receive additional training to ensure participants fully understand the NDIS.
- General planning – participants should be assigned a single planner where possible and measures should be in place to ensure quality control and customer service standards.
- National and regional consistency – a consistent process and national metrics should be developed to enable participants to move seamlessly between regions.

Improving portability and reducing fragmentation (Themes 3 & 4)

- Disability service provider market – NDIA should work with governments to ensure adequate time/resources are given to enable service providers to transition to the free market approach.
- Assisting participants to change providers – 'grassroots assistance' should be given to support participants to transition easily between providers.

- Reducing fragmentation of services – further investigation should be undertaken to determine if the planner and LAC role should be combined across all jurisdictions.

Uniform understanding of the scheme (Theme 5)

- Rapid growth of the scheme – the NDIA should ensure adequate recruitment of staff to ensure appropriate human resources for national rollout.
- Consistency of service delivery and communications – greater flexibility in NDIS eligibility requirements to ensure people with disabilities are not left out, and improved communications.
- Quality assurance – measures to review and strengthen quality assurance systems should be implemented, including changes to planners' performance reviews, independent assessment of participant satisfaction levels, and establishment of a 'participant experience panel'.

Address unmet needs (Theme 6)

- Participant satisfaction with their plans – NDIS should work with disability advocacy groups to develop training for frontline staff, benchmark 'at-risk' groups and facilitate access to other supports. Planners should receive training to ensure participants are comfortable with their plan before submission.
- Self-management of funding – planners should be trained to help participants to decide if they can and/or desire to manage their plan.
- Creating a long-term focus – planners should be trained to assist participants to consider a long-term focus in planning.
- Sustainable and proper use of resources – planners should be trained and have KPIs to ensuring needs are efficiently met within budget constraints, and software/processes should be developed to ensure funding is not misused.

Community support, linkages and referrals (Theme 7)

- Participant support to identify suitable providers – a provider database should be developed, and LACs should receive training to support participants in choosing providers.
- Local area coordinators – the role and responsibilities of LACs should be clarified.
- Fostering effective linkages and referrals – a communication plan should be developed to ensure mainstream services understand the NDIS.
- Mishandling of participant paperwork – appropriate document management processes should be developed to ensure appropriate handling (responding to lost applications).
- Availability of mainstream services – plans should have increased focus on connecting participants with mainstream services.
- Accessibility of service providers – service providers should receive support to transition from block funding to the open market approach.

Meeting greater economic and social inclusion goals for people with disability (Theme 8)

- Innovation and long-term goals used in developing plans – mechanisms should be included in planner training to encourage innovation, long-term goals and focus on social inclusion in development of plans. The NDIS should have sufficient flexibility to include innovative and cutting edge services.
- Integration of participants into mainstream service and the community – the NDIS should have a national marketing campaign promoting inclusivity in society for people with disability.

Next steps

Following a commitment from the Chief Executive Officer of the NDIA this report will be passed on to the Australian Prime Minister, every Chief Minister and Premier, each member of Parliament in every jurisdiction hosting a NDIA trial site, as well as the Joint Standing Committee on the NDIS, and the NDIA Board, with the intention of influencing an improved rollout of the NDIS.

DRAFT

From:
To:

S 47F

Cc:

Subject:

IN CONFIDENCE: ACT Disability Expert Panel meeting papers for 11 August 2015

Date:

Thursday, 6 August 2015 6:24:11 PM

Attachments:

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

[Att 2.4_NDIS Citizen's Jury Overview.docx](#)

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

Good afternoon Expert Panel members

Please find attached the agenda and papers for the ACT Disability Expert Panel meeting for **Tuesday 11 August 2015, 4.00pm - 6.00pm, at 33 Thesiger Court Deakin, NDS conference room.**

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Regards

s 47F

s 47F

Disability ACT | Community Services Directorate | ACT Government

Level 2, Nature Conservation House, Belconnen | GPO Box 158 Canberra ACT 2601 | www.act.gov.au

This email, and any attachments, may be confidential and also privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies of this transmission along with any attachments immediately. You should not copy or use it for any purpose, nor disclose its contents to any other person.

Attachment 2.4: NDIS Citizens' Jury

Background

The National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) Citizens' Jury Scorecard project was an innovative project led by People with Disability Australia in collaboration with Max Hardy Consulting, and with the support of the National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA) between September 2014 and May 2015. Information on the project is [here](#).

The project used deliberative democracy to involve Australian citizens who have helped fund the NDIS and those who have direct knowledge of the Scheme as a participant, to evaluate the staged roll out of the NDIS in six trial sites.

One of the key aims of the NDIS Citizens' Jury Scorecard Project was to ensure the ongoing educative value of this unique project and its methodology, to enhance transparency of the processes undertaken as well as to establish a means to broadcast the outcomes of the Citizens' Jury scorecard verdict.

The Citizens' Jury Scorecard presents the findings of the Jury including a series of recommendations aimed at enhancing the future roll out of the NDIS. It has been compiled by the twelve member Jury, with the assistance of the Citizens' Jury facilitators Max Hardy Consulting following the three and a half day 'trial' held in Sydney from 17 February – 20 February 2015.

Think Films was contracted to film the Citizens' Jury process. The result, is a [film](#) that 'tells the story' of the Citizens' Jury and its interactions with participants of the NDIS, adding deeply personal and qualitative elements to understanding the process and how the scorecard was finalised by the jurors. A DVD of this film is available to be shown.

A launch of the Citizens' Jury Scorecard and the documentary about the project took place at the NDIA's national office in Geelong on 19 May 2015. The launch was chaired by the Chair of the Expert Panel, Sue Salthouse.

Members of the public were given the opportunity to watch the event live online and send in questions they wanted to ask a panel of people involved in the Citizens' Jury process and NDIA representatives.

At the launch of the Jury scorecard the NDIA committed to holding ongoing juries and it is currently proposed these be held on a biannual basis.

Issues

- The Citizens' Jury was unanimous in affirming the intent, ethos and rationale for the NDIS.
- The independent process has found the NDIS is already recording successes and enabling quality of life outcomes for some people with disability that would otherwise be unattainable.
- The results identify some areas for improvement during the planning process, including:
 - Planners need to be well resourced and have the right skills
 - There is a need to ensure collaboration between planners and Local Area Coordinators (LAC);
 - The LAC role is vital to locate the supports people need
 - There is also an opportunity to develop the skills and capacity amongst participants as well as a need to accelerate Information, Linkages and Capacity Building (ILC) supports.
- A number of the recommendations confirm the benefits of independent advocacy and advice to support people throughout the planning process.
- The Jury identified some risks to mitigate during rollout of the NDIS, including:
 - The risk of jurisdictions withdrawing from services too early
 - Reductions in support being received outside of the trial sites

- Avoiding the risk of uneven transition of power from some current service providers to the NDIS participants, based on the change from the block-funding model to the NDIS participant funding controlled model.

ACT Findings

The Jury process took evidence from the ACT in a range of ways.

Fifteen participant witnesses were recruited from across the trial sites, including three from the ACT who gave evidence.

Six advocate witnesses were recruited by People With Disability Australia (PWDA) each representing one of the six NDIS trial sites. Each advocate witness was a person with disability, selected on the basis of being networked within the nominated NDIS trial site, good at consultation and able to bring a greater range of evidence before the Jury.

The role of the advocate witness was to gather feedback and information from a further group of people with disability who use the NDIS. Using an interview format via face-to-face meetings, email or phone interview formats and a set of questions based on the key assessment questions being considered by the Jury, the advocate witnesses interviewed a further 45 people with disability and/ or their carers who were current participants of the NDIS.

The advocate witness for the ACT was a person with an intellectual disability and gave evidence to the Jury in person and presented evidence from a further group of randomly selected participants he had interviewed.

On the 19th of November 2014, PWDA also hosted a social media forum via Facebook and Twitter. The same standardised questions used by the advocate witnesses in their interviews with NDIS participants were posted onto PWDA's Facebook page and Twitter feed over a period of four hours. Over this time some 78 people, located across Australia, provided feedback on their views and experience of the NDIS. Additional responses were also received via Twitter or by phone, if the person did not have access to Facebook. This feedback was then compiled into a report which was presented to the Jury.

Findings

The Jury heard and reported some specific evidence and findings from the ACT.

Overall they found that participants were consistently having positive experiences in the ACT compared to other jurisdictions.

The Jury heard that planners, especially in the ACT, responded quickly to participant requests to adjust/change plans.

The Jury heard some positive evidence about the experiences of participants in the ACT working with Planning Support Coordinators.

In many trial sites, participants did not have an understanding of the role of the planner and Local Area Coordinator (LAC). In some cases, several had never even met the LAC.

They were not clear from the testimonies heard by the Jury, whether the positive experiences of the ACT witnesses were due to a combined planner/LAC role or because the incumbents had deeper experience and more aligned skill sets prior to joining the NDIS. This needs further investigation before the planner/LAC role is combined.

The Jury recommended that further investigation is required into whether the planner and LAC role should be combined, as in the ACT trial site.

The Jury felt the NDIA needs to be aware that in some trial sites and jurisdictions, such as in the ACT, the government, who was the main provider of services, withdrew services immediately when the NDIS was launched.

This has caused a gap in service offerings as a free market has not had time, nor been supported to develop, resulting in participants having little or no access to services. Per the new model, participants should have the option to change providers, which is difficult if there are few or no providers in their area, or the nearest provider is in a different region or state.

PWDA response to the Jury

The Citizens' Jury process has revealed valuable information in a timely manner, which is important for the success of the NDIS and PWDA commends the NDIA on its proactive engagement with the process.

The independent process has found the NDIS is already enabling quality of life outcomes for some people with disability that would otherwise be unattainable. PWDA agrees with this.

The Jury's results highlight some issues with the planning process. Planners need to be well resourced and have the right skills. There is also a need to ensure a close synergy and collaboration between planners and LACs.

The LAC role is important to locate the supports people need. There is also a lack of skills and capacity building amongst participants as well as a need to accelerate ILC supports. This matches the feedback PWDA receives through our systemic advocacy work.

A number of the recommendations of the Jury all point toward the need for independent advocacy to support people going into the planning process. If people do not receive advocacy support the plans are more likely to founder or be underutilised. The NDIA and the Commonwealth needs to be clearer about advocacy and the NDIS. Advocacy is a key to realising the full potential of the NDIS.

PWDA agrees with the Jury about the importance of seeking robust and routine feedback about its performance from participants to ensure it is on the right track.

There needs to be more mechanisms within the trial sites for feedback from knowledgeable people and organisations in the rollout directly to the NDIA.

We agree with the Jury about the risk of jurisdictions withdrawing from services too early. Noting those issues highlighted by the Jury we would also highlight concerns about reductions in support being received outside of the trial site as well as the decision by other agencies in the Commonwealth to depart from services too early, such as through the defunding of disability information services.

We share the Jury's concerns about the uneven transition of power from some current service providers to the NDIS participants, based on the change from the block funding model to the NDIS participant funding controlled model.

For instance, PWDA is concerned that the advocate witness for the Hunter trial site was prevented from gaining access to NDIS participants at Stockton, which is the largest disability institution to transition to the NDIS in a trial site to date. NDIS participants in institutions are the kinds of people the NDIS is intended to help but they are also vulnerable to exploitation in closed settings.

We call on the Stockton Centre to allow independent disability advocates to offer support to participants and we believe this should be a mandatory condition of the NDIA when working with all institutions and other places where people are very vulnerable in the move to individualised funding

We thank the Jury for their comprehensive report and work and we acknowledge the way in which the Board and staff of the NDIA have embraced a bold and challenging independent evaluation process that facilitates direct and unfiltered feedback from consumers.

There are many issues and recommendations raised by the report and we will be working through these progressively for some time.

PWDA agrees that the Jury's recommendation for robust and routine feedback about the NDIS' performance from participants would be valuable.

PWDA recommends continued assessment, in the form of an ongoing program of citizen and participant lead evaluation, so that the wider community is provided constructive information about the progress and successes of this landmark scheme.

We look forward to the next iterations of the process being able to pick up the Northern Territory as well as the coming rollouts in Western Sydney.

Useful Links

PDF version of the scorecard:

http://www.pwd.org.au/documents/pdf/ndis_citizensJuryScorecard.pdf

Word version of the scorecard:

http://www.pwd.org.au/documents/pdf/ndis_citizensJuryScorecard.docx

JAWS friendly: http://www.pwd.org.au/documents/NDIS_CJ_Scorecard_Report_TEXT_ONLY.docx m

Link to PWDA Media Release on release of scorecard:

<http://ymlp.com/zcsUYJ>

Link to Canberra Times Report on NDIA findings in the ACT:

<http://www.canberratimes.com.au/act-news/ndis-citizens-jury-scorecard-finds-gaps-in-the-acts-disability-services-market-20150519-gh3rpy.html>

National Disability Insurance Agency Response to the Scorecard:

<http://www.ndis.gov.au/sites/default/files/files/Agency-Response-to-the-Citizens-Jury-Report.docx>

Opinion piece – why a Citizens Jury for the NDIS:

<http://craigwallaceontherecord.com/what-the-heck-why-a-citizens-jury-is-perfect-for-the-ndis/>