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# Executive Summary

Municipal Association of Victoria [MAV] Response to Victorian State Government reform initiatives:

* The Education State – Early Childhood Consultation Paper, September 2015.

The State Government’s aim for Education in Victoria is to have a ‘truly outstanding system…that will lead the world’. For the Early Years the goal ‘is to tip the developmental scale for all Victoria’s children by stacking the positive side – by supporting parents and families as the central players in children’s lives, providing a high quality M&CH service and ensuring all children benefit from excellent early childhood education and care’.

* Roadmap for Reform: Strong Families, Safe Children, August 2015.

The reform Project intends to develop ‘a new way forward to providing better outcomes for vulnerable children and families’ and in this process the Project ‘will consider how the full range of universal and targeted services can better prevent neglect and abuse, intervene early to prevent issues escalating, support families in crisis to recover, and respond most effectively for children who can’t live at home.’

# Introduction

The Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) is the peak representative and advocacy body for Victoria's 79 councils. The MAV was formed in 1879 and the *Municipal Association Act* 1907 incorporated the MAV to represent the interest of of local government in Victoria

Today, the MAV is a driving and influential force behind a strong and strategically positioned local government sector. Our role is to represent and advocate the interests of local government; raise the sector's profile; ensure its long-term security; facilitate effective networks; support councillors; provide policy and strategic advice; capacity building programs; and insurance services to local government.

As the legislated peak body representing local government in Victoria, the MAV welcomes the State Government’s announcement of these two major reform projects and embraces the opportunity to contribute to the transformation of [i] the Education system and [ii] the system that supports vulnerable families and children with a view to delivering better education, health and wellbeing outcomes for all Victorian children.

The emphasis on the early years and on universal services as platforms for change articulated in both reform agendas places local government in a unique position tocontribute to the initiatives. Where *‘Early childhood development is at the heart of the Victorian**Government’s vision for the Education State’*, local government is the beating heart of early childhood development.

Early Childhood Consultation Paper

There is scant reference [p 4] to local government’s central role in the planning, investment, coordination and delivery of early years services in the Early Childhood Consultation Paper for delivering the Education State. The paper does not articulate the role of local government as employers of the largest single early years workforce in Australia nor its role as a major investor in early years infrastructure and development. Most significantly for these two areas of reform, the document fails to acknowledge local government’s role in the development of Municipal Early Years Plans, Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plans, Cultural Diversity Plans and Disability Action Plans, amongst others, and affords local government little status as an essential and vibrant tier of government.

These oversights reflect and contribute to a lack of understanding and acknowledgment of the work of local government in Victoria. While posing challenges they also offer opportunity to articulate how local government is in a position to strengthen the early childhood system in Victoria.

# SECTION ONE : SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

## MAV proposals to address the need for high-level partnerships and formal agreements to drive reforms.

**The MAV proposes:**

1. Referencing universal and targeted public health imperatives in designing an outstanding education system in Victoria and in providing better outcomes for vulnerable children and young people. Across these two areas of reform there is opportunity to integrate the importance of the social determinants of health, development and education as they impact on vulnerable children and families and the role of local government in addressing local issues.
2. Universal public health and prevention approaches are applied to reforms *‘that focus on developing children’s and young people’s knowledge, skills, physical literacy and behaviour for lifelong health and wellbeing’*,[[1]](#footnote-2) and which amongst other efforts will include quality content for early childhood learning and development about the long-term value of health care and learning, violence prevention, gender equity, and [infant] mental health.
3. Consistent with principles underpinning universal access, that the entitlement of all children including vulnerable children to access early childhood services references current demand imperatives across the service continuum with particular attention to pressures being experienced by early intervention services as they impact on universal services.
4. Priority is given to reviewing and strengthening existing partnerships and agreements and builds new partnerships and agreements across Federal, State and local government the detail of which is represented diagrammatically at the end of this document and includes:

* Municipal Early Years Plans [MEYPs] are formally recognized and supported by the State, and include Education State priorities. Councils will fund planning for their own priorites and the State will fund councils to achieve agreed outcomes related to Education State reforms. The MAV will be funded to revise the MEYP Framework to reflect Education State priorities;
* Maternal and Child Health Service Memorandum of Understanding (DET/MAV on behalf of councils) – consolidate existing arrangements for this essential platform supporting all families in the 2016 – 2019 MoU. Incorporate sustainable recurrent funding model for the State and councils addressing:
  + unit price based on agreed median cost of service delivery
  + population/ birth notification/ enrolment increases automatically funded (as per school system)
  + fair annual price index of at least 3% refelecting real cost escalators
* A pre-school education trilateral planning process with local, State and Commonwealth Governments jointly planning to bring Australian pre-school provision closer to their world counterparts. Planning will cover workforce, infrastructure and operational delivery. Delivery will include moving to at least 20 hours per week for the year prior to school and funded three-year-old pre-school provision; and
* A revised MAV/DET Partnership to include pre-school reform priorities as determined in the final Education State Policy. It will clarify State and local government roles and responsibilities for early years planning, early years infrastructure, governance and access/participation.

## Proposals to address key areas for reform for the early childhood/early years service system and better connections between services.

**The MAV proposes:**

1. DHHS and DET enter a partnership with the MAV to formally endorse and financially support the MAV in the roll out of *Patchwork* across the State to include workers from Government departments and from Community Service Organisations [CSOs].
2. Child FIRST Alliances and local government are supported to include all councils in Alliances to enhance capacity to respond to demand and the requirement to undertake catchment planning.
3. Child FIRST Alliances are each supported by an Early Childhood Development position to facilitate connections and information sharing [data] between Local Government, CSOs, DET and DHHS.
4. Infrastructure planning recognises a priority for integrating and co-locating early childhood services including the redevelopment of schools to offer sites for other early childhood services.
5. Consistent with the principle of proportional universality programs for vulnerable families that are intentionally aligned with universal services such as *Cradle to Kinder* are situated within the universal service delivery platform provided by local government

## Earlier and sustained engagement in universal health, development and learning

**The MAV proposes:**

1. The foundational role of health and wellbeing is included in the Education State diagram for change and that the importance of sustained engagement for vulnerable children is recognized e.g.: *Earlier and sustained engagement in universal health, development and education services*
2. A clearly articulated public health rationale is developed to support all M&CH Key Ages and Stages visits for all children with particular application to known areas and communities of disadvantage and vulnerability.
3. DET resource strategies for local government and CSOs to assertively employ and support the training and further education of Aboriginal workers and workers from CALD and former refugee communities to work across early childhood services.
4. Greater consideration be given to the needs of CALD and former refugee communities in funding allocations to known areas of high diversity, including flexible access for parents to attend language classes attached to early years services and the use of interpreters.

## Educational Quality

**The MAV proposes:**

1. A sound funding base to take pre-school provision into the future under an enduring Commonwealth/State joint funding formula that is based on a quality service cost-funding model. It must as a minimum, meet the goals of the current National Partnership Agreement[[2]](#footnote-3). In addition, it should reduce the funding gap that parents, communities and councils need to find to ensure high quality services are delivered irrespective of the capacity of communities to pay;
2. State/Local Government Infrastructure Agreement - infrastructure provision to visually demonstrate the Education State through a documented Local/State Pre-school Infrastructure Plan that will reflect the over-arching tripartite planning process between Commonwealth, State and local government and will formally harness the role of Victorian local government in pre-school facility provision. The Infrastructure Plan will include agreed Local/State cost sharing arrangements, utilizing existing State/Commonwealth infrastructure particularly in high and low demand areas, leveraging new capital grants to maximize participation, streamlining lease arrangements and building pre-schools on all new school building sites; and
3. State/Local Government Governance Agreement - a new Early Years Governance Structure to move forward with Education State priorities:
4. A Victorian joint Early Years Management [EYM] Panel that will provide for all pre-schools across Victoria and with oversight of the development of consolidated management arrangements for pre-schools over 5-10 years
5. Victorian councils to be funded to undertake capacity assessment reports to progress incorporation of stand alone centres into joint Early Years Management.
6. MAV/DET will agree on the panel selection and each council will be invited to coordinate EYM arrarengements locally.

## More Support for parents and more support for vulnerable and disadvantaged families

**The MAV proposes:**

1. To ensure greater up take of 3 year old kindergarten and ensure equity and certainty of access for all children in the year before school but most particularly for children from vulnerable families, the MAV proposes establishing a pre-school central enrolment platform within the new M&CH state-wide data management system known as CDIS. It is proposed that councils are funded to provide Central Enrolment for all funded 3 and 4-year old pre-school settings, including in long day care and integrated centres, Family Day Care and Playgroups (as appropriate);
2. Enhanced Maternal &Child Health Service is extended

[a] for vulnerable children from the ante-natal period until age three years when they are eligible for Early Start kindergarten - to provide non-stigmatising sustained support and engagement for families, and

[b] to cover an increased number of vulnerable families who can be assisted – particularly in high needs areas;

1. Specific consideration be afforded to the needs of kinship carers across the spectrum of disadvantage with access to education and learning opportunities such as facilitated playgroups being a primary consideration.
2. Increased opportunity for access to training and employment for parents entering/returning to the workforce is made available in conjunction with their children attending integrated early years hubs, through local partnerships between councils, TAFE providers, adult learning programs and employment agencies.

# SECTION TWO – CONTEXT AND RATIONALE FOR PROPOSALS

### Strengths of the Early Childhood System in Victoria and the Role of Local Government.

**1.1.** The two anchors of the universal early childhood system in Victoria are the Maternal and Child Health [M&CH] service and pre-school/kindergarten service delivery. These services offer critical reference points along the continuum of service delivery for the early years. While a few councils subcontract to Community Health Services, 78 out of 79 Local Governments provide M&CH services. All but 4 councils provide 4 year old pre-school and 75% of councils report some level of support for 3 year old pre-school.[[3]](#footnote-4) Victoria would not have a universal platform for early childhood service delivery and no occasion to reference best practice from other OECD nations without the infrastructure platform offered across local government.

**1.2.** The long standing history and breadth of local government involvement in the early years also speaks to its strength as a critical platform for integrating services and providing seamless pathways for families and children. In addition to M&CH and pre-school/kindergarten, councils deliver and provide infrastructure support for Family Day Care, playgroups and playgroup coordination, long day care, occasional care, early years programs in neighbourhood houses, Early Childhood Intervention Services [ECIS], Toy libraries and children’s library programs. All councils provide immunization programs and playground facilities for children. Most councils provide out of school hours programs and vacation programs for primary school age children. A number of councils are funded by State Government to provide Family Support Services while over 80% of councils provide active linking of vulnerable families to universal early years services and parenting education programs through a range of Federal, State and philanthropic funding sources.

**1.3.** The undeniable strength of the Victorian early years system is the quality and reach of the M&CH Service through which all families are engaged. While councils are significantly challenged by the increasing cost burden of delivering the service, support for the provision of M&CH by local government in Victoria is strong and there are many examples of local government commitment to enhancing M&CH delivery:

* The current the Enhanced M&CH Service is the result of innovative projects conducted in 29 councils during the late 1990’s and rolled out in 1999-2000 as part of the Victorian Labor Government’s response to emerging early years research about the impact of abuse and neglect on the developing brain.
* The MAV is supporting three Councils [Yarra Ranges, Whittlesea and Latrobe] in piloting the A-4 Streamlining Project initiated by the State;
* Frankston, Ballarat, Hume and Whittlesea M&CH services are involved in the *right@home* pilot;
* The City of Whitehorse has pioneered the *Baby Makes Three* program
* Yarra Ranges and Maroondah Councils are integral to the success of the *Mabels Project.*
* In the context of the Protecting Victoria’s Vulnerable Children Enquiry [PVVCI] and of the Memorandum of Understanding between the MAV and DET, M&CH services have participated in a thorough review process committing to the principle of proportional universality for the service where ‘*to reduce the steepness of the social gradient, actions must be universal but with a scale and intensity that is proportionate to the level of disadvantage’[[4]](#footnote-5)* .
* A new Central Data Information System [CDIS] for M&CH launched by the MAV in September 2015 has integrated information systems across the elements of M&CH and has the potential to extend to encompass early years services across the service delivery continuum.

**1.4.** Local government has consistently played a major role in initiating, designing and developing children’s services in Victoria securing state and federal funding for all aspects of M&CH, pre-schools and childcare and continues to invest in innovation and best practice in all fields of local government endeavour.

* The MAV has supported councils to operate Kindergarten Central Enrolment systems for over ten years, and many councils have been operating central enrolment for decades. The schemes operates in 49 of the 79 Councils for 4-year old pre-school/ kindergarten and in 28 councils for 3-year old programs. In a recent mapping exercise conducted by the MAV in February 2015 the majority of councils expressed strong support for Central Enrolment acknowledging the benefits of ensuring equity and certainty of access for all children and priority access for vulnerable children. DET has provided one-off grant funding to councils and the MAV for the year 2015 - 2016 to improve pre-school access for vulnerable families through strengthening existing central enrolment processes and supporting other municipalities to introduce central enrolment.
* The MAV has introduced *Patchwork,* a web based communication tool for use by enhanced M&CH services to connect to other service providers. *Patchwork* which was described in the Munro Review [UK 2012] as a successful “*social media tool to**support practice*”, is a simple form of service directory that links workers across a range of services and sectors forming a virtual team around the client with the capacity to respond quickly to positive and concerning events. The MAV has successfully supported this approach in several council areas including the cities of Yarra, Melbourne, Colac Otway, Wodonga, Stonnington and Kingston, and MAV holds the state-wide licence to enable Patchwork to go state-wide.

**1.5.** The Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008 recognizes local government as a major partner to the State Government in the effort to protect public health and wellbeing in Victoria. The Act provides a platform for an enhanced planning role for local government with each council mandated to prepare a Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing plan every four years.[[5]](#footnote-6) Early childhood services in each municipality benefit from local government’s role in developing local strategies and approaches to enhance public health and wellbeing. These approaches are necessarily preventive, place-based and capacity building ensuring that the diverse needs and voices of the community are reflected in planning and development. In this environment councils are strong facilitators of Best Start programs in most sites [19] across the State not including Aboriginal Best Start programs and, with the support of the MAV, develop Municipal Early Years Plans, and convene Early Years Partnerships to facilitate collaborative work to improve outcomes in all areas of health and wellbeing, learning and development.

### Challenges to the Early Childhood System in Victoria

2.1. History of reform in Local Government

Local government reforms implemented by the Kennett Government between 1993 and 1998 reduced the number of councils from 210 to 78, and included dismissing over 1000 Councillors and some 20,000 employees while simultaneously embarking on a Compulsory Competitive Tendering process for up to 50% of council operating costs. Councils were required to reduce combined rate revenue by 20% in the first year following reform and by a further 10% between 1995 and 1997. The reform process imposed a framework across councils without regard to demographic variations, diversity in the nature of services and the financial states of councils.

Notwithstanding the need for reform of local government at that time, the MAV contends that the reform process left an enduring legacy of financial strain, service disruption and widespread community uncertainty about the role and function of local government. Apart from an immediate loss of expertise, local government’s role in the coordination anddelivery of early years services was dismantled in a number of instances. Service provision subsequently became fragmented across and within local government areas, with services variously managed by private commercial providers, CSOs, parent led cooperatives and councils but with infrastructure costs mostly borne by councils as extant landlords.

To inform these current reforms the following points are made:

* M&CH services have largely been reclaimed and restored to a consistent service delivery pattern across councils but this cannot be said for early years services generally nor how local government’s role in service delivery is understood in the wider community. Stability across M&CH services has largely been achieved as a result of the leadership role of the MAV in negotiating a 50/50 Partnerhsip Agreement with the State Government on behalf of councils which has been continuous since 2000.
* ‘Core business’ for local government continues to be a contested area. Councils express disparate views despite a common high level of concern and a genuine commitment to address vulnerability in local communities. This issue is exacerbated by State Government proposals that seek to cap rates in a context of unprecedented growth and demand on all local government services, and has the capacity to lead to further system fragmentation.
* Reviews that have critiqued the effectiveness of approaches to address child and family services sector fragmentation in Victoria in recent years[[6]](#footnote-7) have not referenced the upheaval that occurred in local lovernment in the 1990’s and have perhaps failed to recognize a relationship between the fragmentation that resulted from that period of disruption to the current disconnect between universal services and the secondary and tertiary level service system for vulnerable children and families. Local government for example, is not routinely represented in Child FIRST Alliances despite Alliances being mandated to develop catchment planning. Taskforce 1000 established in 2014 has not referenced the role local government in its reporting structures or area panels. It is questionable too, as to how thoroughly the CSO sector is aware of reforms to M&CH in reponse tothe PVVCI.
* Initiatives that aim to support vulnerable families often fail to acknowledge the role and function of local government leading to a form of “quarantining” children and families that are identified as vulnerable away from mainstream, universal services. Access to early years services by children in out of home care has required a specific protocol between DHHS, the MAV and Early Learning Association Australia to ensure that the most vulnerable children receive the services to which they are entitled. *Cradle to Kinder* is an example of a program which strongly aligns with the universal platforms of ante-natal care, M&CH and pre-school but sits within the secondary system with referrals processed through Child FIRST.

2.2. Demand

**2.2.1.**The greatest single challenge for local government in Victoria in supporting families and it would appear, to CSOs and DHHS working in the secondary and tertiary sectors [including in Family Violence and Homelessness] is demand for services. While secondary and tertiary level services may rely on eligibility criteria to manage demand and access [VAGO 2015], this can and never should be the case for universal and early years services for children that aspire to be amongst the world’s best.

**2.2.2.** Local government services are simultaneously responding to unprecedented population growth [e.g. Cardinia, Casey, Melton, Whittlesea, Wyndham, Mitchel and Baw Baw], increasing community diversity and attendant complexity [e.g. Hume, City of Greater Dandenong, Melbourne and Brimbank] as well as to vulnerable children and families who are unable to access family services because of the high levels of demand and increasing thresholds for eligibility [VAGO 2015].

**2.2.3.** Demand for early years education and care particularly amongst new arrivals and former refugee communities has witnessed growth in private Family Day Care [FDC] providers and in facilitated Playgroups provided by CSOs, placing an unanticipated burden of responsibility on local government with respect to coordination and support. While many councils continue to provide this support, it is no longer a funded activity by the Commonwealth.

2.3 National childcare debate

Despite international evidence[[7]](#footnote-8) there is a national context for supporting childcare provision that is less sympathetic to the concept of a child’s right to free, quality early education and care and the benefits thereof, than it is to enabling parents to enter the workforce. Childcare in Australia is regarded as a commodity situated in a competitive market place. In this context Victoria cannot emulate the Swedish, Canadian or UK models of childcare and learning in the early years, particularly where the role of local government in the delivery of early years services has been under threat since the 1990s. The MAV welcomes the Early Childhood Consultation commitment that with reference to the national childcare debate ‘*workforce participation need not come at the expense of quality learning for children’*. [P4]

### Weaknesses and Gaps in the Early Childhood Service System in Victoria.

**3.1** The universal platform for the planning, development and delivery [inclusive of infrastructure], of universal and targeted early childhood services sits on fragile and sometimes invisible foundations. Local government is largely *assumed* to plan, develop and deliver services rather than *acknowledged* for these functions and roles. The need for a ‘better connection between services’ at a service delivery level is mirrored in the need for a better connection at a higher level between the three tiers of government in the manner of formal agreements and partnerships that articulate the roles and responsibilities of each.

**3.2** There is furthermore, an absence of formal endorsement of the role and responsibilities of local government. While there is a strong authorising environment for the development of Public Health and Wellbeing Plans there is no such authorizing environment for the development of Municipal Early Years Plans, and other key forums and opportunities for collaborative planning and service delivery, such as Child FIRST Alliances and Best Start.

**3.3** An example of the growing recognition of the importance of the ante-natal period with respect to children’s vulnerability has informed the development of *Continuity of Care* service guidelines for public maternity hospitals and M&CH. The guidelines seek to strengthen partnerships between public health services and M&CH by improving coordination, collaboration and communication and clarifying each service’s roles and responsibilities. For effective implementation these guidelines require a strengthened authorising environment.

**3.4** There are gaps in perceptions of what constitutes the universal health, development and education continuum that is supported by M&CH at the one end and pre-school at the other. There are also differing views across the continuum and differing language used about what defines vulnerability. While Best Start programs are not currently delivered state-wide they offer opportunities for each community to develop and deliver outcomes for children that reflect the priorities of the Education State and the needs of vulnerable children, including Aboriginal children and children with disabilities. An understanding of the universal platform continuum needs to start earlier in the ante-natal period recognising the impact of pregnancy on vulnerability, and transition points along the way [such as M&CH Key Ages and Stages visits] need greater emphasis. The MAV proposes that Best Start programs are resourced to deliver outcomes for children at a state-wide level that reflect the aspirations and priorities of the Education State and Roadmap for Reform and Public Health and Wellbeing Plans, recognising that Local Government is well placed to support Best Start programs to re-align indicators in line with those aspirations.

**3.5** While engagement of families and children and particularly of vulnerable children, has been recognised as an impediment to access by services the crucial issue of sustaining engagement has not been clearly articulated in consultation documentation.

**3.6** Evidence from the VAGO report into Early Intervention Services in Victoria [2015] indicates that vulnerable families with complex issues require long term support if they are to remain outside of the tertiary system. The findings reveal that vulnerable families at the more complex, edge of care end of the vulnerability continuum, consistent with the Government’s definition of child vulnerability, require more than episodic/ time limited interventions. Vulnerability permeates layers of family functioning. Once engaged, keeping the most vulnerable children out of the Child Protection system requires long term, continuous support.

**3.7** Weaknesses in communication and information sharing between services and across sectors continue to be highlighted in recommendations arising out of inquiries and reviews into service systems including for the early years. [[8]](#footnote-9) No doubt these issues will again be raised in the report from the Royal Commission into Family Violence in Victoria.

**3.8** Child death inquires over the years have consistently highlighted the need for adult and children’s services to collaborate more effectively to improve outcomes for both adults and their children. Most particularly services addressing adult Mental Health andassociated Drugand Alcohol issues have weak cross sectoral connections. There are weaknesses along the continuum from the antenatal period to post partum care that fail to connect adult and child services.

**3.9** The greatest area of growth in the out of home care sector is in kinship care. This could also be said for families who are not identified as vulnerable but where the cost of early childhood education and care is prohibitive. [[9]](#footnote-10) The absence of specific support for kinship carers and recognition of their significant role in supporting families are not referenced in the Early Childhood Consultation paper.

# Table: Victorian Preschool Provision, Local Government and the Education State

1. **COMMONWEALTH /STATE NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP**

Clarifies roles and responsibilities for planning, funding infrastructure and delivery of preschool

**5. MAV MEYP FRAMEWORK**

Revised to enable planning for local priorities and Education State key reform areas

areas

**9. Participation and access**

1. Central Enrolment Platform set up in new MCH system
2. LG funded to provide central enrolment for all preschool settings
3. Central Enrolment includes funded three year old preschool

**8. Governance**

1. Early Years Management Panel will deliver all preschools
2. LG funded to support phased move from stand alone centre management to new governance arranagments
3. LG coordinates early years management arrangements locally

**7. Infrastructure**

1. Cwlth/State/Local Government Infrastructure Strategy
2. Agreed State/LG infrastructure plan
3. Agreed documented role of LG in preschool facility provision
4. **REVISED MAV/DET PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT (Early Childhood)**

Addresses new reform areas as partners

**DET: THE EDUCATION STATE** **– EARLY CHILDHOOD**

Determines new preschool key reform areas

1. **BILATERAL AGREEMENT**

One agreed stable ongoing funding base for preschool delivery, LG clauses related to joint planning and infrastructure provision

1. Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2015-2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Current National Partnership Agreement States:

   *The Parties are committed to maintaining Universal Access to quality early childhood education program(s) for all children in the year before full-time school for 600 hours per year, delivered by a degree qualified early childhood teacher who meets the National Quality Framework requirements with a focus on participation by vulnerable and disadvantaged children. The Parties recognise that participation in quality early childhood education programs is especially important for vulnerable and disadvantaged children in improving their life-long social inclusion, educational outcomes and economic participation.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Victorian Local Government Support for Children, Young People and Their Families. May 2011 MAV & DEECD. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Sir Michael Marmot UK 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The most recent Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2015 - 2019 articulates the social determinants of health: *“Many public health problems have complex and multiple causes. It is therefore important to see health problems in the context of the total system of which they are part, and consider the interactions and relationships among the elements that characterize the entire system* …*requires coordinated and ‘joined-up’ action, beyond disciplinary, programmatic or sectoral silos. This is particularly important in cases of entrenched social disadvantage.”*  [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. KPMG review of Child FIRST [2011]; Protecting Victoria’s Vulnerable Children Inquiry [2012]; Peter Shergold’s Service Sector Reform [2014]; Victorian Auditor General’s Office Report August [2015]. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Edward Melhuish, 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Protecting Victoria’s Vulnerable Children Inquiry, 2012; Peter Shergold: Roadmap for Reform 2012; VAGO Report into Early Intervention Services in Victoria 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Australian Institute of Family Studies 2015: “*Grandparent-provided child care was the most common of the types of informal care. Of all children aged 0-12 years, 16% were cared for by a grandparent”* [↑](#footnote-ref-10)