

INQUIRY INTO OVERCOMING INDIGENOUS DISADVANTAGE

Organisation: Dubbo Neighbourhood Centre Inc.
Name: Ms Jackie Wright
Position: Senior Manager
Telephone:
Date received: 29/08/2008



DUBBO NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE INC.

ABN 74 649 779 047

213 Brisbane Street, PO Box 523, Dubbo NSW 2830
Phone: (02) 6882 2100 Fax: (02) 6884 3994

Services provided at above address:

- After School Care & Vacation Care
- Each One Teach One
- Community Activities Program
- Community Worker Aged & Disabled
- Community Transport Scheme (Aboriginal, Local & Regional)
- Migrant Support Worker
- Home Modification & Maintenance Scheme
- Neighbourhood Centre
- Outreach Youth Counsellor
- Adolescent Family Counsellor
- Community Visitors Scheme
- Emergency Food Service
- and other temporary projects

The Honorable Ian West (MLC)
Chair Standing Committee on Social Issues
Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage in NSW
Parliament House
Macquarie Street
Sydney, NSW 2000

15th August 2008

Dear Mr West (MLC)

Please find attached a secondary submission to the inquiry into overcoming Indigenous disadvantage in NSW. I forwarded an email of the basic report and now enclose some additional documents for your consideration.

If I can be of further assistance please feel free to contact me on 02 68822100 or 0408 978 327.

Regards

Jackie Wright
Senior Manager
Dubbo Neighbourhood Centre Inc.

PROPOSAL

FAMILY PRESERVATION PROJECT

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:

- This project will respond to needs identified for priority attention (Strategic Areas for Action) of Functional and resilient families and communities, Substance use and misuse and Positive childhood and transition to adulthood in the Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage Key Indicators 2007 Report.
- In recent years a number of initiatives have been developed in recognition of the fact that without support at times of critical stress families can spiral into a pattern of dysfunction leaving adults at risk, or more accurately, more at risk of succumbing to the numbing of pain apparently provided by drugs and alcohol misuse. This is damaging for the adults and creates an extremely hazardous environment for children who rely on the effective care and protection of their adults.
- The major initiatives currently active include the Communities for Children Project, the Early Intervention Project (Brighter Futures), an enhanced delivery model in DoCS, and a number of Families First initiatives. There are also a range of funded services to support young people (and their families to a greater or lesser extent) including Reconnect, Outreach Youth Counseling, DOORWAYS (SAAP brokerage service), JPET, PCYC and others. This does not include out of home care services provided in specialist services and DoCS.
- Most of these services have a target population of early to middle childhood or teenagers over the age of 12 years. Few, if any of these services have as a broad objective the empowering of families to resume control over all aspects of their lives and the lives of their children. Often services will address "presenting problems" and

develop interventions around a problem or series of problems that may be defined by referrers, as much as, if not more than the family engaged in a range of interventions. These interventions are more often than not mandated for the protection or safety and are not focused on developing sustainable capacity of the family to eventually exit the cycle of disadvantage, dependency and forced intervention.

- A gap in the capacity of the existing service infrastructure is the ability to successfully engage with families with complex and multiple issues that can only be resolved with meaningful investment by the family and their immediate “community” or extended family networks. Such people and groups of people often are the only ones who have a real understanding of the breadth and depth of issues confronted by different family members and the risks that they face individually and collectively. They are also the only people who, in the end, can make the decisions and take action to change.
- There are only limited services that respond to the whole family and the encompassing suite of factors contributing to the family breakdown and even less services that are free or affordable to seriously disadvantaged people in the community. There are a number of private psychological services that require significant fees to be paid and a number of referral options via GP’s that provide short term support. Family Support Services receive very limited funding in Dubbo and staff work part time. Interrelate and Centacare provide a range of fee paying services that also respond to those in extreme hardship with reduced or waived fees and provide a range of groups. Such groups will usually target certain issues such as self esteem, parenting skills etc. Other support services again, are very specifically targeted eg women’s housing can accommodate women and children experiencing violence only but cannot currently provide accommodation for post pubescent boys and so the list goes on.
- The proposed model does not attempt to replace or minimize the value of each of the services currently available. It aims to work in a more comprehensive and family driven way, allowing and encouraging families to determine which of the available services will best suit their needs and support their self directed endeavors to protect and preserve family and familial relationships.



HOW DOES IT WORK?

A Family Preservation model aims to involve a wide range of family members and is derived in principle from the variously named Family Decision Making, Family Group Conferencing and Family Group Decision Making model developed in New Zealand to improve child protection outcomes for the Maori population.

The model consists of 3 main elements;

1. Family engagement and preparation for the Family Meeting (this includes the development of questions with the family to guide the process of decision making at the meeting. It includes meeting with the decision makers of the family and providing them with the information that has led to a referral and the needs identified as requiring decisions and a comprehensive explanation of how the model will work. If the decision makers agree to participate in the process they provide information about the family members and extended networks that should be invited to participate. This list may be added to by other participants along the way. AS the picture becomes clearer the facilitator develops questions with the family to ensure that all important aspects of support and need are addressed at the meeting being prepared for;
2. The Family Meeting to develop a plan and possible contingency plans for identified risks is undertaken at a location of the families choosing. Childcare and food is negotiated as required to make the meeting as comfortable as possible for the family. Professionals who the family have decided may be able to assist are prepared and invited to ensure that the information that they provide is free of jargon and is accessible to the families as possible. When information has been provided and questions responded to, the professionals generally leave the meeting. The family then spends time alone in private to respond to the questions developed and to build a plan to address the needs identified during the preparation phase of work. The plan is then considered by any mandated agency staff with the delegation to approve the plan and resources required, on the day.
3. The implementation and reviewing of the plans will be negotiated with the family and relevant agency staff to support ongoing change and adapt to changes occurring for the family over time. Responsibilities are allocated for various tasks and review dates are established, along with support contacts for the families in case of unexpected issues arising. (This final element is new to the system in Australia and is added to try and reduce the falling off of



commitment when the family hits inevitable challenges and loss of motivation. It is intended to employ staff to undertake some ongoing plan support functions.)

The key assumption is that families are competent to make decisions if they are suitably engaged, prepared for the process, and provided with the necessary information to do so (Hudson et al. 1996). It is further believed that involving the wider family in case planning processes increases the possibility that the child will be cared for within the kinship group, families will be more committed to work with a plan, and that relationships between family members will improve (Trotter, Sheehan, Liddel, Strong and Laragy, 1999). "The underlying aim is to empower families so that they can effectively participate in the community and feel competent to draw on their kin group, community and government resources to maintain harmonious families without violence and child maltreatment (Pennell & Burford, 2000).

HISTORY OF MODEL AROUND AUSTRALIA

Conferencing used in Australia by statutory Child Protection Agencies, Period of use and Frequency (Nathan Harris, 2008).

State	Name	No.	Period of Use
Victoria	Family Decision Making, aboriginal Family Decision Making	Unknown	1992-
South Australia	Family Care Meetings	Approximately 420 between 2005-2006	1994-
NSW	Family decision making conferences	None currently	1996-2005
Western Australia	Family Group Conferences	None currently	1996-2005
ACT	Family Group Conferences	Approximately 10-15 per year	1999-
Tasmania	Family Group Conferences	Approximately 180 between 2005-2006	2000-
Queensland	Family group meetings	Unknown	2006-
Northern Territory	Never used	Never used	Never used



There are different legislative status for plans and different guidelines around time of usage and the legal status of plans in each state. These differences are explained more fully in the article by Nathan Harris (see reference attachment.)

RESEARCH INDICATIONS TO DATE:

A number of research papers have been completed in Australia and beyond since the model was developed. A brief summary of some of the key findings are listed below. Details of the papers are included as an attachment.

1. "The results suggested that family assistance added to rather than replaced community support." (Kiely, Bussey, p.4)
2. "..Pennell & Burford (2000 quoted in Kiely & Bussey, p.5) reported that for families experiencing domestic violence, there was a significant fall in substantiated reports of cp concerns for the FGC group 12 months post conference compared with a comparison group.
3. Extremely challenging young people (over 13) did not have their care circumstances significantly improved via Conferencing. "There were twice as many wardship orders for conferenced group....Wardship for some families....to ensure support and ongoing involvement of the statutory service" (Kiely Masters Thesis 2001 p.80) "The belief that that after a conference families would require proportionately less community support because of an increase in support provided by their extended family is definitely not confirmed."(Kiely Masters Thesis 2001 p.81).
4. Early post conference many more kinship placements were made for vulnerable families. This dropped off within a year. (Kiely, Bussey, p.6)
5. Continuing drug and alcohol abuse was instrumental in reducing the effectiveness of plans and the positive relationship development within families.
6. Changes in caseworkers was often cited as contributing to plans not being adequately enacted and monitored (Kiely Masters Thesis 2001 p.84)



SERVICE MODEL PROPOSED

That the funding be provided to support the development of a detailed model for the delivery of services to targeted indigenous families in Dubbo, in partnership with key government stakeholders. Following the development of the model specifications, to organise the delivery of the program based on the following:

1. Key stakeholders will be required to commit to the model of service delivery at a senior level to support release of key staff for development, training and ongoing support of developed family plans. Stakeholders will include DoCS, Education, Housing NSW, NSW Health, Juvenile Justice, Family Relationship Centres, Brighter Futures, FAHCSIA.
2. Research to be conducted on the range of programs being used to address key problem areas such as interfamilial conflict for efficacy in this area.
3. Consideration to be given to the benefits or otherwise of employing 2 Family Plan Support workers to mitigate against the high staff turnover that has limited the support and monitoring of plans in previous models to date. If agreed to in principle, the first would need to be recruited at the commencement of the project and an option for a second after say, 10 conferences had plans endorsed and requiring follow up support.
4. Opportunities to be explored with appropriate agencies to support the project and enhance the transfer of the principles of the model in daily practice.
5. The target population will need to be determined by the Project Stakeholders, given recognition of the resource implications of the choices i.e early intervention vs complex needs (and resource intensive) families. One of the issues that has not been well explored to date is how well this model of service delivery would work as an early intervention strategy. Perhaps some greater clarity may emerge from research about the relative costs and benefits at differing levels of complexity.
6. Determine reasonable benchmarks for participants that may focus on less harm rather than optimal care where there are entrenched dynamics; possible substance abuse induced brain damage etc.
7. Establish realistic performance indicators for the Project.
8. Establish parameters for inclusion of extended family – previous research of families that have been involved in family group meetings have been based in the Claymore area and were largely non-indigenous communities. Family meetings ranged in size from



a few to 9 and took between 9 and 20 hours per conference. An indigenous family conference held in Dubbo in 2000 involved over 25 adults and half a dozen children, some of whom traveled from Engonnia in Far Western NSW and Sydney respectively. The preparation was approximately 60 hours including significant travel time.

9. Clarify what agency roles will require training and funding and timeframes for same.
10. Establish a clearly defined conflict resolution procedure for the Project Stakeholder and Project staff in anticipation of tensions between the groups that will likely arise as part of the process of empowering families to resume control of their families. This has proven to be challenging in the past.
11. Establish an agreed flexible funding pool for the Project Team and some guidelines around its use.
12. Programs must run for at least 3 years;
13. Must be independently evaluated from the commencement to the conclusion.



REFERENCES

Connolly, Marie. Family Group Conferences in Child Welfare (online)
Developing Practice: The Child, Youth and Family Work Journal; Issue 19;
Winter/Spring 2007; 25-53.

Harris, Nathan. Mapping the adoption of Family Group Conferencing in
Australian States and Territories, *Australian Centre for Child Protection
University of South Australia Occasional Paper Series*, Magill, South Australia,
2008 (?).

Harris, Nathan. Family Group Conferencing in Australia 15 years on. *Issues
Paper No. 27*, 2008, Australian Institute of Family Studies, National Child
Protection Clearing House.

Hudson, J., Morris, A., Maxwell, G., & galaway, B., (Eds.) (1996) Family group
conferences: Perspectives on policy and practice. Australia, The Federation
Press.

Kiely, Patricia. 2001. A longitudinal evaluation of family group conferencing.
Unpublished Masters of Clinical Psychology, Macquarie University Sydney.

Pennell, J. & Burford, G. (2000). Family Group Decision Making: Protecting
children and women. *Child Welfare*. 79 (2) 131-158.

Trotter, C., Sheehan, R., Liddell, M., Strong, D., & Laragy, C. (1999). *Evaluation
of the statewide implementation of family group conferencing*. Melbourne:
Human Services, Victoria.

Jackie Wright
Senior Manager
Dubbo Neighbourhood Centre Inc.
12th July 2008



FAMILY PRESERVATION BUDGET				
ELEMENTS	COMMENT	YR 1	YR 2	YR 3
Project Development	\$75000-\$80000 p.a - 6 mths	\$ 40,000.00		
Program Coordinator/Facilitator	55000 p.a above award Gd 5- start after 3 mths	\$ 41,250.00	\$ 57,000.00	\$ 59,000.00
Facilitator	45000 Gd 4 Yr 1 st after 3 months	\$ 33,750.00	\$ 46,000.00	\$ 47,000.00
Family Plan Support Worker 1	45000 Gd 4 Yr 1 st after 3 plans- after 6 months	\$ 22,500.00	\$ 46,000.00	\$ 47,000.00
Family Plan Support Worker 2	45000 Gd 4 Yr 1 st after 1 year		\$ 46,000.00	\$ 47,000.00
Superannuation		\$ 13,750.00	\$ 19,500.00	\$ 20,000.00
Workers Comp		\$ 5,596.25	\$ 7,936.50	\$ 8,140.00
Training (Staff)	\$700 pp + Travel & Accommodation 4 x Yr 1	\$ 2,800.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
Training (Stakeholders)	20 people x 700	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 10,500.00	\$ 10,500.00
Consult Travel	Air fare x 2 x500.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
Consult Accommodation	4 nights x 150 x2	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 1,200.00
Recruitment		\$ 4,000.00		\$ 1,000.00
Rent	200 pwx 52 -250 pwx52 - 300x52	\$ 10,400.00	\$ 13,000.00	\$ 15,600.00
Utilities		\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,600.00	\$ 1,700.00
Office Supplies	500/pp	\$ 2,000.00		
Vehicle Lease	2 cars - \$700/month incl insurance and rego	\$ 16,800.00	\$ 19,200.00	\$ 20,400.00
Fuel	2 cars	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 14,000.00
Telephone	250/mth x 4	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00
Internet	90/month x 3	\$ 3,240.00	\$ 4,320.00	\$ 4,320.00
Set up costs	4 computers	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -	\$ -
	4 desks	\$ 2,000.00	\$ -	\$ -
	3 mobile phones	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -	\$ -
Meeting expenses	Food, childcare, transport to meeting- 1000/meeting x 10	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 11,000.00	\$ 12,000.00
Travel and accommodation	10 overnight trips pp x 3 250 per night pp	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 8,500.00
Audit		\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,600.00	\$ 1,700.00
Security		\$ 200.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 300.00
Plan support fund		\$ 25,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
Research & Evaluation		\$ 60,000.00	\$ 65,000.00	\$ 70,000.00
Direct costs sub total	Indicative only 8/07/08	\$ 347,986.25	\$ 439,106.50	\$ 458,360.00
Project Management	15%	\$ 52,197.94	\$ 65,865.98	\$ 68,754.00
Total Expenses		\$ 400,184.19	\$ 504,972.48	\$ 527,114.00
PROJECT TOTAL	3 YEARS			\$ 1,432,270.66

PROPOSAL

SERVICE FOR 8 TO 12 YEAR OLD HIGH RISK BOYS, AND MEN

RATIONALE FOR THE PROJECT:

- In the Dubbo LGA there is a dearth of services that respond to either the children of this age group or the families of children of this age group. This is, essentially the group of children who were being held responsible for a significant amount of crime approximately 4 years ago and which led to a significant amount of resources being channeled into the community through Community Solutions. This included the establishment of the Community Night Patrol, the Detached Youth Worker, traineeships via the PCYC and extending the hours of operation of the Gordon Centre back in 2004. Of these resources, only the Night Patrol continues to be funded in 2008.
- The group that we are particularly concerned about now is the current group of 8-12 year old boys who are actively engaged in offending behaviours but have not yet been charged due to their age. They are generally known to us (and the community) and live in families with very limited or intermittent supervision and supportive family relationships. The children we are discussing predominantly live in West but a number live in East also. The majority of these children have part time or intermittent patterns of school attendance, increasing their risk of entering the criminal justice system in due course. A number of them have been diagnosed with ADHD and are taking medication. Again the consistency varies. Many also have family members who have either been in prison or are currently detained. Many of the families have no reliable means of transport and to the best of our knowledge do not attend Child and Family Counselling services offered by Community health. Where we have relationships with parent and/or other relatives they are much more frequently women. Our efforts to support the children via the Gulbri Men's Group has had very little effect. A number of the men have indicated that they have little influence over the families concerned due to active drug and alcohol habits.

- This group has close to a full range of life circumstances that result in the reduced life expectancy being targeted by the Federal Government. They are being raised in environments where there is high level of drug and alcohol abuse, smoking, family violence and sexual abuse. There is generally very poor nutrition and attention to health. It is our aim to mitigate against some of these life circumstances.
- Many of these children are current participants in activities provided by the Dubbo Community Development Project 0-99. The later night opening times of the Gordon Centre does not resolve the safety or behavioural issues of this group as they are expected to go home after 8.00 pm in summer and at 6.00 in non-daylight savings times of the year. The Centre then targets the older teenagers, who are able to remain at the activities until 10.00 pm. When this group is required to leave the Centre they tend to hang together in groups, roaming the streets and participating in opportunistic criminal behaviour. When they are dropped home by the Night Patrol they often beat the bus back to the Gordon Centre.
- The current focus on early intervention services by the state and federal governments eg Communities for Children and Brighter Futures (EIP) concentrate on children between 0-5 and 0-8 respectively. The resources of the Department of Community Services also prioritise babies and younger children. The youth services tend to target children and young people between the ages of 12 and 16, leaving a significant service gap for 8-12 year olds. There are a few programs that offer activities for girls such as Shine and Sistaspeak but no service specifically targeting boys of this age group. It is also likely that girls are less visible on the streets of the community unlike their male counterparts, but at this point there is a highly visible group of boys who tend to hang in gangs and are already using weapons, behaving in sexually and physically abusive ways with their peers and with adults who challenge their behaviours. (Please note that where there are clear indicators of abuse these matters are reported to the DoCS Helpline).

EVIDENCE OF NEED:

1. Dubbo's Community Indigenous Profile shows that the largest proportion of children leaving school at Year 8 and 9 or below are



indigenous. Most likely indigenous males, followed by indigenous females.

2. I am aware that agencies providing services for 0-8 or 12 and up are being approached to deal with children of this age, in the absence of designated services for 8-12. This includes Mission Australia, Reconnect and Brighter Futures.
3. Mission Australia has delivered a Cultural Leadership Program since 2004, initially funded by the Attorney Generals Department with a focus on crime prevention. This program now concentrates more on young people demonstrating leadership potential rather than those at particular or immediate risk, although there is clearly crossover.
4. Whilst there is broad recognition of the gap in services for this younger target group within the sector, there is little direct documentary evidence. Commonsense supports the need to adequately address the needs of the younger population and their families to reduce the risk of them becoming entrenched in the intensive service network as they become old enough to qualify.
5. NSW Police provided some statistics for Child at Risk (not related to family violence) and Person's of interest (in non specific police incidents). There were 24 children at risk involvements for under 12's and 20 Persons of interest between 0-10 years and 55 for 11-13 years. Difficulties in collecting the information from a range of incident types means that this information is very limited, but the need for services for this group was supported by Mark Meredith (Crime Manager – Dubbo Police).
6. It is an unfortunate fact that 2 of the young people in this target group have been committed to detention in the last 8 weeks due to breaking and entering.
7. There is general recognition of the need for stronger cultural identity formation in the Dubbo Aboriginal Community Strategy 2006-2020, Strategies 1-5 (p.2). Inherent in any plan for healthy and well educated young people, is an assumption of reasonable care and well being for pre adolescent children.
8. This principle is similarly enshrined in the State Plan: A New Direction for NSW. The section on Rights, Respect and



Responsibility; Delivering Better services; Fairness and Opportunity sections (p.6).

9. Conversation with Senior Detective Mark Meredith Crime Manager Dubbo indicated support for this target group receiving services. It is also of concern to the Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee

SERVICE MODEL PROPOSED:

That the funding be provided to engage a Program Manager to undertake a literature review on relevant programs that have evidence of success in like demographics and to develop a detailed model for the delivery of services to highly at risk 8-12 year old indigenous boys in Dubbo, in partnership with key government stakeholders. Following the development of the model a Coordinator will be recruited to organise the delivery of the program based on the following assumptions:

1. Most, if not all of the identified families will have family violence having a current or historical impact;
2. A partnership is required to be brokered with the relevant stakeholders to ensure that families in most critical need are targeted;
3. MOU's will need to be developed between DoCS, Juvenile Justice, Police and Education (at least) to form an intake assessment team and to provide feedback about the impact of the program on participants;
4. Participation will be voluntary;
5. Activities must be physically active to engage this age group;
6. There must be men who are related or engaged via "family" with the participants involved willing to be part of the program;
7. Identity issues will form the focus of work;
8. Families and the target children will define what they want from the programs and how we will know if it is working via detailed planning meetings with family and extended family members;
9. Group work will be the major strategy engaged;
10. Camps for boys and men will be arranged three times per year;
11. Fortnightly activities for the participants will allow follow up of issues raised throughout the program and allow impetus to be maintained;
12. Referrals must be made for appropriate services being provided in Dubbo and the region (where appropriate);
13. Brokerage services must be able to be purchased to meet identified need in a timely fashion that cannot be met by the (currently overstretched) existing services for men and boys with anger/violence issues.
14. Programs must run for at least 3 years;



15. Performance Indicators must include improved school participation and/or attendance, increased community engagement, an ability to successfully engage a "safety net" developed via the program when required and have key stakeholders identify positive attitude shifts over the duration of the program and;
16. Must be independently evaluated from the commencement to the conclusion.

The Proposed budget is attached for your information.

Please note that since this project was first submitted in January 2008, a further project is being prepared for Family Preservation in Dubbo. As there are many common interests for the 2 target groups it would be optimal to combine the stakeholder groups and research elements to develop and monitor these projects should they be successful in securing funding.

Jackie Wright
Senior Manager
Dubbo Neighbourhood Centre Inc.
12th July 2008



BOYS & MEN PROJECT BUDGET				
ELEMENTS	COMMENT	YR 1	YR 2	YR 3
Project Development	\$75000-\$80000 p.a - 6 mths	\$ 40,000		
Program Coordinator/Facilitator	55000 p.a above award Gd 5- start after 3 mths	\$ 41,250	\$ 57,000	\$ 59,000
Superannuation		\$ 8,125	\$ 5,700	\$ 5,900
Workers Comp		\$ 3,006	\$ 2,109	\$ 2,183
Training (Staff)		\$ 5,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000
Recruitment		\$ 2,000		
Rent	200 pwx 52 -250 pwx52 - 300x52	\$ 10,400	\$ 13,000	\$ 15,600
Utilities		\$ 1,500	\$ 1,600	\$ 1,700
Office Supplies	500/pp	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,400
Fuel	Private mileage 1000kms/month x .65/.7/.75	\$ 650	\$ 700	\$ 750
Telephone	300/mth	\$ 3,600	\$ 3,600	\$ 3,600
Internet	90/month yr 1	\$ 1,080	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,300
Set up costs	computer & software	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -
	Office furniture	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ -
Travel and accommodation	10 overnight trips pp x 3 250 per night pp	\$ 7,500	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,500
Audit		\$ 1,500	\$ 1,600	\$ 1,700
Facility Costs		\$ 5,500	\$ 5,700	\$ 5,900
Flexible funding pool	Brokerage of specialist services	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
Research & Evaluation	Indicative only 8/07/08	\$ 60,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 70,000
Camps	(50.00 pp/pday x3 x25) + (instructor -300/day) + (staff) x	\$ 20,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 24,000
Fortnightly Activities		\$ 20,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 25,000
Direct costs sub total		\$ 264,111	\$ 241,409	\$ 257,533
Project Management	15%	\$ 39,617	\$ 36,211	\$ 38,630
Total Expenses		\$ 303,728	\$ 277,620	\$ 296,163
PROJECT TOTAL	3 YEARS			\$ 877,511

