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Introduction

Purpose and intended audience

This document provides a conceptual framework and step-by-step guide for policy development and service delivery planning in relation to population groups or subgroups. It has been developed particularly for use within the Social Inclusion and Participation work group (SIP) of the Ministry of Social Development (MSD).

SIP includes:

- the Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector
- the Office for Disability Issues
- the Office for Senior Citizens
- the GLBTI policy team.

Social inclusion and participation

“Social inclusion and participation” is a shorthand term for the government’s vision of fairness, opportunity and security for all New Zealanders, and also describes the means we employ to achieve these ends.

The government’s vision has been stated in Opportunity for All New Zealanders as:

An inclusive New Zealand where all people enjoy opportunity to fulfil their potential, prosper and participate in the social, economic, political and cultural life of their communities and nation.

Achieving social inclusion and participation means raising the overall level and distribution of wellbeing in society to ensure that:

- all people have opportunities to develop their potential
- all people achieve a basic level of wellbeing (ie reducing disadvantage)
- social wellbeing is improving on average and in comparison with other developed countries
- there is a similar distribution of outcomes between groups (ie reducing inequalities)
- New Zealand society as a whole is cohesive and expresses a unique national identity
- the wellbeing of present and future generations is enhanced.

---

1 Hyperlinks to websites, resources and references are provided throughout this document to facilitate access to these.
2 GLBTI includes gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, fa’afafine, takatāpui and intersex people.
3 Key documents expressing this vision are the Speech from the Throne (2005), the Address-in-Reply Speech (2005), the Prime Minister’s Statement to Parliament (2006), the Budget Speech 2006 and related media statements.
4 MSD’s own vision statement is more limited in scope, to reflect its particular responsibilities: “An inclusive New Zealand where all people are able to participate in the social and economic life of their communities.”
Context and background

A changing and increasingly diverse population

New Zealand’s population is changing. For example:
- the median age of our population is increasing\(^5\)
- the proportion of older people (those aged 65 years and over) is increasing\(^6\)
- our population is more mobile, in terms of both internal and external migration
- our population has become more diverse, and more visibly diverse, in terms of ethnicity, culture, sexual and gender identities, religion, values, languages spoken, and family structure.\(^7\)

Given this diversity, a one-size-fits-all approach to public policy is increasingly inadequate to ensure equality of opportunity and equity of outcomes (ie a fair go) for all New Zealanders.

Diverse identities are increasingly acknowledged, and various attempts are being made to incorporate these perspectives in public policy development. For example:
- Gender Analysis
- Disability Perspective Toolkit
- Māori Potential Framework
- A Guide to the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi
- Pacific Analysis Framework
- Ethnic Perspectives in Policy
- Whole Child Approach
- Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa and Does Your Policy Need an Age Limit?

High-level frameworks for social policy

Sustainable development for New Zealand

In January 2003, the Government published its Sustainable Development for New Zealand: Programme of Action. This commits the public sector to take account of the long-term economic, social, cultural and environmental consequences of its decisions.

The Local Government Amendment Act 2002 charges local and regional authorities to determine objectives in relation to these same four domains, and to develop Long-term Council Community Plans (LTCCPs) to achieve these objectives.

All social policy should be directed towards sustainable investment in both the present and future wellbeing of New Zealanders.

---

\(^5\) In 1901 the median age of the population was 23 years. By 1991 the median age was 31 years. In 2001 it was 35 years and in 2006 it was 35.9 years. By 2021 it is projected to be 40 years. (Statistics New Zealand nd and 2006.)

\(^6\) In 1951 older people made up 9% of the population. By 2001 this had increased to 12%. In 2006 this increased slightly to 12.3%. By the year 2051 it is projected that older people will comprise 26% of the population. (Statistics New Zealand 2006)

\(^7\) See Boston et al (2006).
Social development for New Zealand

MSD’s Statement of Intent 2006/2007 (2006) states that:

Social development is about promoting the wellbeing of the population as a whole, across a range of areas such as social assistance, health, education, employment and safety. It is about helping people in need, while also assisting them to be self-reliant. (p31)

Successful social development requires us to work with other agencies and with non-government organisations on all the things that affect wellbeing and prosperity, such as health, education, housing, employment, living standards and safety. (p16)

There are two key aspects to social development: social protection and social investment.

- Social protection involves looking after vulnerable members of our society, through things like paying for social assistance and arranging care and protection for children.
- Social investment is about acting before people need help. Social investment provides resources, programmes and support for individuals, families and communities to build on their strengths and improve their social and economic wellbeing over time. It helps us to get ahead of some of the most difficult issues, reducing the future need for social protection. (p16)

The Statement of Intent recognises (p17) that successful social development involves:

- ensuring social and economic policies reinforce each other
- supporting individuals, families and communities to take responsibility for their own wellbeing
- intervening early to tackle problems before they become complex and entrenched
- maintaining social protection over time while tilting spending towards social investment
- implementing a “no wrong door” approach, with a single face for MSD at the local and regional level
- working at the regional and national level to ensure services are well co-ordinated, responsive and flexible
- government agencies, local government and the community and voluntary sector working well together
- building our knowledge of what works, and measuring progress in improving the wellbeing of New Zealanders
- sharing best practice with other agencies in New Zealand and internationally.

Reducing inequalities

The government has a stated goal to “reduce disadvantage and promote equality of opportunity in order to achieve a similar distribution of outcomes between groups, and a more equitable distribution of overall outcomes within society” [SDC Min (04) 13/2].

Reducing Inequalities is not a stand-alone strategy that drives specific goals, targets and work programmes. Rather, policy goals, principles and priorities are expected to be incorporated into departments’ core business where applicable.

---

8 These success factors are elaborated in the Statement of Intent (MSD 2006: 31).
Current government priorities

In the Prime Minister’s Statement at the Opening of Parliament 2006 the Government announced three priority themes for its current term:

- economic transformation that balances economic and social policy
- ensuring that families, young and old, are able to be secure and have the opportunity to reach their full potential
- building a strong sense of national identity and pride.\(^9\)

These whole-of-government priorities apply to all central government activity during the current term of government. Departments have been directed to take these themes into account in their planning processes (including their Statements of Intent), and to consider how core business and baselines can be aligned to support the three priority themes.

---

\(^9\) See further the Statement of Government Priorities and the Budget 2006 media statements.
Roles and responsibilities

It is important to distinguish between the respective roles and responsibilities of central government, local government, iwi and other Māori authorities, community and voluntary sector organisations, communities, families and individuals themselves.

Communities, markets and social institutions such as families can support or undermine people's wellbeing. Social institutions never work perfectly. Collective action through central government can sometimes improve on the operation of markets, families and communities, and can provide essential supports when institutions fail.

A social development approach assumes that it is government's responsibility to promote the wellbeing of its citizens, and that the state can make a difference through planned, organised interventions, and co-ordinated, cross-sectoral strategic planning within a common development framework. But government action also suffers from deficiencies and failings. A modest and realistic approach to state intervention is advisable, with careful consideration of the likely direct and indirect consequences of our interventions.

Further, government is only one actor among many, and there are limits to what government alone can, or should, attempt. The government’s stated aim is to promote freedom with responsibility, and to support people, families and communities to run their own lives wherever possible.

When developing policy or planning services in relation to particular population groups or subgroups, it is necessary, therefore, to ask:

- what are the roles and responsibilities of the state in relation to this issue?
- which central government agencies have responsibilities in relation to it?
- which is the most appropriate lead agency at this time?
- how can we join up agency involvement to achieve the best possible outcomes for the target population group or subgroup?
- can we intervene in ways that enable individuals, families and communities to run their own lives wherever possible?
- with whom should we be consulting?

10 The extent and nature of state intervention needs to be debated and decided from time to time within the democratic political process. Three basic ways in which a government exists to serve its citizens are:
- provision and regulation of services
- facilitation of public relationships and discourse, and arbitration of conflicting claims as to what is due to whom
- managing relationships between its citizens and the wider world of nations, providing protection from, access to, and the basis for relationships with other nation states.

11 Opportunity for All New Zealanders (MSD 2004:15).

12 You may wish to seek advice on consultation from agencies responsible for particular population groups (eg Office for Senior Citizens, Office for Disability Issues, GLBTI policy team, Office of Ethnic Affairs, Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, Te Punī Kōkiri, etc) or sectors (eg Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector). Before consulting with population groups or NGOs, it would be wise to talk first with staff in service delivery groups (Work and Income, Child, Youth and Family, Family and Community Services, Specialist Services) who may already be working with them.

Key resources for central government agencies working with local government, the community and voluntary sector and Māori organisations are Mosaics: Key Findings and Good Practice Guide for Regional Co-ordination and Integrated Service Delivery, the Good Practice Guide for Working with Local Government, the Good Practice Participate website, the Good Practice Funding website, and the consultation guidelines in the Policy Development Toolkit.
Social inclusion and participation: Related concepts

“Social inclusion and participation” is situated theoretically within a cluster of more or less closely related concepts.

Wellbeing is a shorthand term for all those aspects of life that contribute to an individual's happiness, quality of life and welfare, and the interconnections between them. Ten “domains” of wellbeing are reported on annually in the Social Report. Desired outcome statements are specified for each domain. Broadly, these spell out the high-level results government aims to achieve for New Zealand and New Zealanders.13

Social development is a process of co-ordinated social change that promotes the wellbeing of the population as a whole and of disadvantaged groups within it. Wellbeing is the desired end; social development is a means to that end.

Social inclusion and participation is a more concrete way of describing wellbeing that focuses particularly on its transactional and participatory aspects – the relationships between individuals and groups, and their belonging, participating in and contributing on their own terms to our common life in families, communities and society as a whole. We take social inclusion and participation to be a broader and more comprehensive concept than social cohesion.

Social inclusion and participation describes both:

- the results government (on behalf of citizens) wants to achieve through its social policies and programmes
- the means by which these results are to be achieved (ie working in ways that include rather than exclude, and that promote and enable participation in social, economic, political and cultural life).

Social capital can be defined as networks and associated shared norms that facilitate co-operative behaviour within and between social groups.14 It can take three distinct forms:

- bonding social capital – connections within a population group or subgroup
- bridging social capital – connections between individuals who belong to different population groups and subgroups
- linking social capital – access to information, public institutions, resources and services.15

Social connectedness is one domain of wellbeing measured and reported on in the Social Report. It refers to the relationships people have with others in a variety of social roles, and thus contributes to social inclusion and participation, to bonding, bridging and linking social capital, and to social cohesion.16

14 For an introduction to social capital, see Dickson (2004).
15 Most discussions of social capital have focused on local communities, where there is face-to-face contact or at least potential for this to occur. It is an open question as to whether social capital can aggregate, and whether it is conceptually useful in discussion of identities, particularly national identities. See Jenson (1998).
16 The desired outcome statement for the social connectedness domain in the Social Report (MSD 2006: 9) is:

People enjoy constructive relationships with others in their families, whānau, communities, iwi and workplaces. Families support and nurture those in need of care. New Zealand is an inclusive society where people are able to access information and support.
Social cohesion refers to shared values and commitment to a common life, despite diversity.\textsuperscript{17} Social cohesion exists where people feel part of society, family and personal relationships are strong, differences among people are respected, and people feel safe and supported by others.\textsuperscript{18}

Historically, the concept of social cohesion tends to come to prominence when people respond to actual or perceived social change with concerns about public order, security and stability.\textsuperscript{18} It is currently a concern within a number of OECD nations in response to globalisation, conditions of international economic competition and restructuring, a fear of instability, a perceived erosion of common values, the apparent intractability of inequalities and social exclusion, and the threat of global terrorism.

Nation building consists of activities and processes that contribute to nationhood, or a sense of a collective national identity. Our national identity involves our “New Zealand way” of doing things. It is about who we are, what we do, where we live, and how we are seen by the world.

We do not have a clear understanding, however, of what exactly makes for a collective national identity. Is it a product of social cohesion? Or does it contribute to social cohesion? Is it an aggregate of (local community) social capital? Or is it created through shared commitment to an “imagined community”, with common myths, symbols and political projects? Is it a mix of some or all of the above?

Jenson (1998: 12–13, adapted) offers the following indicative inventory of theoretical approaches to questions of social order, with the reminder that “only some theoretical approaches identify social cohesion – defined as shared values and commitment to a community – as the foundation stone of social order”.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17} The concept of social cohesion was first popularised by Émile Durkheim at the end of the 19th century. Durkheim thought a cohesive society depended on shared loyalties, which citizens owed to each other and ultimately to the state because they were bound in ties of interdependency. See further http://durkheim.itgo.com/solidarity.html.

\textsuperscript{18} See Statistics New Zealand, Monitoring Progress Towards a Sustainable New Zealand, section on social cohesion.

\textsuperscript{19} Jane Jenson notes the consequential risk that people may then look to the state to foster consensus, rather than using other formal and informal democratic mechanisms to resolve conflict. See Jenson (1998: 10). Jenson also observes that social cohesion can turn bad, and that focusing on it can reduce a society’s permeability and openness to strangers and outcasts. Social cohesion does not, however, necessarily require uniformity or the imposition of a monoculture.

\textsuperscript{20} Jenson poses the question (1998: 39):
Will we prosper more by letting private institutions, such as markets and the family, take full responsibility for distribution for us and for future generations or do we need to act collectively to ensure a fair future for all. Is social order the result of socialisation, of individual and private initiative, or of well functioning institutions of democratically arrived at collective action?
Government in New Zealand has generally adopted a pragmatic approach to improving social outcomes, rather than a theory-driven rationale for its policies and interventions.

Under the rubric of “social development” there has been active, and generally effective, investment to improve social inclusion and participation. Despite having one of the most diverse populations in the developed world, New Zealand enjoys a relatively high degree of social cohesion. Ensuring that this continues to be the case, and promoting a strong national identity is one of three priority themes for the current administration.

Policy analysts need to keep making use of the whole cluster of more or less loosely related concepts and theories (wellbeing, social development, social inclusion and participation, social capital, social connectedness, social cohesion, national identity and nation building), depending on the particular issues and desired outcomes that are in focus at any one time.

---

22 See further the Statement of Government Priorities (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet 2006).
Dimensions of social inclusion and participation

Key dimensions of social inclusion and participation are: belonging, inclusion, participation, recognition and legitimacy.23

Belonging

Feeling that we belong in a society is commonly anchored in our experiences within families and communities, whether our local (neighbourhood) community, our workplace and professional associations, or our other communities of interest (e.g., sports, religion, cultural pursuits and hobbies).

Belonging involves sharing some set of common experiences, aspirations, norms, values and social attitudes, and feeling committed to the community or communities within which we lead our lives. Belonging is a two-way process that depends on relations characterised by safety, security and trust.

At the level of national identity, belonging means identifying (at least in general terms) with a country’s heritage, norms, icons and characteristic forms of cultural expression.

When people do not feel they belong in this sense, they may experience isolation and alienation, and withdraw more or less exclusively into subgroups defined on the basis of a dominant identity (ethnic, religious, cultural, sexual, or political).

Inclusion

Inclusion means having equality of opportunity to access markets (especially the labour market and recognised forms of economic activity), services, institutions and social networks.

Access to paid work is critical, because it provides people with:
- economic independence, and the means to provide for themselves and their families and to lead the lives they themselves choose
- meaningful and productive activity and social connectedness, which contribute to self-esteem and life satisfaction.

Promoting inclusion requires us to analyse and address barriers that disadvantage, marginalise or exclude people. These barriers can be of many different types, including attitudes, customs, how language is used, social structures, infrastructure and lack of access to services. Some examples are:
- “glass ceilings” that impede career progression
- the unavailability of broadband infrastructure
- using language about others that they don’t use to describe themselves.

When people are not included, they may experience social exclusion.

---

23 Jenson (1998) identified these five dimensions of social cohesion on the basis of a Canadian literature review, but acknowledged that her framework is incomplete. In this paper, we have re-worked these as dimensions of social inclusion and participation, which we take to be a broader and more comprehensive concept than social cohesion.
Participation

Participation involves opportunities both to:

• contribute to neighbourhood, community and national life (eg as a volunteer in a community organisation)
• influence decisions that affect us (eg participating in local governance and consultation processes, and voting in local body and national elections).

Participation can be thought of as “active citizenship”. When people encounter barriers to their participation, or otherwise choose not to participate, they may (passively) withdraw or (actively) choose to live outside prevailing social customs and/or the rule of law.

Recognition

Our communities are increasingly characterised by diversity. Each of us has multiple identities, in terms of our ethnicity, culture, religion, gender, sexual identity, (dis)ability, profession, family status, interests, etc. At any one time, one or more of these identities may come into focus for us.

Ideally, all New Zealanders enjoy the freedom to lead our lives as we choose, in terms of the identity or identities important to us within a particular context, at a particular time. This freedom needs to be qualified, however, by reference to the rule of law, and respect for the rights of others.

Recognition means receiving a measure of public acknowledgment and affirmation of our differences, and the positive contributions these make to the fabric of our community and national life.

Prejudice and discrimination are the opposite of recognition.

• Prejudice refers to a negative or hostile attitude toward another social group, or an individual taken to be representative of another social group. It is based on a faulty and inflexible generalisation (literally, a “pre-judgement”).
• Discrimination occurs when a person is treated differently (and unfavourably) from another person in the same or similar circumstances. Discrimination is prejudice in action.

Prejudice commonly treats people as if some particular trait or identity is the only thing to be recognised in them, and that it is undesirable. For example, regardless of a person’s education, qualifications, skills, work history, family, cultural interests, etc:

• racism sees a person of Chinese ethnicity as “only” an Asian
• homophobia sees a person who is gay or lesbian as “only” homosexual
• Islamophobia sees a person of Islamic faith as “only” a Muslim.

---

24 A slogan which captures the passion of many minority groups for participation is “Nothing about us, without us”.
26 Grounds of discrimination defined in the Human Rights Act 1993 are: sex, marital status, religious belief, ethical belief, colour, race, ethnicity or national origin, disability, age, political opinion, employment status, family status and sexual orientation.
If we meet with prejudice and discrimination, rather than recognition, this reduces feelings of belonging and can severely restrict opportunities for inclusion and participation in social, economic, political and cultural life.

**Legitimacy**

Legitimacy concerns the protection of civil and political rights, and universal access to a broad range of trustworthy mechanisms (both private and public institutions) to regulate and arbitrate people’s rights in respect of each other. It includes confidence in the reliability and fairness of a state’s social protection mechanisms (e.g., welfare benefits, New Zealand Superannuation, a ready response from emergency services, etc).

Legitimacy institutionalises recognition. It goes broader, however, than “trusted state services”.\(^{28}\) It includes, for example, confidence in:

- the integrity with which business dealings and employment relations are conducted
- the governance and management of community and voluntary sector organisations
- the maintenance of sound journalistic standards in media reporting.

An important aspect of legitimacy is the maintenance and promotion of a culture of non-violent conflict resolution (sometimes called “tolerance”), with trustworthy mechanisms for this.\(^{29}\)

Tolerance does not mean “anything goes”, or passively “putting up with” others’ beliefs, attitudes or behaviours with which we are not in agreement. The International Tolerance Network has defined tolerance as the “decision to either endure a conflict or settle it by peaceful means, based on the conviction that the other parties to the conflict enjoy principally the same rights”.\(^{30}\) Tolerance is linked to identification of conflict between people’s rights and the use of active decision-making mechanisms by individuals, groups and institutions to resolve them.

Options for resolving conflict are portrayed in the following diagram from the International Tolerance Network in its publication, *Tolerance: Basis for Democratic Interaction* (2000: 18).

---

\(^{28}\) “Trusted state services” is one of the development goals for the public sector.

\(^{29}\) Jenson (1998: 39) noted that: “… the incorporation of concerns about conflict management by institutions, especially public institutions, is the major challenge for current conversations about social cohesion.”

Legitimacy is protected by access to bodies that can investigate complaints and facilitate mediation and redress. Some New Zealand examples are the Disputes Tribunal, the Health and Disability Commissioner, the Human Rights Commission, the Commerce Commission, the Law Society, the Tenancy Tribunal, the Broadcasting Standards Authority, and television’s Fair Go.

When people do not trust private and public institutions, they may withdraw support for them, or otherwise fail to co-operate with them. They may resort to vigilante action or acts of terrorism, or otherwise choose to live outside the rule of law.
Social inclusion and participation: A step-by-step guide for policy and planning

The following step-by-step guide can be used as a checklist for policy development or service delivery planning that concerns a particular population group or subgroup. Not every section or question will be relevant to a particular project.

Other useful resources are the Policy Development Toolkit on the Public Sector Intranet, and the Population and Sustainable Development Website (see especially the Tools and Resources section).

1. **Strategic phase**
   - What are the results (outcomes) government wants to achieve?
   - What are the key outcome indicators? What are the benchmarks against which we will measure whether we have made a difference?
   - How would we know if anyone was better off?

2. **Analyse and define the problem**
   - What is the problem to be addressed by this policy or service?
   - What information do we have concerning the nature of the problem?
   - What are the roles and responsibilities of the state in relation to this problem and any proposal to address it?
   - What particular roles and responsibilities does our agency or work group have in relation to this issue?
   - What population issues are relevant to this problem?
     - Who are the people (population groups or subgroups) likely to be affected by this proposal, either directly or indirectly?
     - How and to what extent might they be affected?
     - Can meaningful and useful comparisons be drawn between subgroups and the total population?
     - Are we analysing the population within the most appropriate frame (eg are we focusing on ethnicity, when age or socioeconomic status may be more valid)?
     - Do any identified subgroups form coherent logical units for analysis, or are the groups internally diverse in significant ways?
     - How do outcomes vary within groups, as well as between groups?
     - Are projected short-term population trends likely to obscure longer-term population trends?

---

31 The Public Sector Intranet is a secure website accessible only by designated policy staff in the public service.
32 MSD staff should consult Planning, Purchase and Governance if unsure about how a proposal relates to MSD’s strategic outcomes framework and Statement of Intent.
33 Population groups may be thought of in terms of the life cycle (children, young people, working aged people, older people), or in terms of various (and frequently overlapping) categories or identities in relation to gender, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, culture, religion, etc.
• Are there existing gaps in service delivery, or issues regarding access\textsuperscript{34} to information and services for particular population groups or subgroups?
• What is already being done to address this problem, and who is doing it?
• With whom do we need to consult (internally and externally), and at which stages in the policy development or planning process? How will the interests, concerns and views of affected population groups or subgroups be incorporated?

3. **Set objectives**
• What do we want to change?
• Do our goals address the root of the problem, or its symptoms?
• How will we know when the desired changes have been achieved?
• Are our desired outcomes and objectives (intermediate outcomes) consistent with whole-of-government statements and our agency’s own outcomes framework?
• How will our objectives contribute to:
  – belonging
  – inclusion
  – participation
  – recognition
  – legitimacy?

4. **Identify, analyse and design options**
• What evidence is currently available to inform analysis and/or planning?
  – Who holds this data, and how can we access it?
  – Does the available data present any quality or relevance issues?
    – What are the features and limitations of the statistics we are working with?
    – What is the “fit” between what we really want to measure, and what available statistics allow us to measure?
    – Is the sample size or quality of the source data sufficient to support conclusions with respect to the target population subgroups?
    – How have the statistics been compiled?
    – Are definitions used consistently across different statistical collections, and within individual time-series?
    – Have there been any recent changes in how the statistics have been collected or compiled?
    – What information actually matters to support decision-making?
    – Do we need to consult an expert statistician or demographer?\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{34} Barriers to access can include lack of knowledge about the service, the location and design of premises, transport and other costs, language and cultural issues.
– Can we benchmark New Zealand national outcomes data against data from any comparable jurisdictions overseas?
– Can we benchmark sub-national data against other regions within New Zealand?

• What do we know about what works?  

• Which options are most likely to address the identified problem effectively and best contribute to achieving our objectives and desired outcomes?
  – How will each option impact on the population groups or subgroups likely to be affected by it?
  – Are we proposing tailoring, targeting or “one-size-fits-all” interventions?
  – Are these options likely to breach human rights or other international obligations in relation to population groups or subgroups?
  – What are the likely resource implications of implementing these options?
  – Will the social and economic benefits of implementing these options outweigh the costs?
  – What are the risks associated with the issues and options being considered, including the risk of unintended and undesired consequences, and how might these risks be managed?

• What might be the implications of our preferred options for service delivery (including workforce capacity and capability)? Would this involve enhancements to present services, or the development of new (additional) services? Would government deliver enhanced services directly or indirectly (through contracts or partnerships)?

• Which are our preferred options, and why? On what assumptions are these our preferred options, and what trade-offs do they represent?

• How will our preferred options be co-ordinated with other initiatives by central and local government, and civil society?

• How could our preferred options be monitored and evaluated, if implemented, and how might monitoring and evaluation be funded?

• What would be a realistic timeframe to implement the proposal?

5. Present recommendations to decision-makers

• Which decision-makers or decision-making bodies need to consider our proposals?

• Which processes do we need to use, and in which order, to enable this to occur?

---

35 MSD staff should consult Information Analysis and Monitoring, CSRE, in the first instance.
36 If you are developing policy within MSD, have you consulted with our service delivery arms (Work and Income; Child, Youth and Family Services; Family and Community Services; Specialist Services) and Regional Social Policy?
37 MSD staff should consult Forecasting and Modelling (CSRE) and/or Finance (National Office).
38 A useful resource is the Treasury’s Cost Benefit Analysis Primer.
39 MSD staff should consult with CSRE and build monitoring and evaluation into the business case before presenting recommendations to decision-makers.
• What are the best ways to present information and our analysis of it?

6. **Plan for implementation and service delivery**
   • What service delivery targets, if any, should be set in relation to key population groups or subgroups?
   • Do we need to allow for flexible service delivery capacity over the short to medium term to cater for changes in demand levels due to changes in population levels or composition, and real-time evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention?
   • How will we communicate to our target audience/s proposed changes to existing service delivery or the introduction of new services?

7. **Monitor and evaluate**
   • How will the impacts of the policy or service be monitored and evaluated?
     - Will current administrative data capture sufficient information on the demographic characteristics of service recipients to enable monitoring and evaluation?
     - How will monitoring and evaluation of actual impacts occur?
     - Should additional research and evaluation be undertaken?
Resources and links

Key government statements


The Ministry of Social Development’s outcomes framework

Policy development tools

Policy Development Toolkit, accessed 18 December 2006 from https://psi.govt.nz/pdtoolkit/default.aspx [please note: this is a secure website accessible only by designated policy staff in the public service]


Analytical frameworks

Gender Analysis (Ministry of Women’s Affairs), accessed 18 December 2006 from http://www.mwa.govt.nz/gender-analysis


Other resources

Briefing to the Incoming Minister: Leading Social Development in New Zealand (Ministry of Social Development, September 2005), accessed 18 December 2006

Consultation Guidelines in the Policy Development Toolkit (Public Sector Intranet), accessed 18 December 2006 from https://psi.govt.nz/pdtoolkit/default.aspx [please note: this is a secure website accessible only by designated policy staff in the public service]


Good Practice Participate website (Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector), http://www.goodpracticeparticipate.govt.nz/

Good Practice Funding website (Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector), http://www.goodpracticefunding.govt.nz/


Other selected references


Jonathan Bradshaw, Peter Kemp, Sally Baldwin and Abigail Rowe (2004) The Drivers of Social Exclusion: A Review of the Literature for the Social Exclusion Unit in the


