

Annex 1

Option 1	Description	Assumptions	System wide Management	Management Performance Information	Youth Justice capability	Culture	Sector Policy Fragmentation	Gap between Operations and Policy	Time and Cost
Status Quo	Current service delivery and policy functions remain the same	High performing CE appoint Management initiatives endorsed Leadership accepts the problem definition	The recent restructure was intended to encourage more system wide management. It is too early at this stage to tell whether this has been successful. CYF has a history of failing to take a system wide approach which factors in the impact in one part of the business on others.	This option does not impact on performance and management information needs. These systems, behaviours and values need to be built as outlined in the MIS business case. The has been a history of CYF failing to prioritise information management	This structure does not improve Youth Justice capability. This will require the Youth Justice Capability Review to be completed and implemented.	A strong CE with a change programme could impact on the culture of resistance. However, retaining the status quo does not provide a catalyst for change.	The current structure does not resolve existing sector policy fragmentation issues. However, this could be improved through a joint prioritised work programme.	The gap between sector policy and operations would not be assisted by the status quo option. One way of bridging this gap is to co-locate policy and ops staff. It does not join youth justice policy and operations.	No fiscal cost Least disruptive option to service delivery. Six months until a new CE starts leading to loss of momentum of change. Programme from BLR and other CYF performance improvement programmes could, however, continue.

Option 2	Description	Assumptions	System wide Management	Management Performance Information	Youth Justice capability	Culture	Sector Policy Fragmentation	Gap between Operations and Policy	Time and Cost
CYF/ MSD merger	Relocate all CYF functions to MSD CYF becomes a business unit within MSD. CE position does not require advertising.	Management initiatives endorsed Leadership accepts the problem definition.	This option would be likely to encourage system-wide management across the social services, preventative and remedial child and family services. MSD currently takes a system-wide management approach and reassesses business processes.	The Ministry would need to build on the planned MIS to meet the policy and operational roles associated with this option. There has been a history of MSD prioritising management information and valuing research and evaluation. MSD has the methodology and processes needed to cost the baselines.	This structure does not improve Youth Justice Capability. This will require the Youth Justice Capability Review to be completed and implemented.	Organisational change can be a catalyst for culture change. Placing CYF in a larger organisation that values and uses evidence will influence how CYF do their job.	Places accountability for all child and welfare policy with a single CE thus reducing fragmentation. Encourages clearer trade-offs between prevention and remedial work. Builds on MSD existing research and policy capability and reputation. There has been poor engagement on Care and Protection policy due to poor policy capability .	Places accountability for most child and welfare policy and operations with a single CE thus creating a strong incentive to reduce the gap between operations and policy. Shorter feedback loops from operations to care and protection policy due to being in a single organisation. It does not join youth justice policy and operations.	Minimal fiscal cost Minimal disruption whole of CYF transfer in its entirety. May make some staff cynical. Can be implemented immediately e.g. CE of MSD becomes acting CE CYF until Order in Council is implemented. Programme from BLR and other CYF performance improvement programmes can continue.

Option 3	Description	Assumptions	System wide Management	Management Performance Information	Youth Justice capability	Culture	Sector Policy Fragmentation	Gap between Operations and Policy	Time and Cost
Split CYF functions	<p>Relocate Care and Protection, adoption, community funding and policy to MSD</p> <p>Relocate Youth Justice Functions to MoJ.</p> <p>CE positions would not require advertising.</p>	<p>Management initiatives endorsed</p> <p>Leadership accepts the problem definition.</p>	<p>This option would be likely to encourage system-wide management across social services and justice, but not across both together.</p> <p>Potentially creates further fragmentation and less of a whole of system approach – particularly the links between care and protection and Youth Justice.</p>	<p>Shared clients information being duplicated thereby adding to the complexity.</p> <p>Possibly need to build a new system in MoJ for YJ clients.</p> <p>There has been a history of MSD and more recently MoJ prioritising management information and valuing research and evaluation.</p> <p>MSD have the methodology and processes needed to cost the baselines.</p>	<p>The structural change will provide the opportunity to focus on Youth Justice more effectively.</p>	<p>Organisational change can be a catalyst for culture change.</p> <p>Breaking CYF up and placing the parts into larger organisations that values and uses evidence will influence how CYF do their job.</p> <p>Opportunity to build Youth Justice specialist skills and culture</p>	<p>Joins child and family welfare policy and joins youth justice policy and operations reducing fragmentation.</p> <p>Builds on MSD and MoJ existing research and policy capability and reputation.</p>	<p>Places accountability for most child and welfare policy and operations as well as Youth Justice and Justice under single CEs thus creating a strong incentives to reduce the gap between operations and policy.</p> <p>Shorter feedback loops from operations to care and protection and Youth Justice policy due to being in the same organisations.</p>	<p>Mid-range fiscal cost</p> <p>Likely to be disruptive to some staff and some clients</p> <p>Risk service delivery failure in youth justice during transition</p> <p>Programme from BLR and other CYF performance improvement programmes can continue.</p>

Option 4	Description	Assumptions	System wide Management	Management Performance Information	Youth Justice capability	Culture	Sector Policy Fragmentation	Gap between Operations and Policy	Time and Cost
Ministry of Human Services	Unify the functions of CYF and MSD, and the welfare services from the Health and Education sectors.	<p>No new CE appointments require.</p> <p>Management initiatives endorsed</p> <p>Leadership accepts the problem definition</p> <p>Health and Education services for children and youth at risk can be separated out respective ministries.</p>	<p>This option would be likely to encourage system-wide management across the spectrum of preventative-remedial child and family services.</p> <p>MSD currently takes a system-wide management approach and reassesses business processes</p>	<p>The new Ministry would need to build a completely new MIS to meet the diverse policy and operational roles associated with this option.</p> <p>There has been a history of MSD prioritising management information and valuing research and evaluation.</p> <p>MSD has the methodology and processes needed to cost the baselines</p>	<p>This structure does not improve Youth Justice Capability. This will require the Youth Justice Capability Review to be completed and implemented.</p>	<p>Organisational change can be a catalyst for culture change.</p>	<p>Places accountability for all child and welfare policy with a single CE thus reducing fragmentation.</p> <p>Encourages Clearer trade-offs between prevention and remedial work.</p> <p>Builds on MSD existing research and policy capability and reputation.</p> <p>There has been a history of Care and Protection policy being a low priority for MSD.</p>	<p>Places accountability for all child and welfare policy and operations with a single CE thus creating a strong incentive to reduce the gap between operations and policy.</p> <p>Shorter feedback loops from operations to care and protection policy due to being in a single organisation.</p> <p>It does not join youth justice policy and operations.</p>	<p>Higher fiscal cost</p> <p>May “affect” Health and Education staff depending on how clearly staff can be identified for transfer.</p> <p>Likely to delay implementation of change due to the length of time to establish which parts of Health and Education to transfer.</p> <p>Programme from BLR and other CYF performance improvement programmes can continue.</p>