Report commissioned
by Minderoo Foundation

Activating Civic and Community Participation

Growing participation, hope and belonging.
Learning from twelve months of inquiry across communities, systems and behaviours.



Centre for Public Impact
Founded by BCG

the good shift

THE BEHAVIOUR CHANGE COLLABORATIVE

Contents

Executive Summary 1

Introduction 5

Unlocking the conditions for participation 8

Three Streams of Inquiry 10

Key Insights 12

What the research tells us 14

Key recommendations 27

Conclusion 28

Audience and purpose

This report is written for the ecosystem of people, communities and organisations working to support greater participation in communities.

This document is a synthesis of what we learnt and how we undertook the work in this 12-month foundational phase of enquiry and action research. It does not present a single model or blueprint. It shares patterns and conditions that appeared consistently across places and methods, and outlines implications for practice, policy and funding. It is intended to be useful to practitioners, funders and policymakers.



Executive Summary

Why this work

Across Australia, concerns about disconnection, declining trust and uneven participation in civic and community life are increasingly visible. At the same time, many communities continue to organise, care for one another and take action in ways that are informal, locally grounded and often overlooked by policy, funding and institutional systems.

Participation matters because it shapes the conditions people rely on every day - trust, social support and a sense of belonging. Where these are strong, families and children are more likely to do well.

One of our primary outcomes in the Minderoo 2030 Strategy that all children in Australia reach their full potential in thriving communities This work is about understanding how participation contributes to that outcome, and where philanthropy can help strengthen the conditions that make it possible.

Through the Activating Civic and Community Participation (ACCP) project, Minderoo has set out to better understand how participation actually operates in people's lives. We wanted to understand what enables participation, what constrains it, and where philanthropy can play a constructive role in strengthening the conditions that allow participation to take root and endure. We collaborated with three partners; The Good Shift, The Centre for Public Impact and The Behaviour Change Collaborative to help tackle this challenge.

This paper reflects what we have learned so far. It does not present a finished model or a single solution. Instead, it shares a set of insights drawn from twelve months of inquiry, grounded in community experience, systems analysis and behavioural evidence.

How we approached the work

Minderoo commissioned three partners to undertake complementary lines of inquiry into civic and community participation across Australia:

The Centre for Public Impact Australia and New Zealand (CPI)

A not-for-profit organisation that works with governments and public servants to reimagine government, focusing on building legitimacy and fostering innovation.

The Good Shift (TGS)

An organisation that works with communities, philanthropies, governments, industry and systems innovation collectives to grow the capabilities, conditions and infrastructures that support transitions towards better futures for more people, in more places and for the planet.

The Behaviour Change Collaborative (The BCC)

The Behaviour Change Collaborative is a social enterprise working collaboratively to address health, social and environmental challenges.

Each of these partners explored civic and community participation from distinct but complementary perspectives using different methodologies to identify both grassroots and systemic challenges and opportunities through an iterative, collaborative approach.

The Good Shift focused on place-based, community-centred learnings grounded in the lived reality of experienced activators. The Centre for Public Impact focused on system-level conditions including governance, policy, funding and power. The Behaviour Change Collaborative focused on behavioural, social and contextual influences on participation in everyday life drawing heavily on lived experience of community members in six communities across Australia.

Collectively, the work engaged more than 400 people through interviews, community-led research activities, community immersions, workshops and fieldwork across more than a dozen locations, including regional centres, outer metropolitan areas, First Nations perspectives, and places experiencing social, economic or environmental pressure.

Over twelve months, these strands of work were brought together alongside Minderoo's own learning, via 'weaving' conversations, to build a more complete picture of participation than any single lens could provide.

What this foundational phase has produced

This first phase of ACCP has generated a shared narrative about the conditions that enable and constrain participation, a clearer understanding of how personal, social and structural factors interact, and a substantial body of systems, behavioural and community-grounded evidence.

These strands form a credible foundation for understanding participation as it is experienced in practice, not just as it is designed in theory. What follows is a shared consolidation of thinking across all partners thinking, produced through repeated weavings and is attributed to a collective effort.

What we learned together

We've known that what works in one place doesn't necessarily work in another. However, some common patterns emerge which signpost how we might support participation in diverse contexts.

Participation doesn't stand still, so funding needs to adapt

Participation is enabled or inhibited by many different things, and we need philanthropic approaches that can engage with multiple approaches simultaneously. In addition to thinking about 'what' is being funded, it is important to think about 'how' things are funded.

Participation is shaped by context and conditions

Participation is dynamic rather than static. It changes as people's circumstances change and as the environments around them enable or constrain involvement. Strengthening participation requires a learning posture rather than fixed models or one-off interventions.

Participation is core community infrastructure

Across the work, participation consistently emerged as a core community infrastructure. The spaces, organisations, relationships and processes that allow people to connect and act together require intentional investment, maintenance and adaptation over time.

Barriers to participation in many communities are structural and contextual

Barriers to participation compound across personal, social and structural layers. In the communities that were engaged, opportunity and capability emerged as the primary conditions for participation. When either is constrained, participation does not occur, regardless of motivation.

Participation, power and sustained agency

Sustained participation is strongest where people have a real stake in outcomes through shared assets, governance or ownership. Participation becomes more durable when linked to tangible benefit, shared responsibility and accountability.

The systems behind participation matter

Insurance, compliance, risk settings and funding rules often determine whether community-led activity can proceed. Addressing these factors is essential if participation is to be enabled.



Across all three streams, one finding was consistent: participation is rarely constrained by a lack of motivation.

People generally want to participate when participation feels relevant, safe and worthwhile.

Participation depends on people having the opportunity and capability to engage in ways that fit the realities of their lives.

These conditions are shaped by systems, infrastructure and local context, regardless of an individual's motivation to engage.

Where participation is limited or uneven, the constraints are more often structural and contextual.

These include time pressure, cost, transport, safety, accessibility, confidence, language, trust in institutions and prior experience of exclusion.



Executive Summary

Participation should be understood as core community infrastructure

Like any form of infrastructure, it must be supported, maintained and invested in over time to remain strong and accessible.

Implications for funding and investment

Short term funding approaches were consistently flagged as a major issue indicating how choices about time horizons, risk tolerance, reporting and governance actively shape participation levels. This means treating the spaces, organisations, relationships and processes that allow people to connect and act together as something to invest in, maintain, and innovate. When we adopt this framing, it shifts philanthropy's leverage point:

- from funding participation activities
- to supporting communities to own, govern and sustain their own ***resourcing environments in which participation can more readily occur.***

Conclusion

This work shows that philanthropy can play a meaningful role in strengthening civic and community life by investing in the conditions that make participation possible.

We share this synthesis as a contribution to the ecosystem. The focus now is for the ecosystem to put these insights into practice, testing them in real contexts, and strengthening what holds over time.

The full repository of artefact, insights and recommendations can be accessed here:

Scan the code to access the full repository

Introduction

Community and civic participation is often the invisible underpinning of human flourishing. It shapes the everyday conditions people rely on trust, connection, support and a sense of belonging that sit beneath stronger outcomes for families and children.

Across Australia, concerns about disconnection, declining trust and uneven participation in civic and community life are increasingly visible. At the same time, many communities continue to organise, care for one another and take action in ways that are informal, locally grounded and often overlooked by policy, funding and institutional systems.

Participation in community life makes a material difference to how people experience their everyday lives. Where people are connected, able to contribute and have a voice, stronger conditions follow - trust between people and institutions, social support networks, shared norms, and a sense of belonging. These are the foundations that shape whether families and children experience stability, opportunity and hope.

Through the development of our 2030 Strategy, Minderoo identified participation as a critical system condition underpinning of one of our primary outcomes: that all children in Australia reach their full potential in thriving communities.

The working hypothesis we took into this work is that participation is not a peripheral outcome, but a core lever in shaping child, family and community wellbeing. It is best understood as part of the system infrastructure that determines who has access, who has voice, and who is supported to contribute.

When participation is strong, communities are more resilient, better able to respond to shocks, and more capable of supporting children to thrive over the long term. Where participation is weak or uneven, outcomes are fragmented and inequitable, regardless of service provision.

This shift in understanding is increasingly reflected across philanthropy. There is growing recognition that funding services alone is insufficient if the underlying conditions for participation are not in place. Funders must focus more deliberately on strengthening the enabling conditions for participation, including social infrastructure, local relationships, access, and communityled decision making, as a pathway to more durable impact.

Put simply: when people are connected, engaged and able to act together in their communities, families and children are more likely to do well. This work is about understanding what makes that possible, and where philanthropy can most effectively help strengthen those conditions at scale.

Through the **Activating Civic and Community Participation (ACCP)** project, Minderoo set out to better understand what enables participation, what gets in the way, and how philanthropy can support the conditions that allow participation to take root and endure as a first step towards a longer-term approach to supporting participation.


This project looked at participation as something real and practical an observable action, a behaviour – not as an outcome of a program but how people actually show up, connect and take part in their communities day to day.

The model that was developed through our initial theory of change process is shown in Figure 1. This served as a working hypothesis for the early design of the project. It brought together our early assumptions about the conditions that enable active civic and community participation, including trust and belonging, shared identity, hope, social connection and community agency. Rather than treating these relationships as fixed, we used the model to shape the project scope, identify key learning questions, and guide the design of our research and engagement activities.

> When people are connected, engaged and empowered in their communities, families and children are more likely to thrive.

Figure 1:

An initial working hypothesis of active civic and community participation.



Unlocking the conditions for participation

Participation takes many forms. It shows up differently across places, relationships and moments, shaped by people's everyday lives and the conditions around them.

Minderoo has been exploring the role of philanthropy in strengthening communities in this context, looking at how funding can not only respond to challenges but also build the conditions for more connected communities where families can thrive.

This work looks at the conditions that support participation in community and civic life, grounded in lived experience and evidence of what works. Increasing participation supports stronger health and wellbeing, especially for young children and families.

What this work shows

Focusing on the conditions that sit behind participation

We see a clear link between participation and the everyday conditions people rely on – trust, connection, support and a sense of belonging. Strengthening these conditions helps create communities where families and children have stability, opportunity and hope.

Moving from activity to involvement

The opportunity is not to create more programs, but to support more people to take an active role in their communities. This means shifting from seeing people as recipients of services to contributors, connectors and leaders in their own places.

A clear role for philanthropy

Philanthropy can make a meaningful difference – not by leading from the front, but by backing the conditions that make participation possible. This includes strengthening relationships, improving access, and supporting community-led efforts that build trust and connection over time.

What we set out to understand

In late 2024, we commissioned three partners, The Good Shift (TGS), Centre for Public Impact (CPI), and The Behaviour Change Collaborative (The BCC), to work with us to explore how philanthropy can support stronger civic and community participation across Australia.

We asked them to:

1. Identify the conditions that make participation possible
2. Understand what is already working and where support is missing
3. Explore how to build a stronger, more connected field over time
4. Surface opportunities that align with a partner-first, place-based approach
5. Consider where there is potential to extend impact beyond individual communities
6. Inform practical next steps that help individuals, organisations and governments address barriers to participation

How we learned together

Each partner undertook a distinct line of inquiry, with each stream focused on a different part of the overall question.

Over twelve months, these streams were brought together alongside Minderoo's own learning to build a shared view and test what was emerging. This helped strengthen the synthesis and reduce blind spots.

We took a **learning out loud** approach throughout. Rather than working in isolation, we shared our thinking as it developed through blogs, web content and regular convenings. This allowed us to test ideas early, stay connected to what others were seeing, and ensure the work reflected what is happening in practice.

We also brought partners together at key points through what we called "project weavings"; bringing together insights from each partner to evolve our thinking.

These sessions focused on:

- surfacing what matters most
- testing assumptions
- being clear about what we know, what is still emerging, and what needs further work

Importantly, the insights and reflections that follow should not be viewed as the output of any single partner or organisation. They represent a shared consolidation of thinking developed through repeated project weavings, ongoing dialogue and collective sense-making across the consortium.


Figure 2:

Ecological Systems Model

Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Model (1974)

Adapted to focus on black youth development and attachment processes in context

(Stern, Barbarin and Cassidy, 2021)



Minderoo's Communities vision: All children in Australia reach their full potential in thriving communities.

Approach

Our approach emphasises the power of local knowledge and lived experience in fostering sustainable change, recognising that the environments surrounding our children significantly influence their development. We create impact either directly through engagement with communities that choose to work with us or through system change that improves the wellbeing of those communities.

Outcomes

1. Young children are developmentally on track and experiencing strong well-being.
2. Families and caregivers are empowered to foster their young child's holistic development.
3. Families experiencing adversity can achieve economic dignity.
4. Communities have the power to accelerate progress on the things that matter most to them.
5. Communities are vibrant and socially cohesive, with safe, sustainable and playable environments.

Three streams of inquiry



Centre for Public Impact

CPI focused on understanding the systemic conditions in which participation happens and creating a shared learning approach for funders. CPI's process drew upon interviews and sense-making workshops with global and Australian thought leaders, as well as community immersions in Shepperton, Victoria. They explored how civic and community participation is shaped not only by different types of funding postures, but also how participation happens and is influenced by interconnected elements.

Through analysis of international and Australian case examples, CPI surfaced productive tensions funders and communities must navigate. To assist with this, they developed a Wayfinding Guide and constellation mapping processes. These resources help funders map the conditions that enable participation and choose funding roles that create space for participation to flourish.

The Good Shift

The Good Shift undertook a place-based, community-centred inquiry into civic and community participation, combining global and Australian evidence reviews with reports and artefacts developed by six Community Researchers from diverse contexts.

These Community Researchers are trusted members of their own communities, engaged to contribute lived experience, local knowledge, and relational insight into how civic and community participation actually operates in everyday life. Their perspectives are rarely captured through traditional research approaches.

TGS explored six key thematics informed by the broader Minderoo 2030 strategy, including:

- Participation that shifts power and outcomes
- Participation that grows gender equity
- Social capital
- Community wealth building
- Climate and disaster resilience
- Social cohesion

These insights have been synthesised into a robust evidence base and menu of strategies. They are the "what" and "why" for any future interventions and are grounded in a place-based community systems lens. The 'how' of participation is viewed from diverse contexts, regional First Nations communities, refugee women's groups and communities impacted by natural disasters.

Unlocking the conditions for participation

The Behaviour Change Collaborative

The Behaviour Change Collaborative undertook a behavioural, community-grounded inquiry into civic and community participation, combining global and Australian evidence review with expert interviews, quantitative analysis and deep community immersions across the six Australian locations illustrated below.

The BCC's immersive fieldwork with residents, community organisations and local government explored how key contexts – neighbourhood-scale participation, volunteering and informal contribution, safety and belonging, time and cost pressures, trust in institutions, physical infrastructure, services, and the role of social norms and personal invitation – are shaped and informed by the lived experience of individuals. The BCC also applied a systems lens to understand how governance and funding mechanisms impact individual and community participation in local settings.



- **Deep community immersions undertaken by The Behaviour Change Collaborative**
- **Deep community immersions undertaken by The Centre for Public Impact**
- **Community Researcher project facilitated by The Good Shift**

What we got

400+ voices
80 interviews
12+ communities engaged

Emerging shared narrative on the enabling conditions for participation

10 core insights and recommendations and a bank of ideas for the ecosystem to take forward

Key systems insights on how personal, social and structural factors interact

100+ actionable strategies, initiatives and recommendations

What the research tells us: *Key insights*

The insights emerged through 12 months of collaborative inquiry, drawing on diverse perspectives across communities, disciplines and contexts. They represent shared patterns and recurring themes, not a checklist or fixed framework.

The goal is not to implement all ten insights everywhere, but to use them as a lens for understanding what participation requires, and where energy and investment might be most usefully directed.

1. **Participation as Core Community Infrastructure**
2. **Influences on participation are rarely about motivation - they are structural and contextual**
3. **Participation barriers compound across 'layers'**
4. **Belonging, agency and sustained participation are influenced by who controls resources, assets and decision-making, not just who is invited into a process**
5. **Start with what already exists rather than building new programs, buildings or institutions**
6. **Focus on the shared learning infrastructure that enables local learning to inform system changes**
7. **We need to evolve and transform the processes and structures that sit behind participation**
8. **Participation is a Developmental Pathway**
9. **Community Participation is a living action**
10. **What becomes possible if we resource community participation?**

> Participation is fundamentally relational, not a program, but a social infrastructure

1 Participation as Core Community Infrastructure

The spaces, organisations, relationships and processes that enable people to connect and act together require deliberate investment, care and adaptation over time, just like any other essential community systems like public transport, local health services or parks and libraries.

Across all streams of work, participation emerges as the "operating system" through which social capital is built, equity is advanced, community wealth is grown, and resilience is strengthened.

Whether participation is framed as a system, a form of infrastructure, or simply as behaviour, the implication is the same. Sustained participation depends on investing in the conditions that enable people to connect, organise and act together over time.

This means treating the spaces, organisations, relationships and processes that allow people to connect and act together as something to invest in, maintain, and innovate.

For philanthropy, impact does not come from funding participation activities alone, but from enabling the structures, relationships and processes that communities can use, adapt and sustain. This means backing the organisations, connectors and shared systems that help people come together and take part over time, rather than only funding one-off programs or events.

Policy/decision makers and funders should treat participation as essential infrastructure to be resourced continuously, not as a discrete project output or a free input to be extracted from communities. Communicating and nurturing participation as a shared and valuable asset could be explored so communities and community members understand and celebrate the broader impacts of their engagement.

Figure 3:
Infrastructures supporting participation





Figure 4:

Elements of civic and community participation

These 37 Elements were developed by CPI as a starting point to help guide funders with a structured and systemic way to consider both the visible and less visible factors that enable and inhibit participation.



2 Influences on participation are rarely about motivation - for many communities they are structural and contextual

Through fieldwork across the teams we saw that people participate when they feel safe, welcome, capable and able to access opportunities that fit the realities of their lives. In these communities participation is strongest where people spend time locally, third spaces are accessible and welcoming, and mechanisms are in place to reduce friction (e.g. community connectors).

Conversely, safety concerns, cost-of-living pressures, fragmented governance, transport barriers and complex volunteering or funding systems undermined involvement. The BCC also called out life-stage differences with participation peaking for parents of young children and retirees, with a drop for working-age adults, and noted that bonding within cultural groups often co-exists with weak bridging across groups, underscoring the need for intentional intercultural connectors.


Participation Gates of Capability and Opportunity

Motivation, Capability and Opportunity are the key participation gates. if any of these are constrained, the desired behaviour (participation) doesn't happen. Time poverty (working long hours or juggling caring roles) is a major barrier, but it's closely linked to economic stress, one reason the work highlights combining economic empowerment with participation opportunities (so people have capacity to participate). Disengagement also often stems from overlapping layers of personal (confidence, skills, health), social (networks, norms, trust) and structural (policies, costs, accessibility). The depiction of these participation gates (below) show that when one "participation gate" (capability or opportunity) is closed, participation drops, regardless of motivation.

> Essentially, you can't "nudge" your way around structural barriers.

Figure 5:

Participation gates of capability and opportunity



*Adapted from the work of Michie et al COM-B model

3 Participation barriers compound across ‘layers’

The work also showed how these barriers compound rather than sit in isolation. For example:

- Time poverty is a function of several factors, most notably, economic stress and changing cultural narratives about the value of ‘free time’
- Lack of confidence is worsened by fragmented social networks
- Structural obstacles (things like compliance, insurance, cost, language) intersect with individual opportunity.


Overcoming barriers requires interventions at multiple levels, personal (agency, skills, confidence), social (networks, norms), and structural (policies, costs, accessibility) rather than a single program or response.

These can be grouped into three layers:

- **Physical, social and demographic context** - place, transport, urban design, shared spaces
- **Basic needs and individual resources** - time, income, safety, confidence, language
- **Accelerators of connection** such as community builders, connectors, shared activities, trusted institutions.

> Participation becomes transformative when it moves from voice to stake – governance, ownership, and community wealth building.

Figure 6:
Summary of enablers and barriers



What the research tells us: Key insights

4 Belonging, agency and sustained participation are shaped by who controls resources, assets and decision-making, not just who is invited into a process

Participation, social capital and economic pathways are intertwined

When communities acquire assets, such as repurposing a vacant building into a community-run enterprise or establishing a neighbourhood-owned supermarket, they don’t just meet local needs and create local jobs, they create reasons to participate and bring people together.

The insights on capability and opportunity suggest that when people have a stake and see tangible benefits, their motivation to engage increases. This prominent insight, which we are broadly defining as **community wealth building** or social wealth building, opens opportunities for interventions that yield both social and economic dividends (e.g. community-owned enterprises providing employment and governed by residents). For funders, this means thinking beyond funding participation activities towards the structures and conditions that enable mechanisms like community-owned assets, social enterprises, community foundations, regenerative economic systems to take root.

Community wealth building transforms participation from voice to economic agency

Australia faces an unprecedented intergenerational wealth transfer of an estimated $3.5 to $5.4 trillion over the coming decades, which, without deliberate intervention, will deepen asset-based inequality. Community wealth building strategies (cooperatives, community land trusts, local procurement by anchor institutions, community investment cooperatives) convert participation into more durable pathways for community ownership and shared economic power.

5 Start with what already exists rather than building new programs, buildings or institutions.

Across communities, there is already a significant base of social, cultural and physical infrastructure that enables people to connect and take part. Social capital, informal leadership, mutual aid and cultural networks are active in many places, particularly in First Nations, migrant and persistently disadvantaged communities. These systems are often trusted, locally grounded and shaped by lived experience.

There is consistent evidence that participation is stronger when investment builds on this existing foundation. This includes resourcing trusted mechanisms such as community connectors, neighbourhood centres and Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations, rather than creating parallel structures that duplicate or displace what already works. These foundations are especially important in First Nations, migrant and persistently disadvantaged communities, where trust and local legitimacy are built over time and cannot be manufactured from outside.

The same applies to physical infrastructure. Parks, libraries, neighbourhood centres and shared community spaces already provide accessible places for connection and participation, yet they are often under-resourced.

A core principle of investment is therefore to start locally. This means identifying what is already working in a place and directing resources to strengthen, adapt and extend that infrastructure over time.



6 Focus on the shared learning infrastructure that enables local learning to inform system changes.

Across the work, it is clear that many oganisations and practitioners are already building participation in practice. Groups like Befriend, Town Team Movement, Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations (ACCOs), neighbourhood centres and other locally rooted organisations are actively supporting participation every day. They create spaces for connection, broker relationships, share knowledge and help people navigate barriers, often working quietly behind the scenes to hold communities together and keep things moving. However, this learning is often fragmented and does not consistently inform wider systems **This creates a clear gap.**

There is a need to invest in shared learning infrastructure that enables local insight to be visible, shared and acted on, to allow learning to accumulate over time by:

- **Connecting practitioners and organisations across places,** so they are not working in isolation
- **Capturing and sharing what is being learned in practice,** including what is working and what is not
- **Enabling local insight to travel beyond individual communities or projects**
- **Linking learning on the ground to decision-making in policy, funding and systems.**

Without this, learning remains local and participation efforts stay fragmented. With it, the day-to-day experience of communities can inform more effective and responsive systems.

For philanthropy, this highlights an opportunity to both fund activity *and* support the conditions that allow learning to flow across the system and strengthen participation over time.

7 We need to evolve and transform the systems that sit behind participation

Requirements around insurance, compliance, risk and grant administration are rarely headline issues, but they frequently determine whether small, community-led initiatives ever start.

Enabling participation therefore means evolving these systems through:

- more flexible, risk-tolerant approaches for small-scale, community-led activity, particularly where the current systems were never designed with grassroots groups in mind.
- pooled or simplified insurance arrangements, lighter-touch investment mechanisms, or streamlined approvals that reduce the burden on volunteers and informal groups.
- Better supports and coverage for backbone or auspicing organisations such as, Community Resource Centres, local community organisations and Local Governments, groups that can hold insurance, manage compliance, or handle the administrative load on behalf of smaller community groups, so local energy isn't spent navigating bureaucracy.

None of this is a quick fix, and much of it sits outside traditional program funding, but they're an important part of the ecosystem if we're serious about enabling participation.

> Focus on the shared learning infrastructure that enables local learning to inform system changes.



Figure 7:

Children and Families and Civic Participation

Graphic: The Good Shift

What participation of children and families looks like

Everyday Relational Participation
Informal engagement through shared meals, community gardens, playgroups, cultural events, neighbourhood spaces, playgrounds that build trust & belonging over time

Early-years Focused Participation
Engagement with early years settings, childcare, schools, parent groups in ways that increase connection, confidence, decision-making & the capacity to navigate systems

Community and Civic Participation
Families, children & young people engage in community activities, volunteering, local governance, neighbourhood initiatives, cultural activities & local economies

Cultural Governance as Participation
First Nations community control & culturally grounded governance models strengthen cultural safety & trust & can increase effective engagement with early years supports

Co-design and Co-production as Participation
Children, young people & families working alongside professionals to research, design, deliver & evaluate services & programs

How participation of children and families produces change

Knowledge and skill development
Participation exposes families to information, resources & skills that improve their capacity to support children's development

Increased self-efficacy
Families who participate in decision-making develop greater confidence in their parenting & advocacy capabilities

Collective efficacy
Mutual trust and shared expectations among residents create the capacity to regulate behaviour, maintain social order and intervene when they notice suspicious activity

Strengthened attachment and relationships
Participation builds trust, strengthens family & community bonds & increases communication between adults & children

Social trust
Founded on belief in honesty & reliability of neighbours & comunity members, built through infomal voluntary initiatives such as neighbourhood associations & interfaith networks

Agency through practice
When children participate in citizens' assemblies, participatory budgeting or community decision-making they develop practical skills & confidence that sustain lifelong democratic habits.

Agency and empowerment
When children & parents are positioned as active agents rather than passive recipients, motivation, engagement & ownership of outcomes increase

Socialisation
From early childhood,family, peers, schools & media introduce children to prevailing social norms & moral codes, shaping their moral education & cognitive nuurturing

Mitigating trauma
Higher social capital reduces the likelihood of childhood mistreatment & supportive social networks can break the link between trauma & criminal behaviour by providing ongoing support & attachment

Participation is strongly linked to better outcomes for children and families

Participation of children and young people is linked to stronger communities

Participation of children and young people grows stronger democracies and economies

The outcomes that participation of children and families generates

The effects are strongest when participation is sustained, place-based, culturally grounded, and embedded in everyday community life rather than delivered as time-limited interventions

Family engagement in children's learning environment (inc. pre-school), is associated with stronger social-emotional development in children, school attendance & completion

Stronger informal support networks (social capital) reduce isolation & support parenting – recognised as protective for children, & are linked to better childhood outcomes generally

Intergenerational bonding & bridging social capital improves school performance, moderates bad behaviour & reduces youth crime / arrests

Active co-design of youth & family friendly spaces & events are associated with reduction of crime in neighbourhoods

Youth civic activities & democratic activities are bidirectional: institutions shape opportunities & youth led initatives can contribute to shaping democratic reforms & policies

Participatory, community-based support reduces demand on acute & statutory services, generating savings that can be redirected towards further preventative investment – creating and economics of prevention

Neighbourhood connectedness, trust & informal networks significantly improve cognitive & socio-emotional skills in children

Diverse community relationships in childhood (beyond the family) have been found to contribute meaningfully to developmental trajectories.

Growing evidence for an intergenerational transmission effect where informal community engagement by parents fosters civic capability in children

Young people who are more connected to & willing to participate / contribute to their neighbourhoods are significantly less likely to endorse or use violence

Early investments in activating civic & community participation through early childhood & family initiatives create the foundation for participation across lifetimes

School-based civic initiatives can promote long-term civic & political participation & thereby strengthen social trust & create foundations for democracy & cohesion

8 Participation is a Spectrum

Participation is a progression and not necessarily a linear pathway. It requires a first step, and a relevant and individually feasible entry point across the spectrum.

At each step along this pathway, capability and confidence build on themselves – small acts of involvement can foster new skills and relationships, which in turn open the door to deeper engagement and greater power. In this way, participation isn't just parallel to other goals like health, education or economic inclusion – it is the route through which those outcomes are achieved.

This means participation needs to be understood as something that meets people where they are.

In practice:

- People require **entry points that match their current capacity and context**
- These entry points vary across the life course and across different social and economic circumstances
- For many, **small and accessible forms of participation can open the door to deeper involvement over time,** although this progression is not linear or the same for everyone.

Well established participation infrastructure provides a range of ways for people to engage, from low-barrier entry points through to opportunities for deeper involvement and shared leadership.

Factors such as personal capacity, confidence, life stage, cultural context and access to local opportunities all shape how people are able to take part at any given point in time.

> Participation, connectedness, equity, and resilience form a single living system with social and economic benefits.

9 Community Participation is a living action

Community participation is the collective expression of countless acts of contribution, connection and involvement that shape community life.

Participation depends on an individual's capability and opportunity within their life context. Arts, culture, community sport and creativity play an important role in shaping both. They provide accessible pathways for people to connect with others, express identity, share stories, contribute to community life and exercise agency.

The social, relational and physical infrastructure of a community can accelerate, enable or constrain participation. This includes not only community organisations, networks and places, but also the creative and cultural assets that bring people together. Libraries, community arts organisations, sporting associations, festivals, cultural institutions, local artists, makerspaces and informal creative networks all provide opportunities for participation and connection. Addressing barriers requires crafting solutions that open capability and/or opportunity "gates" for individuals, groups and whole communities.

When participation is present, social ties deepen, health improves, trust grows, democratic engagement strengthens, and communities become more resilient; when it erodes, loneliness, distrust, and polarisation feed each other in a downward spiral.

Interviews and community research underscore that participation is an active process. People build connections, foster cohesion and strengthen social capital by doing things together.

Arts, culture, creativity and sport can support this journey by helping people express identity, strengthen belonging, imagine new possibilities and act collectively. In doing so, they build the agency, trust and collective capacity that enable communities to shape their own futures and well-being.



10 What becomes possible if we resource community participation?

When we properly resource participation as essential infrastructure, a new set of possibilities opens up for communities. This means investing in the conditions that allow people to connect, contribute and lead: spaces to gather, roles that support and bridge, systems that reduce friction, and platforms that amplify voice and agency. When these elements are in place, participation becomes a catalyst. Communities are better able to generate their own solutions, steward shared assets, and respond to challenges with confidence and creativity. Figure 8 overleaf illustrates how resourcing participation unlocks a chain of positive effects, from stronger social ties and local leadership to more inclusive governance and improved outcomes in health, education, safety and economic resilience.

What starts to unravel if we don't resource community participation

Without the social and physical infrastructure that enables people to connect, contribute and lead, communities begin to unravel. Disconnection grows, trust erodes, and the burden of care falls on fewer shoulders. Local leadership burns out, informal networks weaken, and the capacity to respond to challenges diminishes. Over time, this leads to disengagement, disillusionment and a loss of collective confidence.
Figure 9 illustrates how the absence of participation support can trigger a downward spiral, from isolation and civic withdrawal to poorer outcomes in health, education and economic resilience. When participation is neglected, we lose more than engagement. We lose the relationships, routines and shared purpose that hold communities together.

Figure 8:

Systems map showing the positive connections that are associated with increased civic and community participation



Graphic: The Good Shift

Figure 9:

Systems map showing the negative connections that are associated with decreased civic and community participation



Graphic: The Good Shift

Funding implications

Participation is always evolving and requires a learning posture from funders.

Strengthening participation requires more than good ideas or short-term projects. It requires a shift in how we think about funding - from transactional grants to long-term investment in the conditions that make participation possible.

One approach developed by the Centre for Public Impact emphasises working iteratively, learning as you go, and adapting to changing conditions rather than trying to design fixed solutions upfront.

Setting up to wayfind – choosing a funding posture

	I want to … solve a problem by funding a specific solution	I want to … contribute to a desired outcome	I want to … scale a project or approach to that is already underway
Funder as expert	Specific problem and solution are pre-defined by funder.	Desired outcome and intervention are defined by funder.	Scaling what works.
	Example: Disaster Relief Grants Most appropriate when funders have identified a desired state	**Example: Social Impact Bond - Play2Learn+** Most appropriate when funders have identified a desired state they are working towards and seek to progress through funding intervention/s but don't have sufficient time, authority or capacity to involve funding recipients in designing the solution	**Example: Men's Sheds** Most appropriate when funder wants to scale a program that has been proven effective
Funder as collaborator	Specific problem is pre-defined by funder, solution is created by recipient or co-created with funder.	Desired outcome is defined by funder but intervention is created by recipient or co-created with funder.	Scaling what works in the grantee's context.
	Example: Future Drought Fund Community Impact Program Most appropriate when there is a complex problem that aligns with the funders' priorities and focus areas and there is sufficient time and funding available to invite community into the process of co-creating specific solution/s	**Example: Stronger Places Stronger People** Most appropriate when a desired outcome that aligns with the funders' priorities and focus areas and there is sufficient time and funding available to invite community into the process of co-creating specific solution/s	**Example: Community Hubs Australia's Place based approach** Most appropriate when a funder wants to scale an approach, rather than a specific program, and that approach can be adapted to meet local needs and contexts
Funder as Field Builder	Specific problem and solution/s are defined by a coalition of actors working together.	Desired outcome and interventions are defined by a coalition of actors working together.	Scaling the conditions that make change possible. (Scaling Deep)
	Example: Boundless Epics Most appropriate when the funder believes that the way to address a problem is to bring together a collection of partners who will work together to define the problem from a variety of angles, and develop a range of solutions	**Example: Paul Ramsay Foundation's Peer-to-Peer Program** Most appropriate when cultivating relationships and networks between different actors and building capacity amongst grantees is seen as a priority (see Participatory Grantmaking Report)	**Example: Wolfville Community Oven.** Most appropriate when funders want to focus on shifting relationships, cultural beliefs and values - and have the funding, time to invest in learning and relationships

Funding postures

While funders face real constraints, including risk settings, accountability requirements and delivery pressures, this work shows that investing in learning and relationships is both practical and widely accessible, regardless of where a funder starts. (see Table opposite)

The Centre for Public Impact's wayfinding approach is helpful here. It recognises that funders tend to operate from different starting points, which CPI describes as three broad postures: Expert, Collaborator and Field-builder. Rather than prescribing a single model, this approach meets funders where they are and provides a path to learn, test assumptions and gradually shift away from short-term, output-driven funding.

As funders move toward more collaborative and field-oriented approaches, the focus shifts from funding delivery to supporting stewardship of the system over time. This includes:

- Providing multi-year, flexible funding to organisations that act as backbone infrastructure
- Resourcing community connectors and local governance roles
- Supporting learning and adaptation, rather than expecting fixed outcomes upfront.

CPI's wayfinding framework also provides a practical lens for navigating this work. It highlights three parts of the system that funders need to pay attention to:

- **Elements:** the visible parts of the system, such as programs, organisations and activities
- **Constellations:** the relationships and patterns that connect these elements across places and actors
- **Dark matter:** the underlying conditions that shape how the system behaves, including trust, power, norms and incentives.

Taken together, this reinforces a consistent insight from this work. While it is often easier to fund visible elements, lasting impact depends on also engaging with the relationships and underlying conditions that sit beneath them.

In practice, applying a wayfinding approach means working across all three parts of the system. It means supporting what is already happening on the ground, strengthening the connections between people and organisations, and investing in the less visible conditions that enable participation to take root and grow over time.

More information about the Wayfaring Guide can be found here: LINK/QR Code PLEASE!


Figure 10:

Factors constraining funding postures

Different contextual pressures and considerations may dictate which funding style is (or is not) possible.

These factors often constrain possible funding postures.

Graphic: Centre for Public Impact




Considering investment strategies

To realise the full potential of participation, we need to move away from fragmented, short-term funding and towards investment strategies that build the structural conditions for participation to take root and grow. The images (see Figure 11) show how this shift can be made tangible. They illustrate how investment in participation infrastructure such as shared community assets, local governance capability and relational roles can create the environment that allows people to connect, contribute and lead.

By investing in the foundations that communities can own, govern and sustain, we create the conditions for participation to become a lasting force for wellbeing, equity and resilience. These strategies offer a practical way to move beyond transactional funding and towards long-term,

Figure 11:
Investment Strategies for Activating Civic and Community Participation



Strategy	What it builds	Test Question
A **Enabling conditions**	Capacity, coordination, material supports, informal infrastructure	Are the conditions in place for people to participate?
B **Shared Assets**	Ownership, wealth, economic agency, community-controlled capital	Does participation lead to assets communities own?
C **Pathways to Power**	Decision authority, governance capability, institutional reform	Who decides? Does participation shift who holds power?
D **Belonging Infrastructure**	Trust, connection, bridging capital, resilience infrastructure	Do people feel they belong? Are divisions being bridged?
E **Rewiring Funding Cultures**	Sustainable, adaptive, learning oriented resourcing	Is funding practice itself enabling or undermining participation?

These investment principles bring the recommendations together. They translate the evidence from this work into a clear set of choices about how to fund participation in ways that are practical, consistent and sustained over time.

Long-term, flexible and relational

Back participation as something that builds over time, by investing in trust, relationships and local capability rather than short-term delivery.

Start with what exists

Strengthen the social, cultural and physical infrastructure communities already rely on, rather than building parallel programs or institutions.

Participation as core infrastructure

Fund participation with the same consistency and seriousness as other essential infrastructure, recognising its role in enabling wider outcomes.

Power shifts to communities

Move beyond engagement toward community influence and control over decisions, resources and priorities.

Participation builds wealth

Support participation as a pathway to both social and economic outcomes, including local ownership, shared assets and community-led development.

Equitable by design

Reduce structural barriers so participation is possible in practice, not just encouraged in principle.

Learning as a shared asset

Invest in shared learning infrastructure so insights from practice can travel, inform decisions and strengthen the system over time.

Taken together, these principles are less about what to fund, and more about how to fund in ways that strengthen participation consistently, credibly and at scale.



Key recommendations for policy and funding

These recommendations are drawn from the collective insights generated across twelve months of inquiry, bringing together the perspectives of the Centre for Public Impact, The Good Shift and The Behaviour Change Collaborative. They reflect a shared synthesis of what enables participation in practice, grounded in lived experience, evidence and cross-disciplinary learning.

Treat participation as core community infrastructure

One of the clearest messages from this work is that participation should be treated as core community infrastructure that must be supported, maintained and invested in over time. Across the ACCP work, participation consistently emerges as a foundational condition for trust, belonging, local leadership, resilience and more durable outcomes for families and children.

Participation depends on how people's motivation, capability and opportunity interact with the wider conditions around them – relationships, local infrastructure, institutions and policy settings. When these elements work together, participation grows and communities are better able to support families and children. When they do not, participation remains uneven and outcomes are harder to sustain.

For policy and funding, this means resourcing the people, places and systems that make participation possible with the same seriousness we bring to other essential infrastructure. It also means recognising that many other outcomes, including child and family wellbeing, are harder to achieve or sustain where participation is weak or uneven.

Start with what already exists and strengthen it

Social capital, informal leadership, mutual aid, and cultural networks already operate in communities, particularly in First Nations, migrant and persistently disadvantaged contexts. Outcomes are stronger when investment reinforces these existing foundations. This includes resourcing community connectors, neighbourhood centres, community hubs and Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations, rather than creating parallel structures that duplicate, displace or weaken what communities already rely on.

Existing physical infrastructure such as libraries, parks, arts and cultural spaces, community halls, sporting facilities, and neighbourhood centres also matter here. These are often the places where people first connect, participate and build confidence, yet they are frequently under-resourced.

A first principle of investment should therefore be to engage locally, identify what is already working, and strengthen the relationships, places and local capability that allow participation to grow in context. The evidence base shows that when investments focus on a single intervention in isolation, or pilots are developed without understanding the conditions they operate within, engagement is difficult to sustain and the enabling relationships - the 'dark matter' that drives participation - are often missed.

Stronger outcomes come from strengthening the connections between these social and physical assets and investing in the relationships and local capability that allow them to work together as a system.

Funders must rewire their own practices, not just fund community change

Transforming participation requires more than new community initiatives. It also requires funders to change how they behave. The evidence base generated through this project points to the limits of isolated interventions and the importance of understanding the conditions, relationships and tensions that shape participation in context.

In practice, this means shifting away from compliance-heavy, short-term approaches toward ways of working that are more relational, flexible and grounded in how communities operate. This includes adopting approaches like participatory grant making or other partner engaged models, committing to Indigenous Data Sovereignty, replacing rigid reporting with community-defined learning, co-designing measurement so it is useful and proportionate, and investing in capability building infrastructure such as shared learning networks and narrative work.

Funders must also support community change and make it easier for participation to happen through the way they fund, measure and operate. This includes using institutional voice to influence policy, embedding participation objectives across programs, sharing learning across teams and organisations, and deploying flexible forms of capital to support community-led activity, de-risk early-stage ideas and enable local asset ownership.

Fund the connectors, coordinators and backbone roles that hold participation together

Across the communities we explored, these enabling roles took many forms: community builders who personally invite people into local activities, neighbourhood centres that provide trusted spaces for connection, Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations that anchor participation in culture and place, local governments that convene diverse stakeholders, and backbone organisations that align effort across multiple community groups. Their contribution is often invisible, but without them participation is significantly harder to sustain.

These roles are high-leverage and chronically underfunded. The research points to the importance of funding connector roles as ongoing community infrastructure, not as short-term add-ons to projects. It also points to the value of backbone organisations that can provide coordination, governance, compliance cover, training and practical support that smaller groups and volunteers cannot carry alone.

For policy and funding, this means expanding what counts as investable. If connectors, coordinators and community builders are essential to participation, they need to be recognised and funded as such.



Create low-barrier entry points into participation

The work makes clear that participation is developmental. People do not move from disengagement to participation in one step. In many contexts, participation begins through small, familiar and low-pressure forms of involvement such as local events, arts, cultural and sporting activities, volunteering, shared meals, community gardens or neighbourhood projects.

This matters because participation is shaped by life stage, confidence, time, income, safety and access. Many people need entry points that fit the realities of their lives. That means policy and funding should not only back formal civic processes, but also invest in the smaller, informal and local opportunities that allow people to take a first step and build trust, capability and confidence over time.

Enabling intermediary organisations such as community foundations, neighbourhood centres, local governments, community hubs and community building entities to quickly and easily deploy small, flexible micro-grants are one practical example of this. They can help spark local activity, create quick wins and lower the threshold for participation, especially when paired with trusted local support. These organisations are often deeply connected to local networks and can identify opportunities, back emerging leaders and support community-led ideas before they are visible to larger funders.

Removing the structural friction that quietly blocks participation

People are much more likely to participate when they feel safe, welcome, capable and able to access opportunities that fit the realities of their lives. Participation often drops not because people do not care, but because the systems around them make it too difficult.

This includes burdens such as complex insurance arrangements, compliance requirements, funding rules, reporting obligations, planning controls, permit systems, transport barriers, cost pressures and the lack of accessible spaces. These are rarely headline issues, but they often determine whether community-led action gets off the ground at all.




Figure 12:
Civic and community infrastructure

Key recommendations for policy and funding

Invest in shared learning infrastructure and field capability

A further implication of the work is that local learning needs to travel. Across communities, practitioners and organisations are already testing, adapting and learning in real time. But too often these insights remain local, fragmented or invisible to the wider system.

This creates a strong case for investing in shared learning infrastructure. That includes peer learning networks, field-building platforms, convenings, narrative work and other mechanisms that help practitioners, funders and policymakers share what is working, what is not, and what conditions matter most in different places. Examples from other sectors already exist, including communities of practice for peer workers, lived-experience practitioners and community sector leaders. These networks allow practitioners to regularly share insights, reflect on challenges, develop common resources and build collective capability.

There is a need to reframe the role of funding. The task is not simply to fund activity, but to invest in the conditions that allow participation to take root, adapt and endure.

This means funding not only the people, organisations, places and systems that enable connection, but also the learning infrastructure that helps communities test ideas, share insights, adapt to changing conditions and build on what works over time. Participation is shaped by context, so the goal is not to replicate fixed models, but to strengthen communities' capacity to learn, respond and evolve in ways that fit local realities.

Without this, the sector will continue to generate isolated projects and partial insight. With it, local practice can inform broader system change, and investment can become more responsive, coordinated and useful over time.

Shift funding from short-term activity to long-term stewardship of conditions

Across the evidence base, short-term, output-driven funding comes through as one of the most consistent barriers to sustained participation. Trust, local leadership, skills, civic confidence and community assets build over time. They are undermined when funding is fragmented, time-limited or narrowly tied to pre-set deliverables.

The implication is not simply that grants should be longer. It is that funders need to shift from funding activity alone to stewarding the conditions that allow participation to take root and endure. This includes multi-year core funding for community hubs and spaces, long-term support for backbone and connector roles, and flexible investment that allows communities and intermediaries to learn and adapt over time.

This is where the work also sharpens the distinction between visible, time-bound initiatives and deeper structural investment. If the goal is lasting change, funding must move beyond what is easy to showcase and toward the people, organisations and systems that hold participation together between projects, events and funding cycles.

Shift power, not just participation

The work also reinforces that meaningful participation is not just about being consulted or invited in. It is about who shapes the agenda, who holds decision-making power, and who controls resources, assets and governance.

For policy and funding, this means going beyond engagement processes and creating pathways for communities to influence decisions before priorities and criteria are set. It also means backing participatory governance, community-controlled mechanisms, lived experience leadership and local capability to exercise real decision-making power over time. Without this shift, participation risks remaining extractive and symbolic.

It also means committing to longer time horizons.

Evidence from interviews and the literature consistently shows that trust, skills, and community assets accumulate over time and are undermined by short funding cycles. The Peter McKenzie Project in New Zealand (17 years, $17m) illustrates how dissolving the boundary between funder and funded can produce network-based, community-driven change rather than hierarchical grant relationships. This also has implications for how funders think about exit. Too often, success is measured by what a program delivers while funding is present. A participation lens suggests a different question: what remains when the funding ends? Sustainable exit strategies focus on ensuring communities have the relationships, capabilities, resources and infrastructure needed to continue shaping their own future long after external support has been withdrawn.

Radical governance

We heard that 'scale' is the enemy of participation and that the latter is strongest at local level and when grounded in purpose. While governance currently emphasises scale, standardisation and uniformity, participation is local, contextual and messy.

Leadership is a necessary component of effective governance. However current approaches do not adequately recognise there are multiple forms of leadership legitimacy, and that at a local level, leadership is socially conferred rather than structurally assigned.

Radical governance would see decision-making rights, accountability and power at the smallest viable scale, and an acceptance that 'messiness' is a feature of a healthy governance system, not a failure.

Radical governance would allow space for leadership to emerge in place, rather than be appointed elsewhere. It would also allow for the creation of roles that are temporary, more task-based and earned through contribution and community standing. Policy and funding therefore need to treat structural friction as a core intervention point. This means simplifying requirements for grassroots activity, streamlining approvals, reducing administrative burden, and designing funding in ways that fit community realities rather than institutional convenience.

Participation declines when compliance burdens are high (or insurmountable), engagement feels bureaucratic and prescribed roles are regimented and long-term. A radical approach to governance would see governance itself become more meaningful and socially rewarding. Radical governance systems could be designed for motivation first, management second.

Conclusion

Across the inquiry, participation was best understood not as a discrete program output or as something communities can be invited into after decisions have been made, but as part of the core infrastructure of community life.

If the people, places, relationships and systems that enable participation are under-resourced, participation becomes fragile. If they are strengthened, communities are better able to support families and children, respond to shocks, steward shared assets and shape the decisions that affect their lives.

Low or uneven participation is rarely about motivation alone. People take part when they feel safe, welcome and capable; when there are accessible places and trusted people to connect them; and when participation fits the realities of their lives.

This means strengthening civic and community life requires more than programs, campaigns or invitations. It requires investment in the conditions that make participation possible: trusted relationships, local infrastructure, community connectors, supportive institutions and pathways into contribution.

The work also points to a clear starting point: strengthen what communities already hold. Across places, participation is often sustained through local relationships, cultural networks, informal leadership, mutual aid, volunteers, community hubs, neighbourhood centres, Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations, sport, arts, shared spaces and everyday acts of care. Effective investment does not begin by creating parallel activity. It begins by listening locally, identifying what is already trusted, and resourcing the people, places and practices communities use to connect and act together.

For philanthropy, this requires a different posture. If participation is core community infrastructure, it cannot be funded as a short-term project or treated as a free input. It requires long-term, flexible and relational investment in the connective work that holds participation together: connectors, coordinators, backbone roles, local governance capability, shared learning, facilitation, relationship-building and practical support that reduces administrative burden. It also requires funders and system leaders to examine their own settings, because risk, reporting, procurement, insurance, measurement and governance can either open opportunity or quietly close it down.

The deeper implication is about power. Meaningful participation is not only about who is consulted, invited or engaged. It is about who helps define problems, shape priorities, control resources, govern assets and benefit from what is built. Participation becomes durable when communities have a real stake in outcomes through shared assets, community-governed funds, participatory governance, local ownership and decision-making power. The task is not simply to increase participation, but to make participation consequential.

This synthesis provides a clearer way to see the conditions that allow participation to take root, and a stronger basis for action across policy, philanthropy and practice. If funders, policymakers and practitioners act on this, participation can become more than something communities are asked to do. It can become an everyday foundation for trust, belonging, shared agency and better futures for children and families.

> This is where philanthropy can make a meaningful difference: by backing the conditions that allow communities not only to take part, but to shape what comes next.

MINDEROO FOUNDATION

minderoo.org



Centre for Public Impact
Founded by BCG

the good shift

THE BEHAVIOUR CHANGE COLLABORATIVE