HOPE Reconciliation Progress Monitoring Framework

How to Use the Framework

The HOPE Reconciliation Progress Monitoring Framework has been developed to support in monitoring its reconciliation activities and organistional development over time. It provides a practical and consistent way for HOPE to document progress, identify areas requiring further attention and ensure reconciliation remains an ongoing organistional commitment. The framework is designed to be used from the beginning of HOPE's reconciliation capacity-building process and was informed by Sarah Chapman's Environmental-program Monitoring framework. HOPE should first complete a baseline assessment (month 0) to establish its current position, followed by reviews at approximately 3 months, 6 months and 12 months.

At each review, HOPE can record actions undertaken, evidence of progress, challenges or barriers, responsibilities and priorities for the next review period. The framework is intended to support reflection, learning and accountability rather than operate as a compliance checklist. Progress should therefore be considered in terms of the quality and sustainability of organistional change, rather than simply the number of activities completed. Attention should be given to cultural safety, respectful engagement, organistional commitment and avoiding tokenistic practices or unnecessary cultural load on First Nations peoples and organisations. At the 12-month review, HOPE can use the evidence collected throughout the monitoring period to reconsider its organistional readiness and determine whether to continue capacity-building activities or explore progressing towards a formal Reflect Reconciliation Action Plan.

Rating Guide:

Rating	Meaning
Not started	No action has commenced
Early progress	Initial discussions/actions have commenced
In progress	Meaningful and consistent action is occurring
Embedded	Practice has become part of normal HOPE operations
Not applicable	Not currently relevant

Area	What are we monitoring?	Baseline	Target/action	Evidence of achievement	Responsibility	3 months	6 months	12 months
Commitment and leadership	Management Committee demonstrates ongoing commitment to reconciliation							
Responsibility	A person/small group has responsibility for coordinating actions							
Resources	Appropriate time, volunteer capacity and funding are considered							
Cultural learning	Volunteers have opportunities to develop cultural knowledge							
Cultural safety	Cultural Safety Checklist is completed and identified improvements are addressed							
Communication	Website, documents and communications use culturally respectful language							
Acknowledgement of Country	Appropriate Acknowledgement is incorporated into relevant HOPE practices							

First Nations engagement	Engagement is respectful, voluntary and avoids cultural load							
Relationship development	Relationships are approached gradually and maintained where mutually appropriate							
Community participation	HOPE considers appropriate participation in NAIDOC Week, NRW and First Nations-led events							
Environmental practice	Opportunities to respectfully recognise First Nations environmental knowledge are explored							
First Nations-led initiatives	Opportunities to support existing First Nations-led initiatives are considered							
Volunteer participation	Opportunities to make HOPE more welcoming and accessible to First Nations volunteers are considered							

Funding	Relevant funding opportunities for reconciliation/cultural learning are reviewed							
Organistional learning	Lessons, challenges and changes are documented							
Future RAP readiness	HOPE periodically reassesses whether it has the commitment and capacity for a Reflect RAP							

HOPE Reconciliation Progress Review

At 3, 6 and 12 months, whoever is responsible will complete the following:

Review date: _____

Completed by: _____

Next review: _____

1. What have we achieved since the last review?

_____

2. What have we learned?

_____

3. What has not progressed, and why?

_____

4. Are there any concerns about cultural safety, tokenism or cultural load?

_____

5. Have we received any First Nations guidance or feedback that should influence our approach?

_____

6. What are our three priorities before the next review?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

7. Who is responsible for each priority?

_____

