

---

# Southern Wairarapa Safer Community Council

## Integrated Funding Contract

*A collaborative contract signed between the Southern Wairarapa Safer Community Council and its core government funders to align the funding outcomes and reporting requirements associated with the Life to the Max crime prevention programme.*

### **The Parties**

#### **The Provider**

Southern Wairarapa Safer Community Council

#### **The Funders**

Ministry of Social Development (Department of Work and Income)

Department of Internal Affairs

Carterton District Council

South Wairarapa District Councils (Community Development Committee)

### **Background**

In 1997 the Southern Wairarapa Safer Community Council (SWSCC) became the first Safer Community Council (SCC) in New Zealand to have two district councils as key partners. The core business of SCCs is crime prevention, with each SCC supported by a funded co-ordinator. In 2003, the Crime Prevention Unit<sup>22</sup> undertook a national review of SCCs, resulting in many being disestablished. Those remaining were funded for actual crime prevention projects only. The SWSCC's project was 'Southern Wairarapa - Life to the Max'.

The SWSCC had done much consultation with non-governmental organisations, iwi, and the community about a targeted early intervention and prevention programme for the Southern Wairarapa. At a presentation to the Regional Intersectoral Forum (RIF) the RIF moved that the Life to the Max programme become one of their key Wairarapa projects.

The murder of six year-old Featherston girl Coral Burrows<sup>23</sup> in September 2003 galvanised community and government agencies into thinking about how they could think and work differently to prevent such tragedies occurring. Coral's death highlighted gaps in services in Southern Wairarapa as well as the need for government support in the development of 'Southern Wairarapa - Life to the Max'.

Since 2005 'Southern Wairarapa - Life to the Max' has worked with young people identified as being at risk of offending. It incorporates an assessment of the needs and risk factors of the

---

<sup>22</sup> The Crime Prevention Unit is based within the Ministry of Justice.

<sup>23</sup> Coral went missing from school in September 2003, sparking massive family, community and police searches around Southern Wairarapa. Coral's body was found buried some 10 days later. She had been beaten and murdered by her step-father who was under the influence of methamphetamine at the time.

young person and their family/whānau and ensures a coordinated approach among agencies who work with them and their families.

The SWSCC had been funded for 'Southern Wairarapa - Life to the Max' from five sources – the Department of Work and Income, the Department of Internal Affairs, the Crime Prevention Unit and Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils. Each funder had a different contract containing different outcome expectations and accountability requirements. Managing the different contracts often left the SWSCC feeling 'swamped'. It also meant that their resources were being diverted away from core service delivery to meet contract administration requirements.

### Benefits of Putting Pen to Paper...

- integrating a number of existing SWSCC contracts with government and local councils into a single agreement;
- allowing SWSCC to focus more on providing the 'Southern Wairarapa - Life to the Max' programme by reducing the amount of time and resources required to meet accountability and reporting requirements;
- strengthening the 'whole of government' approach to funding by enabling agencies to examine the way they are collectively supporting the SWSCC and their 'Southern Wairarapa - Life to the Max' programme.

### Putting it Together...

The Ministry of Social Development (MSD) approached the SWSCC to see if they were interested in participating in the Funding for Outcomes<sup>24</sup> integrated contract process. With the approval of all parties MSD took on the role of interagency coordination and an integrated agreement was developed based on the Funding for Outcomes Integrated Contract template.

*"For us, having a single central person to coordinate central government's engagement was invaluable."*

*- Tere Lenihan, Southern Wairarapa Safer Community Council*

Through a series of joint meetings between SWSCC and its funders, the parties cooperatively determined the content that best suited their agreement. This became more than simply amalgamating the existing government contract goals. It involved documenting and developing a shared understanding of the role and work of the SWSCC and carrying out a full re-appraisal of existing contracts to identify their shared themes. The process enabled government funders to reflect on what a 'whole of government' approach meant and what behaviours and processes could best help the SWSCC to meet their common goals.

*"Each government agency had worked with the SWSCC before, but the agencies themselves had not worked TOGETHER with the SWSCC. One unintended consequence of the process was that central government agencies could see who was and wasn't involved in funding this initiative."*

*- Mike Grace, Ministry of Social Development*

<sup>24</sup> Funding for Outcomes is an initiative that aims to improve client outcomes and integrate and streamline contracting processes for community social service providers. Led by the Ministry of Social Development the Funding for Outcomes process sees funding agencies and community providers working together to define results expected from service delivery, and to integrate reporting requirements. An important component of the work is the review meetings which allow all funders to gain a clear understanding of clients' issues and the provider and funders to identify best practice responses. Initially a three year pilot, Funding for Outcomes has now been incorporated into the Family and Community Services. For more information see: <http://www.familyservices.govt.nz/funding-for-outcomes>

For the SWSCC the process of working collaboratively with its funders to develop a contract that suited them also required a shift in thinking and approach. They had to learn to articulate and advocate for their own aspirations rather than just respond to funder expectations. For the SWSCC this represented a change in the traditional power balance between funders and providers as they came to see themselves now more as a 'partner' rather than a 'puppet'.

The integrated contract process took around a year to complete and was celebrated with a small launch with some wine and cake. The contract is for a three year period and will be formally reviewed in mid-2008.

### Key Agreement Features...

- negotiated monitoring framework that includes meaningful and relevant information for tracking outcomes. Five indicators for success have now been identified;
- it is a living document – every six months the parties to the agreement meet to discuss progress and ways of improving current practice;
- organisations that are not party to the agreement eg. Police and Child Youth and Family Services are also able to attend the six monthly meetings. This strengthens the desire for the six monthly monitoring process to be about "change and not just compliance".

*"The monitoring meetings cover a fairly broad range of topics – what ever is necessary to be covered at the time."*

*- Julie Hallam, Carterton District Council*

### Biggest Challenges...

- length of time to complete the agreement process;
- redefining service delivery in terms of broad outcomes rather than sector specific deliverables – this required new thinking from both government and community provider perspectives;
- being one of the first off the block! Getting the required understanding and support for an integrated contract approach across government agencies and their respective financial and reporting systems. Much of the practical knowledge of 'how to do it' and 'how to best manage the process' has been gained from actually preparing the agreement;
- working out who needed to be at the table. For example, the Councils' funding for 'Life to the Max' comes from contracts with the Crime Prevention Unit (CPU). Originally, the CPU, Carterton District and South Wairarapa District Councils sat at the integrated agreement table. However the CPU has since stepped back, with the Councils now representing themselves and their funder at the collaborative funding table.

### Things That Helped...

- pre-existing relationships between SWSCC and its funders, and confidence among funders that they had a good programme that was being delivered effectively;
- consultation and discussion about the agreement before it was signed ensured wider organisational support;
- funders were able to see that their needs could be met through the integrated funding process.

## What Has Happened Since...

The level of dialogue and interaction between the local councils associated with the SWSCC and the Ministry of Social Development has significantly increased. This has also been assisted by the LTCCP<sup>25</sup> community outcomes processes.<sup>26</sup>

It is also suggested that the agreement and the ongoing monitoring meetings provide a forum for working towards sustainable funding for the SWSCC.

## Best Advice For Others...

- be very clear about what you require from stakeholders before you engage with them;
- the broker/relationship manager role is a key. It is not about which agency plays the role but how they play it - it is about a skill set;
- be realistic about what you can achieve with the amount of funding that you have;
- learn to negotiate confidently and don't be afraid to advocate for your organisation and its needs.

*"The concept of integrated funding is excellent and we should see how it could be further developed around New Zealand."*

*- Tere Lenihan, Southern Wairarapa Safer Community Council*

<sup>25</sup> Long Term Council Community Plan.

<sup>26</sup> The Local Government Act 2002 requires councils to identify community outcomes - statements of community aspiration for the current and future social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of their locality. In identifying and reporting on community outcomes, councils must identify, so far as is practicable, other organisations and groups who might influence community outcomes and encourage their participation in the community outcomes process.

#### 4. LONG-TERM AND SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES

##### 4.1 You and the funders have agreed the following long and short-term outcomes to be achieved as the result of the application of the funding and our working together in accordance with this agreement

**Long-term outcome:** Young people and their families/whanau in Southern Wairarapa are living in safer communities and have improved opportunities/outcomes to develop into fully participating members of the community.

**Short-term outcome:** The Life To The Max Programme has minimised risk factors for clients and their whanau/families.

Indicator of success	Data
Young people referred to the Life to the Max (LTTM) programme who are potential offenders or offenders, have not offended or have reduced offending levels during the programme and 12 months after leaving.	Assessment tool – risk assessment measured against reduction of risk. Police data to be provided within LTTM report structure
All young people referred to the LTTM programme are either in school, training for employment or employment	MSD data or other documentation that the provider will collect showing that the indicator has been achieved
4-6 working age referrals to the LTTM programme have been placed in paid employment of at least 20 hours per week.	MSD data
Young people under 16 years referred to the LTTM programme who are not regularly attending school have been re-engaged in education, training or other outcome identified in their case management plan.	Reports on school attendance Case management plans Milestone reports

#### 5. SPECIFIC RULES AND REQUIREMENTS RELEVANT TO EACH FUNDER

##### 5.1 The funders may have specific rules or requirements that they require you to perform. These are matters that are not covered in the standard terms and conditions and are specific to the individual funders. The specific rules and requirements are as follows

Funders Ministry of Social Development (Work and Income) and Carterton and South Wairarapa District Councils (Social Development Committee)

###### Specific rules and requirements

Payments are exclusive of GST

## 6. REPORTING AND MONITORING

### 6.1 You and the funders have agreed the following reporting and monitoring arrangements for this agreement

Financial report			
The first financial report will be provided to our relationship manager by <b>15 April 2006</b> with subsequent financial reports provided in <b>April and October</b> in each year.			
Service reports			
The following service reports will be required and will be provided to our relationship manager and/or the individual funders as set out below.			
Describe service report	Report due	Period covered by report	Delivered to
Report shown in Appendix 2	15 April 2006	Signing to 30 March 2006	Relationship Manager
	15 July 2006	1 April to 30 June 2006	
	15 October 2006	1 July to 30 September 2006	
	15 January 2007	1 October to 30 December 2006	
	15 April 2007	1 January to 30 March 2007	
	15 July 2007	1 April to 30 June 2007	
	15 October 2007	1 July to 30 September 2007	
	15 January 2008	1 October to 30 December 2007	
	15 April 2008	1 January to 30 March 2008	
	30 June 2008	1 April to 30 June 2008	
Monitoring the agreement			
Our relationship manager will work with you and the funders to prepare a monitoring plan which will be used by the funders to assist their review of the reports and audits.			
Our relationship manager will, as soon as possible after receipt, provide each of the funders with a copy of the financial report, and any other reports or audits that the individual funders may require.			
Review meetings			
The relationship managers will arrange review meetings to discuss:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• your progress in contributing to the outcomes and the delivery of the service requirements</li> <li>• the expenditure of the funding</li> <li>• any difficulties that you or we may have</li> <li>• any issues arising from the addition or exit of a funder</li> <li>• whether the required reports and audits (if any) have been provided in accordance with the agreed reporting and monitoring arrangements, and any issues arising from those reports or audits</li> <li>• any other matters that either you or we may wish to raise.</li> </ul>			

#### Review meeting dates

The relationship managers will arrange review meetings at the following times:

- January 2006
- July 2006
- January 2007
- July 2007
- January 2008
- June 2008