



Eastern & Central  
**COMMUNITY  
TRUST**

Helping fund a better community

## **SPECIAL PROGRAMMES COMMITTEE MEETING**

**11.00am Thursday, 23 March 2017**  
**Eastern & Central Community Trust Board Room**

**AGENDA FOR A MEETING OF THE SPECIAL PROGRAMMES COMMITTEE,  
TO BE HELD IN THE BOARD ROOM, 102-104 RUSSELL STREET SOUTH, HASTINGS,  
ON THURSDAY 23<sup>rd</sup> MARCH 2017, COMMENCING AT 11:00 AM.**

1. Welcome and Apologies
2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> January 2017.
3. SPC Terms of Reference
4. SPC Annual Work-plan
5. Science Project Update
  - a. Recommendation to Board
6. Regional Sports Trusts Update
7. Maths is Fun Update
  - a. Wairarapa REAP Meeting
  - b. Evaluation Consult Proposal
8. Summer Reading Project
  - a. Independent Review
9. Any Other Business:
10. Close

<b>Report type:</b>	Secretarial and Board Administration Items
<b>Recommendation:</b>	The SPC approves the Minutes of the SPC Meeting held on 26th January 2017 as a true and accurate record of the meeting.
<b>Agenda item no:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Subject:</b>	Draft Minutes of the SPC Meeting held on 26th January 2017
<b>Responsible for the report:</b>	Trust Secretary

<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To record the resolutions of the SPC from the Meeting, including decisions taken.
---------------------------	---

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SPECIAL PROGRAMMES COMMITTEE.  
HELD IN THE BOARD ROOM, 1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR, WESTERMAN'S BUILDING,  
102-104 RUSSELL STREET SOUTH, HASTINGS,  
ON THURSDAY, 26 JANUARY 2017, COMMENCING AT 11:00 AM.**

**TRUSTEES PRESENT:**

Margaret Millard (Chair), Caren Rangi, Bryan Guy, David Lea

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Jonathan Bell (General Manager) Neil Attapattu, and Rose Artemiev (Donations Assessors), Rebecca Huckle (Secretary):

Margaret welcomed the committee and noted the apology from Robyn Rauna

The committee discussed the following programmes the Trust is involved in;

**Summer Reading Programme**

Neil advised that he had just had a meeting with Sue Fargher and noted the following;

- said that there were always summer reading programmes- looking to formalise it
- Looking at a new theme each year
- Looking to gain funding on a national level. Intention was to visit Bev Watkins to ask for assistance.
- No difference at this stage- looking to get the rest of the country up to level of our regions. Is there a timeframe?

Early days- just had the first meeting – looking to develop a committee etc.

Noted the differences in the involvement of the different libraries. E.g.

- Discussion, and questions raised on the programme covered;
  - Are we reaching the children we want to have an impact on e.g. Maori & Pacifica?
  - Are our original goals being achieved?
  - Children attending may already have the desire to read.
- The merits of the gifts and how these were determined/given out. There seems to be variation between the different Libraries. Taradale has a lot of volunteers over and above our funding, and prizes awarded on a regular basis providing incentive to complete the programme. Compared with the Tararua library which used part of the funding for a raffle for an ipad at the end as a prize.
  - 
  - Some form of accountability back to ECCT-
  - Demonstration of outcomes is needed
  - Formal contract to be developed with a formal reporting process
  - Consideration could be given for a refresh of the programme
- Noted that we do not want to be too bureaucratic, and burden the programme with compliance. Noted that we followed a process for the RST's and developed contract and reporting in discussions with them, a similar process could be followed.
- Discussion on the governing committee, its makeup, functionality and purpose. Suggestion was to consider an independent person on the Board, or someone from ECCT. This needs to be considered carefully. Agreement from the committee that ECCT want some assurance that our money is having the best outcomes possible. Seems to be variability in the different programmes at different libraries. Need to articulate that to the Committee.

- Sale of the programmes to other regions is now reported on. Part of the being more self-sustainable.

#### **Maths is fun:**

- The independent report from Evaluation Consult had been forwarded to the committee.
- Comment from staff as follows;
  - Scoping document requested that four questions be covered (which covered the original objectives of the programme) the final report did not answer these specifically.
  - Some statements in the report were not validated by hard facts or data.
  - Draft report was questioned and further explanation requested as well as clarification of some areas.
  - Issues with the building following the earthquake meant the report was late in being received.
  - Generally it was a good report which identified some areas which the programme was doing well. Noted that the Case Studies were good.
- The report noted some areas for improvement
  - Data collection could enable longitudinal evaluations of the impact of the programme.
  - Data storage, could be a potential area of risk.
  - Consideration for different venues to enable better use of space and reach different ethnic groups e.g. marae for Maori children
  - Reporting needs to be tightened up
  - Contracts need to be reviewed in line with reporting requirements.
- General discussion on;
  - Original committee overseeing governance comprising Wairarapa REAP, Masterton District Council and one other member. This committee is no longer in existence.
  - General agreement that the report didn't provide the direct answers we were looking for.
  - Wairarapa REAP is collecting data, perhaps not the data we can use to make meaningful decisions on for the future.
  - Agreement that the programme was making an impact, even though the evidence to back this up was circumstantial.
  - Question raised if there was still a need for this programme, and are we getting good value for our investment.
- The committee agreed to wait for the presentation from Evaluation Consult at the Board meeting. At that time clarification would be sought on some of the questions asked and then the next action steps would be decided from there.

#### **Science Pilot**

- Jonathan gave an overview of the conversations he had with Ian Kennedy and the current situation, a copy of an email report to the SPC committee was provided. In summary;
  - Meeting held with Ian Kennedy, Neil Attapattu and Jonathan Bell in Palmerston North last year to discuss the project.
  - Suggestion was made to consider other options of trying to achieve the programmes objectives other than science clubs. Science clubs sustainability for the future relies heavily on volunteers/parent help.
  - The concept of training the teachers was discussed as an option.
  - Jonathan asked Ian to come back with a proposal outlining the possibility of training the teachers rather than the original methodology of the project.

- Ian Kennedy came back with a project which was basically agreed to by schools and was ready to roll out.
- Jonathan left the meeting at this point.

Not subsidising Government funding. Still achieve the outcome but done differently.

Question raised, is it a variation of purpose if still delivering on the original objectives or is it professional development?

Where have we got written down the Science objectives? We haven't got a scope – there was a contract drawn up. Was a pilot and didn't know whether it was going to work. Wasn't our idea and had been done in Canterbury- started in Waipuk- wanted to broaden the access of kids to science. Expectation that the Board would make a decision and feed back to him. No report back from Ian Kennedy at the moment, Neil thinks that he is waiting on us to make a decision. Initial scope has morphed into tutoring the teachers. Ian has had meetings with the teachers from the respective schools involved in the pilot.

Jonathan may have had phone conversation after the email, need to know where it is at.

Recollection was that agreed to 3-year funding – however a conversation happened to deliver this instead of clubs.

Jonathan Bell spoke to Ian Kennedy, Margaret Millard then after that. Lost the momentum. The lack of it on the agenda till May was the one that put the brakes on.

Given Ian Kennedy has indicated personal development is it still in scope?

Margaret Millard noted that whatever Jonathan Bell has talked to them about we have to support. Don't know what it is exactly. Don't know how many schools have agreed.

Need to re-visit this and agree to it after the meeting- we defaulted and we have some guilt around this, whole issue around supporting teachers.

Need to bring a variation of purpose to the Boards attention. Margaret Millard will speak to it at Board meeting.

Needs to go in as a resolution in Board Papers- have the email attached.

Meeting closed. 12:55pm

### **Chairman's Notes**

It was the first meeting two of the Trustees attended so much of the meeting was an open discussion. The report of the meeting does accurately reflect the conversations that took place but some comments could not be verified as fact e.g. "All agreed that science clubs would not be sustainable in the future as it relied heavily on parent help" It should be noted that this is the case with most NGO's which we financially support. Leadership and empowerment of participants and volunteers is a critical factor in maintaining voluntary support.

No recommendations or decisions were made and a further meeting was scheduled prior to the March Board meeting where the issues identified in the January meeting will be addressed.

<b>Report type:</b>	SPC Information Papers
<b>Recommendation:</b>	That the SPC receives and notes the update on the Math's is Fun Review
<b>Agenda item no:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Subject:</b>	Math's is Fund Review
<b>Responsible for the report:</b>	General Manager

<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To provide the SPC with an update of the Math's is Fun review
---------------------------	---

Included in the march 2017 General Managers Report (Main Board Papers) is an update on the actions from the January Board meeting. I will give a verbal report to the committee on these.

I also attach a proposal from Evaluation Consult to continue working with ECCT in developing an evaluation model. I have declined this opportunity as it is included in the work we have contracted the Centre for Social Impact to complete.

Jonathan Bell

March 2017

# Memorandum

---

**To:** Jonathan Bell, Managing Director, Eastern and Central Community Trust (ECCT)  
**From:** Kate Averill, Carmin Young, Evaluation Consult  
**Date:** 21 February 2017  
**Subject:** Organisational support – strategic and evaluative management, technology and data, Māori

Dear Jonathan,

Thank you for the recent dialogue on the findings and recommendations from the Maths is Fun Evaluation and the Board workshop follow up discussions. Your current internal projects including strategic planning and the positive progress of the Regional Sports Trust Programmes are moving ECCT along a strategic development pathway.

Evaluation Consult specialises in providing evaluative management advice and support assisting senior managers and boards align, integrate and practically enhance their strategic and programme results, data collection, technology, and reporting.

We have enjoyed working with ECCT management and undertaking the recent evaluation. We are building up our institutional and contextual understanding of ECCT, its objectives, operations, and performance goals.

From our discussions and inputs, Evaluation Consult has identified three key areas that we could add value by supporting ECCT Management, Board and at programme levels with collaborative evaluative management expertise.

1. **Support ECCT management to align strategic objectives, trust, and programme outcomes** and outputs using a working ECCT evaluative management framework which is used to aggregate results across all trust programmes, funding, and activities. This will include 'way of working', specific focus and integration for Māori and Pasifika within ECCT activities and data collection.
2. **Confirm strategic and aggregation framework** with technology platform expanded from what was used for Maths is Fun Evaluation and functionality expanded.
3. **Integrate cascading risk management and reporting from programme, to functional and sector areas to strategic outcomes and document ECCT 'way of working'** to standardise working evaluative management system across ECCT.

**Value:** With ECCT management co-design to integrate and enhance current processes, apply learnings, and operationalise from current inputs in strategic planning, previous ECCT inputs, and the Maths is Fun Programme Evaluation. This is to align organisational performance and strategic objectives of ECCT at management and governance levels. This will assist ECCT track impacts in communities from the use of funds provided from ECCT, and demonstrate value for money.

**Offering:** Support Management and Board on agreed activities. Evaluation Consult recommends ECCT contract Evaluation Consult for ten days to work collaboratively as agreed. The activities could include:

1. Organisational overview of current objectives, work streams, and key discussions with board, management and senior staff to confirm existing systems and any current or potential gaps.
2. Refine current platform used for Maths is Fun Programme (refer over page for screenshot) to incorporate document storage, for organisational overview and key discussions with board, management and senior staff.



3. Co-design working system in working session with ECCT management and Board representatives to confirm working evaluative framework, and use of enabling technology and provide ethical data security. These discussions and use of working evaluative model with aggregatable data will assist areas to focus on, data areas, using evaluative management information, governance, and 18-month development enhancement pathway of which this guidance moves ECCT into the operational stage within six weeks.
4. Write up pathway using model as discussion tool, pathway to enhance focus areas, and action items. We advocate 6-month pathway with 2 monthly milestones and reflective review undertaken by self-assessment, steering group (includes Board, management senior staff) and EC representatives.

**Costs:** Cost for ten days of evaluative management expertise and support is \$14,000 plus GST (includes support, advice discussion, workshop, tailored working evaluative model, co-design for platform, data collection tools, and 'way of working' document and performance development timeline).



Figure 1: Screenshot of integrated Evaluative Learning and Management Platform (ELM) used for the Maths is Fun Evaluation.

Note: This platform can be adapted for ECCT itself and expanded for subsites and contractor data entry with access to sites managed by ECCT and EC depending on requirements of each provider identified by ECCT and level of funding.