

1. COMMUNITY FUNDING REVIEW

Officer responsible Community Relations Manager	Author Julie Macdonald, DDI 371-1524
---	--

The purpose of this report is to recommend to the Council the terms of reference for a community funding review. This review has been initiated by Councillor Graham Condon and the Mayor, and is supported by the Chair of the Strategy and Finance Committee, Councillor Alister James.

BACKGROUND

Following the 2001 election, some elected members proposed a review which seeks to streamline community funding processes. Elected members have suggested that a funding review could recommend ways of prioritising requests for funding and help evaluate the impact of community funding. It could also address the issues raised by the various requests for the Christchurch City Council to support projects which have traditionally been core government responsibility. Further impetus for this review is provided by concerns expressed by both the Council staff and community organisations about the variety of Council funding processes which are currently in place.

TERMS OF REFERENCE PROPOSED BY COUNCILLORS

Aim

To identify and recommend an overall approach for distributing community funding as well as priorities and mechanisms which are consistent with policy objectives and good practice guidelines.

Objectives

- To identify the broad funding context within which Council community funding is distributed (both within Council and in Christchurch generally),
- To identify the current policy guidelines and administration processes of each of the funding streams within the scope of this review,
- To identify the level of funding currently allocated to achieving specific policy outcomes (including the level of funding specifically allocated to achieving target group policy outcomes),
- To survey community groups, funding decision makers and funding administrators about ways in which the funding streams could be better co-ordinated and made more accessible (taking into account both policy and administrative considerations),
- To develop recommendations for each of the targeted funding streams which improve their policy fit and administrative efficiency,
- To develop recommendations to improve the overall co-ordination of the Council community funding streams,
- To identify appropriate monitoring and evaluation processes for Council community funding streams.

Scope

The scope of this review will be *Council community funding streams which are administered by the Council*.

Method

A staff team made up of Community Relations Unit and Leisure Unit members will carry out the review. The review will include information from community groups, the Council's funding administrators and elected members (including Councillors and Community Board members).

Timeframe

It is anticipated that a draft review report will be submitted to the Community and Leisure Committee on 13 August 2002.

DISCUSSION

The scope of this review will be *Council community funding streams which are administered by the Council*. This does not explicitly include other budget items which may be used to support community initiatives (such as those in the Community Relations Unit budget, Leisure Unit budget and Canterbury Development Corporation funds, or funding schemes administered by the Council on behalf of other organisations). However all of these items will be considered as part of the broader context within which Council funding streams operate.

The table below summarises the Council community funding streams and indicates which streams will be within the scope of this review.

Funding Scheme	Administered by	Part of this Review	2001/2002 Funds
Loan Scheme	Leisure Unit, CCC	Yes	Est. \$250,000
Major Grants (excluding amount of the Community Development Scheme)	Leisure Unit, CCC	Yes	\$2,994,435
Metropolitan Discretionary Funding	Community Relations Unit, CCC	Yes	\$149,460
Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Action Plans funding	Community Relations Unit, CCC	Yes	\$40,000
Social Initiatives Funding	Community Relations Unit, CCC	Yes	\$815,000
Community Board Discretionary/ Project Funding	Community Relations Unit, CCC	No	\$1,800,000
Community Board Strengthening Communities Action Plans funding	Community Relations Unit, CCC	Yes	\$240,000
Community Worker Positions ¹	Community Relations Unit, CCC	Yes	\$240,000
Community Development Scheme	Leisure Unit, CCC	Yes	\$432,000
Canterbury Development Corporation (CDC) Community Employment Initiatives Funding	Canterbury Development Corporation	No	\$409,470
Community Sport Fund (Hillary Commission)	Leisure Unit, CCC for Hillary Commission	No	\$347,643
Creative Communities Scheme (Creative New Zealand)	Leisure Unit, CCC for Creative New Zealand	No	Est. \$195,000

At this stage the proposed review will not look at the Community Board Discretionary/ Project Funding. This is because while some of these funds are used to support community organisations, their overall scope is much wider. However, this is an issue which Councillors may like to consider.

The Social Well-being Policy and the Community Policy will guide this review. The Social Wellbeing Policy provides a broad framework for all the social activities of Council and the Community Policy provides specific guidance for the administration of funding schemes.

The implications of this review are that the Council may make significant changes to the way it administers its funding streams. It may also make significant changes to the role of Council policies in guiding funding decisions.

- Recommendation:**
1. That the Council agree to the terms of reference as outlined in the report.
 2. That the Community Board Discretionary/Project Funding not be included in the first stage of the Community Funding Review.
 3. That on completion of the first stage of the review the interim results be discussed with the Community Boards and other funding bodies.

¹ When this was set up it was identified by Council for review prior to the 2003/2004 budget.