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Executive Summary

*Introduction to the Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service*

Whakamana Whānau is a social work support service for Māori whānau/families where whānau violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring. Whakamana Whānau is a collaborative approach between Family Works Hawke’s Bay and Te Ikaroa Rangatahi Social Services providing a multi-systemic approach in supporting whānau to become, and remain, safe and violence free.

This evaluation is focused on the Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service delivered by Family Works Hawke’s Bay. It includes all clients receiving services from the Family Works Hawke’s Bay Whakamana Whānau social worker up to, and including, 30th June 2014. The service was two years into a three year service contract at the time of the evaluation. The evaluation is therefore focused on service implementation and the outcomes achieved by clients over this timeframe. It is not yet possible to fully evaluate the extent to which the service supported the achievement of longer-term change for whānau and in their environment.

Family Works Hawke’s Bay has a strengths-based social work practice that is solution-focused and child-centred. The child-centred practice of Family Works means that the caseload of the Family Works Whakamana Whānau social worker consists of those whānau who have children, particularly where the children are under five years of age.

*Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service Implementation and Client Outcomes – April 2012 to June 2014*

Family Works Hawke’s Bay has established and implemented an effective and respected social work service. The Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service has employed one social worker since the service was initiated. The work of establishing this new service and implementing what has become a service that is well-regarded, both by client whānau and by referring and collaborating agencies/community organisations, has been undertaken by an experienced Māori social worker who has worked with Family Works Hawke’s Bay for over eight years.

The findings of this evaluation show that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service is reaching its target population and providing high quality social work services that are effective in supporting change for Māori whānau/families where whānau violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

**Referrals**

The first referrals to Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service were received in April 2012. Over the time period of data analysed for this evaluation, 1st April 2012 – 30th June 2014, 53 client whānau had been referred to Whakamana Whānau for social work support. At the end of this period there were five current files and 48 files had been closed.

Many of the whānau referred to the service were unemployed or on benefits, living in private rental accommodation and living in areas of high socio-economic deprivation – some of the demographic indicators of a population with a high risk of family violence. Of those referred, 83% identify as NZ Māori, 11% as NZ Māori/NZ European and 2% as NZ Māori/Pasifika.

Referral data shows that Child, Youth & Family (CYF) and health services were the biggest sources of client referrals along with self- and family-referrals.

**Social work process and interventions**

Casework records show good social work processes were followed with client whānau. The social worker responded very promptly to referrals received and was persistent in efforts to establish contact with all whānau referred for social work support to address whānau violence.

---

Assessment and goal planning were completed with all Whakamana Whānau social work clients. The issues addressed in Goal Plans formed by whānau provide an overview of the challenges whānau members are dealing with in trying to function effectively in their communities, in their day-to-day lives and relationships.

The social worker followed a process of regular review of Goal Plans and achievements every six to eight weeks with each client whānau. Final reviews were completed with all clients with the exception of those who disengaged or discontinued with the service when they had received the support to resolve their key issues.

**Client Outcomes – closed cases**

Case outcomes indicate that most client whānau made positive changes for their whānau with support from the service. Client whānau made significant improvements in whānau safety and in care for their children over the time they were engaged with the service. They also made significant gains in their connections to health, education services and to their extended whānau and communities. Clients achieved positive change on 65% of their overall Goal Plan issues and on 86% of ‘whānau violence’ specific goals. Overall, 71% of client whānau achieved 50% or more of the goals in their Goal Plans.

Client service evaluation surveys show that 91% of clients agreed that the service had helped them to achieve their goals; and 100% would recommend the service to others.

Whānau were referred to a wide range of organisations and services in the community as part of the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service, supporting clients to access the resources they needed and linking them into their community supports. Referrals to organisations and services in the community are recorded for 74% of client whānau.

Community organisations/agencies were named as providing ongoing support services for over one quarter (28%) of whānau on case closure with Whakamana Whānau.

**Family Violence Incidents recorded for Client Whānau - POL 400 Data**

Police family violence incident data suggests that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service has decreased the incidence of violence in some client whānau over the time period covered by this evaluation. For half (50%) of the 30 files with POL 400 data, the records indicate a reduction in the incidence of whānau violence triggering police call-outs (and resulting in POL 400 reports) after the whānau had exited Whakamana Whānau; for 67% of files with POL 400s, the data shows a decrease in the frequency of police call-outs, or no call-outs, after case closure with Whakamana Whānau.

**Clients’ Experience of the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service**

Clients value the social work support and appreciated talking through their situation with the social worker. They also valued the social worker’s capacity to listen as well as the advice, information, advocacy and the strategies they were helped to develop.

Clients are satisfied with the service and with their relationship with the social worker. Through client service evaluation surveys, Whakamana Whānau clients expressed their satisfaction with the service, with their engagement with the social worker and with service accessibility.

Those clients who generously participated in interviews said they had eliminated, or reduced, violence in their home, had learnt how to be safe and stay safe, and how to communicate better with partners and children. Most interviewed also said they had removed the use of drugs and/or alcohol in their lives. The social worker’s manner and approach to working with whānau were identified as key to the support for whānau to change their lives. They also identified that they were able to maintain long-term changes within their homes because they felt better equipped to handle issues and set backs on their own. Whakamana Whānau had provided support to empower them to advocate for themselves, helped them to manage their emotions and gave them the ability to
discuss issues with partners and whānau. The clients also referred to their learning and how it helped them deal with problems without violence. They reported that they were more confident to reach out into the community for the support they needed to maintain the changes they had made.

**Experience of Government Agency and Community Stakeholders**

Responses from the 20 agency and community organisation stakeholders who participated in the online survey show that the service is well-regarded by referring and collaborating agencies/community organisations. In addition, many of the stakeholders responding to the survey took the opportunity to offer their appreciation of the service and to commend the social worker’s professionalism, experience, approach and competence. Ninety-five percent (95%) agreed or that the Whakamana Whānau service is making a positive difference to restoring the safety and wellbeing / mauri ora of whānau where family violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

**Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service Staff**

Whakamana Whānau is an innovative collaborative approach between Family Works Hawke’s Bay and Te Ikaroa Rangatahi Social Services. The success of the collaboration is based on good relationships between the managers and between the frontline staff, on the complementary skills and strengths each brings to the partnership, and on addressing issues as they arise. Service outcomes are supported by the suite of complementary services available for whānau across those delivered by the collaborative partners.

The Whakamana Whānau social worker has developed the practice of holding ‘professionals meetings’ where there is more than one other agency involved with a client whānau to clarify the role of each professional working with the whānau, to clearly establish who the ‘lead professional’ is and to ensure that all are working towards the same goals.

Both partner organisations have been innovative in extending their work with client whānau to bring in members of the wider whānau, holding whānau hui with extended whānau attending.

Innovation within the Whakamana Whānau collaboration is also shown by the evolution of the Kanohi ki te Kanohi programme, a 10 week group-based anti-violence learning programme which has been developed as a way of consolidating and progressing the changes being made by whānau as a result of their individual engagement with Whakamana Whānau.

**Recommendations**

Based on the evaluation findings and on issues arising, this evaluation puts forward recommendations aimed at addressing the concern that the family violence ‘response system’ in Hawke’s Bay does not have the resources to persist in coordinated efforts by key agencies to engage and support whānau/families known to be experiencing violence.

**In Conclusion: Summary of Evaluation Findings**

The Results-Based Accountability (RBA) matrix for the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service presented on page 5 shows a selection of the measures which have contributed to this evaluation and summarises the outcomes of the work with the 53 client whānau referred to the service from April 2012 to June 2014. The client work contributing to each of these indicators is presented in detail in the evaluation findings.

These RBA outcomes show that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service is reaching its target population and providing high quality social work services that are effective in supporting change for Māori whānau/families where whānau violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

---

2 This evaluation has been structured in part by a programme logic and Results-Based Accountability (RBA) matrix (see Appendix 2) and guided by a set of key questions to be addressed by the Whakamana Whānau evaluation (see Appendix 3).
Assessing the evaluation findings against the Key Questions established for the service evaluation shows that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service has been successful in meeting the following expectations of the funding contract for the time period of service provision evaluated:

- delivering direct services to families/whānau that restore safety and wellbeing/mauri ora where family violence has, or is at risk of occurring;
- creating longer-term change needed to prevent family violence from recurring;
- helping families and whānau access additional services needed and draw on wider whānau/community to achieve longer-term change;
- focusing on effective, innovative joined-up ways to meet family/whānau and community need;
- reducing service fragmentation, duplication and gaps in frontline services.
### Result-Based Accountability Matrix:

**FAMILY WORKS WHAKAMANA WHĀNAU SOCIAL WORK SERVICE - Outcomes Summary April 2012 – June 2014 (inclusive)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW MUCH DID WE DO? (Service Volumes)</th>
<th>REFFERALS</th>
<th>HOW WELL DID WE DO IT? (Service Quality)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social work support</strong></td>
<td>- 98% assessed as High Risk</td>
<td><strong>Timeliness of first contact following referral</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 53 whānau / clients</td>
<td>- 11% gang-affiliated        • 74% within 1 day; • 83% within 7 days;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOGRAPHICS</strong></td>
<td>- 51% with other agencies involved on referral</td>
<td>• 17% required from 1 – 7 weeks to establish contact with whānau &amp; get engagement with service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>- Referral sources</td>
<td><strong>Completion rates</strong>: (48 closed files)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 94% Māori; • 2% Pasifika</td>
<td>• 25% CYF; • 21% Health;     • 88% (42) key outcomes met; • 6% (3) referred on; • 6% (3) disengaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2% Other; • 2% Unknown</td>
<td>• 19% Self/whānau; • 9% Education/SWiS;</td>
<td><strong>Whānau satisfaction with service (service evaluation surveys)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whānau structure</strong></td>
<td>• 9% police/probation; • 11% NGOs</td>
<td>• 89% reported service was accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 68% with children under 5</td>
<td><strong>Referrals to other community agencies</strong></td>
<td>• 96% satisfied with their relationship with worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 116 children in client whānau</td>
<td>- 74% of whānau were referred for specific support services including:</td>
<td>• 94% satisfied with the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 51 aged under 5; * 39 aged 5-12;</td>
<td>* 66% Family therapy &amp; counselling;</td>
<td><strong>Feedback from agency partners/stakeholders:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 26 youth aged 12-24</td>
<td>* 29% Family violence programmes;</td>
<td>• 100% of referring agencies were satisfied with referral processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • 25% sole parents                   | * 23% Parenting programmes & support | “[The] referral process is very precise, full of information about referral issues and relationship issues. Any dangers (including dogs on property), any requirements for whānau is noted and discussed before meeting”.
| • 42% living as extended families    | **IS ANYONE BETTER OFF? (Service Effectiveness)** | |
| • 21% employed; 70% benefit recipients |**WHĀNAU FEEDBACK** (service evaluation surveys – 54 responses) | As a result of Whakamana Whānau interventions, clients told us that:

- 91% had met their goals
- 92% had improved their relationships; 61% within whānau & 26% with others
- 86% had learnt new skills or strategies that are useful
- 85% felt better prepared for the future
- 100% would recommend the service to others

“I am glad to have been referred to do this programme. I feel I have been able to better myself as an individual, father and partner.”

**FEEDBACK FROM AGENCY PARTNERS/STAKEHOLDERS:**

- 100% of referring agencies agreed that the service is making a positive difference for the whānau they referred
- 95% of partners/stakeholders agreed that the service supports whānau to make longer term changes that prevent the recurrence of family violence (One community partner providing housing ‘did not know’)

“Excellent service. I use this service as my first port of call with whānau who fit the referral criteria.”

### CHANGES ACHIEVED IN ISSUES LISTED IN GOAL PLANS – whānau ratings

- 65% of all contracted goals were rated as improved (using scale of 1 to 10)
- 86% of all ‘whānau violence’ goals were rated as improved (using scale of 1 to 10)
- 28% of whānau achieved self-assessed improvements of 5 points or greater
- 31% of whānau achieved self-assessed improvements of 1 to 4 points
- 45% of whānau completed 80% or more of the goals in their Goal Plan
- 71% of whānau completed more than 50% of their Goal Plans
- 14% of whānau disengaged before review & self-assessment of goal achievement

### SOCIAL WORKER ASSESSED CHANGES IN WHĀNAU SAFETY AND WELL-BEING/MAURI ORA

#### Gains in Whānau Safety and Care on case closure:

- 90% assessed as having improved overall
- 98% increased whānau safety
- 98% had improved care of their children

#### Gains in Whānau Community Connection on case closure: (where applicable)

- 98% were better connected to their extended whānau & community
- 98% improved their health / use of health services
- 80% improved children’s participation in school
Introduction

The Whakamana Whānau Service and the Evaluation

Whakamana Whānau is a social work support service for Māori whānau/families where whānau violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

The Whakamana Whānau service is a collaborative approach between Family Works Hawke’s Bay and Te Ikaroa Rangatahi Social Services providing a multi-systemic approach in supporting whānau to become, and remain, safe and violence free.

At the time this evaluation was instigated the Whakamana Whānau service was nearly 2 years into a 3 year service contract. Given that the service is new and is being delivered as part of a re-focused approach to family violence services, Family Works Hawke’s Bay initiated an evaluation to investigate service achievements to-date, to create an opportunity to reflect more deeply on service achievements and to inform future service developments.

This evaluation is focused on the Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service delivered by Family Works Hawke’s Bay. It includes all clients receiving services from the Family Works Hawke’s Bay Whakamana Whānau social worker up to, and including, 30th June 2014.

Background to the Service and its Context

The service was established early in 2012 through funding from the Ministry of Social Development (MSD) Family-Centred Services Fund administered by Family and Community Services (FACS).

In 2011, the Family Works Hawke’s Bay service manager and the Kaiwhakahaere of both Te Ikaroa Rangatahi and Tangata Piringa Māori Women’s Refuge explored the option of becoming collaborative partners in a service to deliver whānau-focused support to address whānau violence. These discussions were facilitated by the mutual trust and knowledge of each other’s work, developed over many years of working and living in the same community.

Both Te Ikaroa Rangatahi and Tangata Piringa Māori Women’s Refuge had staff trained as whānau, hapu, and iwi kaiwhakaruruahau in the Mauri Ora Whānau framework and were working in whānau with the issues underlying whānau violence. Family Works Hawke’s Bay is a tauwi service provider with a child protection focus using a strength-based solution-focused practice framework and delivers services to a client population that is 70% Māori.

Changes in sector funding at that time created the opportunity and incentive to work in collaboration with other agencies with complementary strengths and similar client-focused, strengths-based practices, albeit informed by different conceptual frameworks. These discussions led to a successful collective funding application and a contract with Family and Community Services (FACS) for Family-Centred Services funding, initially for the 2011-2012 funding year.

The collaboration began with three partners; however, in the first year Tangata Piringa closed its services and left the collaboration. At this time Te Ikaroa Rangatahi and Family Works Hawke’s Bay reassessed their partnership and, with FACS agreement, the collaboration has continued successfully with two partners. The partnership is contracted to deliver services to 48 clients per year.

Funding of Family Violence Services from 2011-12 Financial Year

The Ministry of Social Development (MSD) Family-Centred Services Fund, administered by Family and Community Services (FACS) was created in 2011 to enable family violence services providers and provider collectives to work more flexibly to restore family safety and family wellbeing where violence has occurred and to help create the longer-term changes needed to prevent violence from recurring.

The fund encourages providers to work together to reduce service fragmentation, duplication and gaps – to provide innovative, integrated and cost-effective frontline services that respond to local
needs. Funding also acknowledges that creating longer-term change for families may involve helping them to access additional services that they may need and to draw on the informal supports available in their wider whānau and community to help achieve longer-term transformational change in their environment.

The Hastings District Council area was identified as having a high need for family violence services. The Family-Centred Services Fund was distributed so that proportionally more funding per head of population went to areas of highest need; where levels of need were calculated by using four characteristics: applications for protection orders, Police Family Violence Incident Reports, Child, Youth and Family notifications, and a measure of low income (a combination of the New Zealand Deprivation Index and the proportion of the population in each Territorial Authority (TA) who are beneficiaries).

Family-Centred Services contracts include the expectation that service providers will:
• deliver direct services to families/whānau that restore safety and wellbeing/mauri ora where family violence has, or is at risk of occurring;
• create longer-term change needed to prevent family violence from recurring;
• help families and whānau access additional services needed and draw on wider whānau/community to achieve longer-term change;
• focus on effective, innovative joined-up ways to meet family/whānau and community need;
• reduce service fragmentation, duplication and gaps in frontline services.

Literature Review
A brief literature review was undertaken to inform the evaluation on the scale and impact of family violence in the Hawke’s Bay region, and on the published evidence-base for effective family violence support and prevention services. This review draws largely on material published in New Zealand.

Family Violence Statistics – National and Regional
New Zealand/Aotearoa has an unacceptable level of family violence. For the 10 years from 2000-2010, it was reported that 30% of women in New Zealand/Aotearoa had experienced physical violence at some time in their lives and 14% had suffered sexual violence – the highest rates of all 14 OECD countries reporting for this time period.

In 2013, there were 95,080 family violence investigations by NZ Police; and, 59,137 family violence investigations where at least one child aged 0-16 years was linked to the investigation.

The NZ Police Eastern District area, which covers the Hawke’s Bay and Gisborne regions, has the highest rate of reported Family Violence per head of population. In 2011 NZ Police undertook a review of Family Violence within the Eastern District to understand the growth in family violence in the region and to review their processes for working with family violence. This review concluded that, while reported family violence had grown significantly in the previous 10 years, the growth was identical to that seen nationally and was not out of proportion to the high level of identified risk factors for family violence within the Eastern District which has a population scoring the highest or second highest across six identified risk factors.

The Eastern District has a well-functioning Family Violence Inter Agency Response System (FVIARS) which drives collaboration and inter-agency co-ordination in response to reported family violence.

---

7 aged 15-24; Māori; single or in de facto relationships; unemployed or on benefits; living in 20% most socio-economically disadvantaged areas – deciles 9 & 10 on NZ Deprivation Index; currently living in solo parent households; living in private rental accommodation
The 2011 review found that Eastern District’s FVIARS processes were working well and had led to a significant increase in community confidence in Police with better reporting of family violence, including increased reporting of lower level violence incidences which enable earlier interventions with greater opportunity to prevent the recurrence of family violence.

**The Costs and Impact of Family Violence**

Family violence is very costly – to the whānau members/individuals involved and to communities and society. As well as the direct costs to individuals, dealing with family violence requires significant justice, health and welfare resources. The economic costs to the individual and to society were conservatively estimated to be between $1.2 and $5.8 billion per annum in 1995\(^8\), with the lower end figure updated to $4.1 billion in 2014\(^9\).

However, these economic estimates do not include the ongoing human and social costs of living with family violence. Family violence affects people’s psychological, emotional and physical well-being and has life-long impacts on their capacity to participate in their families, workplaces and communities.

Family violence is a harmful pattern of relating that is defined\(^10\) as:

> ... a broad range of controlling behaviours, commonly of a physical, sexual and/or psychological nature which typically involve fear, intimidation and emotional deprivation. It occurs within a variety of close interpersonal relationships, such as between partners, parents and children, siblings and in other relationships where significant others are not part of the physical household but are part of the family and/or are fulfilling the function of family.

This harmful pattern of relating requires appropriate sustained intervention to support the changes needed to prevent family violence from continuing – against current family members, ex-partners and their children, and against adult partners and children in future relationships\(^11\).

The trauma of family violence, chronic and repeat victimisation, has cumulative and compounding harmful effects which can be carried from one generation to the next. It disrupts the foundations of family and whānau life, and its negative effects include poor mental health, self-medication through drug and alcohol use, suicide attempts and inability to hold-down employment or to participate in learning. It erodes the resources and social supports available to victims, increasing their vulnerability and isolation.

Many Māori experiencing whānau violence are dealing with serious levels of victimisation and entrapment, extreme economic deprivation and high levels of historical and intergenerational trauma. Whānau violence operates with other structural inequities in their lives to undermine their attempts to keep themselves and their children safe within their relationships, to leave relationships or to keep themselves safe post-separation.

The Family Violence Death Review Committee\(^12\) stressed the necessity of cultural competence for those providing services to families/whānau affected by violence so that those from outside the dominant mainstream norms are not put at additional risk. They describe the intergenerational

---


\(^12\) *Ibid*
effects of adverse environments and trauma, the intergenerational patterns of family violence which can wrongly be assumed to be ‘normal’ cultural behaviours. The Second Taskforce on Whänau Violence described the apparent widespread acceptance of violence as a ‘normal’ way of whänau members interacting as an ‘imposter tikanga’, a legacy of colonisation and institutional racism in New Zealand/Aotearoa.\(^\text{13}\)

**Characteristics of Effective Family Violence Support and Prevention Initiatives**

A 2013 paper\(^\text{14}\), produced for the Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families, reviewed the effectiveness of interventions for adult victims and children exposed to family violence. This review concludes that there is strong evidence that overall responses to violence are most effective when they are integrated and co-ordinated: ‘... when a high level of multi-agency collaboration is achieved, violence is reduced’.

The factors common to effective interventions in addressing family violence and its impacts were identified as:

- Services provided through multi-agency co-ordination or collaboration are integrated
- Response systems are able to address the variety of needs of adult victims and children who have been exposed to violence at different points in time, to support participant to determine their own solutions and to work with differences in culture, age, level of trauma and co-occurring issues
- Longer-term, ongoing support is available
- Effective interventions have:
  - Skilled, experienced and well-supported staff with a strong understanding of the dynamics of partner and other family violence
  - A clear purpose and theoretical base
  - Strong linkages to other services which support victims and children

The need for collaborative, integrated responses to family violence is also emphasized in the Family Violence Death Review Committee report\(^\text{15}\), which criticises the occurrence of one-off responses to incidences of violence. Responses need to address the underlying harmful patterns of relating that lead to violence, which requires sustained interventions by wrap-around services trying multiple ways of engaging and staying involved (in the short- and long-term).

*The focus needs to shift from being solely on the actions of the individuals involved, which makes victims responsible for their own safety, to a pro-active systemic response in which the services and community are responsible for the victim’s safety.*

This report also stresses that collaborative, integrated family violence responses must provide services which contain, challenge and change the abuser’s use of violence. It highlights changes in the Victorian government which ‘has modelled moving from a ‘service system’ that previously put responsibility on the victim to take action, to an ‘integrated system response’ that emphasizes the safety of women and children, and the accountability of the abuser.’

Family violence services work not only to protect family members from further harm, but to promote their well-being in the longer term. Recognising that trauma of family violence leads to the loss of economic, social and personal resources central to well-being, family violence services work

---

\(^{13}\) T. Kruger et al., 2004. *Transforming Whänau Violence – A Conceptual Framework. A Report from the former Second Taskforce on Whänau Violence*


to enhance the ongoing safety, stability and health of those affected, to increase their social connections and access to community resources, as well as supporting them to increase their knowledge and understanding of family/relationship dynamics and to build their skills and self-knowledge. These activities are detailed in a paper from the US National Resource Center on Domestic Violence\(^\text{16}\) examining the work of domestic violence programmes within a ‘Social and Emotional Well-Being Promotion’ framework which is summarised and presented as a Theory of Change. While activities of this focus on increasing the well-being of the victims of violence and their children it also stresses that family violence programmes must engage in activities to create communities that hold offenders accountable and promote justice.

The literature reviewed strongly supports the stated expectations of MSD’s Family-Centred Services Fund contracts – to provide co-ordinated, collaborative family violence services working flexibly to meet the needs of families where violence has occurred or is occurring, both through the immediate service responses and in providing long-term support to address underlying harmful patterns of relating. To meet these requirements, staff members working in this sector need a strong understanding of the dynamics of family violence and to have strong linkages with staff in all other agencies who are part of the overall ’system response’ to family violence. Additionally staff must be well connected to local organisations and community groups to be able to facilitate family members’ access to any community resources they need and increase their social connections to reduce their isolation. The literature also highlights that an ‘integrated system response’ emphasizes both the safety of the victims of family violence and the accountability of the abuser.

**The Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service**

**Service Description**

Family Works Hawke’s Bay has a strengths-based social work practice that is solution-focused and child-centred. The child-centred practice of Family Works Hawke’s Bay means that the caseload of the Family Works Whakamana Whānau social worker consists of those whānau who have children, particularly where the children are under the age of five. Social work assessments draw on Te Whare Tapa Whā and the social work intervention process is informed by the Powhiri Poutama model.

The service is delivered by an experienced Māori social worker who has worked with Family Works Hawke’s Bay for over eight years and is known in the community where many of the client whānau live. The social worker’s professional practice is supported by regular external supervision and by cultural supervision from the Presbyterian Support East Coast Māori Cultural Advisor.

**Whakamana Whānau Social Work Process and Interventions**

Initial referrals are responded to by following-up with the referrer to gather any further information needed for triage and for the social worker to make arrangements to contact the client and safely conduct a home visit.

Clients are contacted by phone, or if necessary by letter, to arrange a time for a home visit for the social worker to introduce herself and to explain the service, and for whakawhānaungatanga. Where phone calls or letters receive no response, the social worker will make an unannounced visit to the residential address given on referral. With client whānau agreement to participate in the service a time is arranged to complete an assessment and begin a service plan.

At this stage the social worker’s major focus is on the children’s safety and care, and on identifying what the whānau needs to happen first based on the hierarchy of needs, dealing with immediate needs first – Safety Plans, protection orders, food, housing.

---

Wherever possible assessment and planning processes include the wider whānau, and are done using large sheets of paper and ideally with whānau members scribing. Social work interventions then focus on implementation of the whānau plan. The social worker uses tools such as ‘Three Houses’ to include the children and identify their worries, aspirations, and what they want from their parents. These processes include identifying what supports the whānau has in their wider whānau or community.

Once the immediate needs of the whānau have been attended to the next stage is to begin therapeutic interventions for behavioral change around violence and for parenting practices to ensure the care of children. These steps are progressed through referrals to whānau therapy and/or to parenting programmes or family parenting support services (Family Start or PAFT). At the same time social work support for whānau members assists them to work through their planned objectives, advocating and supporting independence and, if needed, linking whānau to other providers and to other resources.

Whānau progress is supported by regular 6-8 weekly reviews of goals and achievements, identifying what is working or not working for the whānau and hearing the children’s perspective of change. This process of review enables the whānau to re-evaluate their needs, to determine next steps and if they now have the confidence, tools and strategies to manage for themselves.

At the time of exiting the service, whānau review their overall goals and their achievements are celebrated. This is also the time when a closure plan is agreed to ensure that whānau have strategies for the future, including how to seek further support if needed in the future.

**Recording Information from the Social Work Process – data available for monitoring progress and for evaluation**

The Family Works Client Management System (CMS) is used to record information from key points in the social work process and interventions. CMS files include demographic and referral information, records of client goals agreed in Goal Plans (as issues to be addressed) and client-rated progress on goal achievement at the time of Goal Plan reviews and on closure; case-worker rated assessments of client change on key indicators such as the safety and care of children; and file status on closure.

Analysis of this CMS data enables a detailed evaluation of client referrals, the social work process and of client progress.

**The Evaluation**

The focus of this evaluation is the Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service delivered by Family Works Hawke’s Bay. The service was two years into a three year service contract at the time of the evaluation. The evaluation is therefore focused on service implementation and the outcomes achieved by clients over this timeframe. It is not yet possible to evaluate the extent to which the service supported the achievement of longer-term change for whānau and in their environment.

An Evaluation Framework was developed for the service (see Appendix 2). This approach maps a service and constructs a programme logic and results-based accountability\(^\text{17}\) (RBA) matrix for the service. These evaluation framework components clearly establish the available data sources to inform evaluation of programme processes and of client outcomes. The RBA matrix sets out measures of *Service Volumes* (how much ‘service’ is being delivered?), *Service Quality* (how well are services delivered?) and *Service Effectiveness* (are service users better off?).

---

\(^\text{17}\) *Trying Hard is not Good Enough*, Friedmann, M., 2005, Trafford Publishing; 
See also Performance measures, Results Accountability, Mark Friedmann, [www.resultsaccountability.com](http://www.resultsaccountability.com)
A table of key questions to be addressed by the Whakamana Whānau evaluation, with identified data sources and means of collection is included as Appendix 3.

Out-of-scope for evaluation
The evaluation does not include those services delivered Te Ikaroa Rangatahi Social Services, which are more appropriately evaluated through a kaupapa Māori evaluation facilitated by a Māori evaluation team.

Nor does the evaluation formally include the Kanohi ki te Kanohi group learning programme\textsuperscript{18} to reduce whānau violence, a programme that has been developing over the time of the evaluation process with the initial programme starting in March 2014 and completed in June 2014. A second programme began in mid-July 2014 with a third programme in progress at the time of writing. Note, however, that clients do not separate out their experiences of the social work support and the learning from participating in Kanohi ki te Kanohi. So this report does contain feedback from whānau who have received Whakamana Whānau services delivered by Family Works Hawke’s Bay and who have also participated in the Kanohi ki te Kanohi group learning programme.

Methods
The evaluation was undertaken using mixed methods with both qualitative and quantitative data being collected. It draws on multiple data sources to bring a range of perspectives to evaluating the Family Works Hawke’s Bay Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service.

These data sources include reports generated from the Family Works Client Management System database (CMS) drawing on quantitative and qualitative data recorded in the course of service delivery, client and stakeholder interviews, client service evaluation surveys and stakeholder surveys of referring partner agencies and agencies that clients have been referred on to for specific services.

The client face-to-face interviews with consenting service participants were conducted by a Masters of Social Work student on a research placement as part of the Masters study programme. The student was supported throughout the interview processes by the Presbyterian Support East Coast Māori Cultural Advisor. Information from the client interviews is incorporated into the service evaluation report to represent the voices and experiences of client whānau as directly as possible. This evaluative study of clients’ experience of the Whakamana Whānau service has also been written up as a separate piece of work.

A full description of these sources of data is included in the appendices.

Data Analysis
Quantitative data from CMS database reports and survey questions generating quantitative responses were entered into Excel spreadsheets for statistical analysis and to generate graphical representations of results.

Qualitative information from interviews and surveys was thematically analysed to identify key words and themes, which were organised into broad categories for reporting. Selected quotes are included in the report to illustrate participants’ experience of the Family Works Hawke’s Bay Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service.

\textsuperscript{18} This programme is being developed collaboratively by the partner organisations as a follow-on for whānau who have received Whakamana Whānau support services through Family Works or Te Ikaroa Rangatahi. Through this 10 week group programme participants learn from the experiences of others, learning to become independent of violence, and building strategies and practices for preventing violence.
**Evaluation Findings**

The first referrals to Whakamana Whānau were received in April 2012. Over the time period of data analysed for this evaluation, 1st April 2012 – 30th June 2014, 53 whānau/clients had been referred to Whakamana Whānau for social work support. At the end of this period there were five current files and 48 files had been closed.

**DESCRIPTION OF CLIENT GROUP**

**Demographics**

Many of the whānau referred to the service were unemployed or on benefits, living in private rental accommodation and living in areas of high socio-economic deprivation – some of the demographic indicators of a population with a high risk of family violence. The demographics of the Whakamana Whānau client group are presented below and a selection of these are shown graphically on page 14.

- Ethnicity data shows that 83% of those referred identify as NZ Māori; 11% as NZ Māori/NZ European; 2% as NZ Māori/Pasifika: and for 4% there is no data available.
- 19% of clients have named their iwi affiliations.
- Most clients (70%) were supported by benefits (37); 21% of whānau were supported by income from employment (11) and 8% were students (4). Data is not available for 1 client.
- The total client whānau group for this evaluation encompassed 116 children/tamariki – 51 children under 5, 39 aged 5-12 and 26 young people aged 12-24.
- 68% of client whānau included young children under the age of 5.
- 25% of clients were identified as sole parents.
- For 64% of client whānau (23), the mother was the primary caregiver; for 15% caregiving was shared by both parents (8) and in one whānau the father was the primary caregiver (2%). In 4% whānau (2) the children were in the care of extended family through CYF Whānau Care; for 8% whānau (4) children were in the care of other whānau members – either grandmothers (3) or an aunt.
- Many whānau (42%) were living in extended family groups.
- 64% of client whānau were living in rental accommodation, 24% were living with relatives (with house ownership status not specified), 6% were living in their own home.
- Client whānau were living largely in Hastings suburbs (79%) with 4% from Havelock North, 13% from Napier suburbs and 4% from areas outside of the Hastings & Napier urban areas.
- Most client whānau (87%) were living in high socio-economic deprivation areas (NZ Dep. scores of 9 or 10) and 9% in areas with deprivation scores of 8.
- 51% of whānau had professionals from other agencies involved on referral; 27% had 3 or more agencies involved and one whānau had professionals from 8 agencies involved.

---


20 The Social Deprivation Index (NZ Dep.) is a measure of socioeconomic status calculated from census data to indicate the average level of deprivation of people living in a small geographic area relative to the whole New Zealand population. Deprivation scores range from 1 to 10, with a score of 1 allocated to the least deprived areas and 10 allocated to the most deprived. Indicators used in defining the deprivation in a community are:

- Income - number adults on benefit
- Employment – number of adults unemployed
- Poverty – number living in households with income below poverty thresholds
- Communication – no access to telephone
- Transport – no access to car
- Support - number aged less than 60 living in single parent family (sole parent families)
- Qualifications – number adults without any qualifications
- Home ownership – number not living in own home
- Living space – household overcrowding
DEMOGRAPHICS OF FAMILY WORKS WHAKAMANA WHĀNAU CLIENTS

Ethnicity
- NZ Māori (83%)
- NZ Māori/NZ European (11%)
- NZ Māori/Pasifika (2%)
- Not known (4%)

Primary Caregiver
- Mother (65%)
- Father (24%)
- Aunt (2%)
- Grandmother (2%)
- CYF Whanau Care extended (4%)
- Parents (15%)
- Not completed (6%)

No. children in whānau
- 1 child (35%)
- 2 children (29%)
- 3 children (22%)
- 4 children (6%)
- 5 children (6%)
- 6 children (2%)

Income Source
- Benefit (70%)
- Employed (21%)
- Student (7%)
- Not known (2%)
Client Referrals to the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service

Referral data shows that Child, Youth and Family (CYF) and health services were the biggest sources of client referrals along with self- and family-referrals:

- One quarter (25%, 13) client whānau were referred through CYF; it is assumed that most, if not all, of these referral came from FVIARS
- A further 9% of referrals were received through the justice system, 8% (4) from Probation Services and 1 from Police
- Health services referred 21% (11) clients; 7 referrals from Plunket, 3 from DHB services (Mental Health Services and Special Care Baby Unit) and 1 from primary health services (GP)
- Self-referrals and those from whānau/friends accounted for 19% of referrals (10)
- Referrals were also made from education (9% including referrals through the SWiS service) and 11% through other NGO’s, mostly through Women’s Refuge
- Four repeat referrals were received (8% of referrals)
  - 3 of these were self-referrals to undertake further work; 2 of these were originally CYF referrals and 1 from education²¹
  - 1 repeat referral was from Probation Services and had originated from Probation

On referral:

- 98% of client whānau were assessed by the Whakamana Whānau service as being high risk; 62% were assessed as high risk by the referrer and 6% as medium risk
- 11% of whānau had identified gang-affiliations
- 51% of those referred had other agencies involved at the time of referral, with the number of agencies ranging from 1 to 8

²¹ The CMS data for each of these 3 repeat referrals shows that the whānau was ready to take further steps to prevent whānau violence. Therefore, these repeat referrals are regarded as a success indicator for the service.
Referrals Received who did not engage with Whakamana Whānau

The interview conducted with the social worker, in which concern was expressed about the number of referrals where the whānau were not able to be engaged with the service, prompted the evaluator to investigate and analyse the referral sources and reasons for non-engagement with the Whakamana Whānau service.

Sixty percent (60%) of all those referred to the service do not engage – nearly two-thirds of these (57%) are Child, Youth and Family (CYF) referrals and it is assumed that most of these are from the Family Violence Interagency Response System (FVIARS) which deals with all POL 400 notifications – police callouts for family violence incidents. The service statistics show that 43% of CYF-referred whānau who do not engage with the service either refused support or were not able to be contacted despite considerable time and effort on the part of the Whakamana Whānau social worker.

‘Non-Placement’ Data

The Family Works Hawke’s Bay administrative processes record some details for referrals received which do not progress to becoming clients of services, including the source of the referral and the reason for non-placement in a service. Analysis of intake data enabled the identification of referrals received for the Whakamana Whānau service which were ‘Non-Placements’.

Over the time period covered by the evaluation there were 79 ‘Non-Placements’ which along with the 53 clients who engaged with the service, gives a total of 132 referrals to the Whakamana Whānau from April 2012 – June 2014. The sources of these referrals and the reasons for non-placement are shown below:

- 22% (17) were not able to be contacted
- 35% (28) declined the service *(includes 1 whānau who left the area)*
- 43% (34) were receiving support through other services/engaged with other support options

The finding that 60% of those referred to Whakamana Whānau do not become clients of the service raised questions about the overall ‘referral outcomes’ for all referrals to the Whakamana Whānau including Non-Placements (See Table 1).

- Nearly two thirds (63%) of those initially self-referred or referred by family/friends and by community NGO’s and services engaged with the Whakamana Whānau service as clients; most of those referred from these sources who did not engage were receiving other services and support (19-29%) with a few declining the service (0-6%) or not contactable (7-13%).
- Nearly half (45-50%) of those referred through police/probation, health and education sources engaged as clients although higher numbers from these referrals declined the service (23-36%); some of those referred were receiving other support (9-23%) or were not contactable (5-18%).
- Of those referred through CYF, just over one in five (22%) whānau referred engaged with the Whakamana Whānau service as clients; one quarter (26%) declined the service and 17% were not contactable. One third (34%) did not engage because they were receiving other services or support.

This data analysis also shows that more than half of ‘Non-Placements’ were for referrals from CYF:
- 57% (45) CYF
- 14% (11) from health services, including 9 from Plunket
- 8% (6) from Police, including 1 from Probation
- 8% (6) from education services including SWiS
- 8% (6) self-referrals, including from family/friends
- 6% (5) from other NGO’s and community services

---

22 CYF referrals are most likely to have originated from the FVIARS process although this is not shown in information accessible to the evaluator.
**TABLE 1: Overall Referral Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Source</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Referrals (Service PLUS Intake)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, Youth &amp; Family (CYF)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/Probation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Plunket</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/School/SWiS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NGO's</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/Family/Friend</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

File closure notes indicate the considerable effort exerted by the social worker to engage with all those referred and to ensure that these whānau were aware of what the Whakamana Whānau service offered, of alternative avenues of support available to them, and of the actions that would be taken if the service was declined (where referrals were from CYF or police).

Intake data shows that the social worker spent 16% of the total service time in efforts to contact and engage with these intake referrals to the service – phone calls and letters to those referred and phone calls to referrers, home visits to locate and meet with whānau referred, and the associated travel and administration time required.

**Comment**

This is the most challenging aspect of the work for the social worker - the number of whānau where she knows that violence is happening but she is not able to reach them or the support is refused. Of particular concern are those referrals that have come via CYF from the Family Violence Interagency Response System (FVIARS) which deals with all POL 400 notifications. The service statistics show that 43% of these whānau refused support or were not able to be contacted. These whānau are referred back to CYF where their files are frequently closed until there is another whānau violence incident triggering a POL 400.

In spite of sustained effort the Whakamana Whānau social worker was unable to reach or engage with a significant proportion of whānau where violence is known to be currently occurring (a POL 400 had triggered the referral) and there is understandably greatly concern that the ‘response system’ as a whole does not currently seem to have the resources to persist in coordinated efforts by key agencies to engage and support these whānau.
**SOCIAL WORK PROCESS - INTERVENTIONS AND OUTCOMES**

**Social Work Engagement with Client Whānau, Length of Interventions and Caseload**

The social worker responded very promptly to referrals received and was persistent in efforts to establish contact with all whānau referred for social work support to address whānau violence.

The first contact with a client after referral is recorded as being within one working day for 74% of clients and within seven working days for 83% of clients. Making first contact took longer for the remaining 17% - from one to seven weeks. Client Management System (CMS) records show the numerous and repeat attempts made to contact ‘hard-to-reach’ clients through phone calls, through letters where phone calls were unsuccessful and, as a last resort, through unannounced home visits.

Sixty six percent (66%) of clients were enrolled with the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service for up to four months, 25% for four to six months and 9% for more than six months (see graph below).

The social worker’s caseload built up steadily once the Whakamana Whānau service was established, with the first client whānau engaged with the service in April 2012. The social worker has had a caseload of five or more of these high and complex clients each month since August 2012, with an average of eight cases. For a period of six months from May 2013 to October 2013 the social worker’s caseload was 10 and, at times, was up to 14, client whānau.

The social worker’s monthly caseload with the numbers of referrals and case closures each month is shown graphically on page 19.

![Graph showing the length of intervention and caseload](image-url)
Client Assessments, Goal Planning, Reviews and Case Closure

Assessment and goal planning were completed with all Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service clients. The issues addressed in Goal Plans formed by whānau provide an overview of the challenges whānau members are dealing with in trying to function effectively in their communities, in their day-to-day lives and relationships.

The social worker followed a process of regular review of goals plans and achievements every six to eight weeks with each client whānau. Final reviews were completed with all clients except those who disengaged or discontinued once they had been supported to resolve their key issues (e.g. housing).

Goals - Issues addressed through social work interventions

Of the 53 clients recorded in CMS, 52 have Goal Plans listing the issues listed as the agreed focus of the goals to be achieved through social work assistance and support, clearly indicating that the process of client assessment followed by establishing a Goal Plan with the client had occurred. There was no Goal Plan established for one client who was referred on directly to the Social Worker in Schools service (SWiS) for ongoing social work support for the child.

Each client Goal Plan had, on average, four issues listed as the agreed focus of the goals to be achieved through social work assistance and support. The number of issues agreed in client Goal Plans ranged from 1 to 10.

While all clients were referred to Whakamana Whānau to deal with violence in the whānau, and the impact of whānau violence on children and whānau members, the range of ‘other’ issues addressed by clients as part of dealing with the underlying patterns and consequences in their lives are summarised below and presented graphically on page 22.

- Just under half (46%) of the agreed Goal Plan issues are Social or Community Issues
  - Financial Hardship/Employment (15%)
  - Housing (10%)
  - School – truancy / behaviour (5%)
  - Justice / Probation / Police (2%)
o Other Social / Community (14%) – includes conflict, institutional/community issues and isolation.

- Relationship Issues are the next large category at 43%
  o Parenting (20%)
  o Relationships/Family Dynamics (17%)
  o Custody/Access (6%)

- Personal issues (7%) includes stress, anger, anxiety and behaviour
- Substance Use / Abuse (alcohol) accounts for 3% of contract issues
- Health (1%) - mental wellbeing

These issues provide an overview of the complexity and multiplicity of the issues that these whānau are contending with. What stands out are the challenges whānau members are dealing with in trying to function effectively in their communities, in their day-to-day lives and relationships.

**Goal Plan reviews and case closure**

Client Management System (CMS) data shows that the social worker followed a process of regular review of goals plans and achievements every six to eight weeks for each client whānau. Final reviews were completed with all clients with the exception of those who disengaged or discontinued with the service when they had received the support to resolve their key issues.

At the time of this evaluation, 48 files were closed:

- 42 file (88%) were closed because the whānau had achieved their key outcomes for engaging with the service
- 3 files (6%) were closed because the whānau had been referred on to other more appropriate services
- 3 files (6%) were closed because the client whānau disengaged from the service very early after assessment and Goal Plan formation.

Nine of the clients whose files were recorded as ‘Outcomes Met’ on closure had left the service prior to undertaking their final closing review and therefore their goals plans were not fully completed. For each of these client whānau, the social worker had assessed that child safety was no longer of concern and that the client whānau had achieved their key outcomes for engaging with the service.

A brief description of these file outcomes follows:

- two of these clients no longer kept appointments once they been supported into housing through Housing New Zealand;
- two sought social work support through a time of crisis and then discontinued with the service when their crisis situations lessened;
- two did not keep appointments once they had left their violent relationships and returned to live with parents with whānau support;
- another engaged with the service well but was not contactable after being released from home detention;
- two case files concern the same whānau where a prison term and erratic communication after release interrupted further progress.
Client Outcomes – Closed Cases

Social worker-assessed changes in whānau safety and wellbeing/mauri ora

Client whānau made significant improvements in whānau safety and in care for their children over the time they were engaged with the service. They also made significant gains in their connections to health, education services and to their extended whānau and communities.

Gains in Whānau Safety and Care on case closure:

- 90% assessed as having improved overall
- 98% had increased whānau safety
- 98% had improved care of their children

Gains in Whānau Health and Wellbeing on case closure: (where applicable)

- 98% had improved their health / use of health services
- 80% had improved children’s participation in school or early childhood education
- 98% were better connected to their extended whānau and community

Client-assessed changes achieved on issues listed in clients’ Goal Plans and contracts

Clients achieved positive change on 65% of their overall Goal Plan issues and on 86% of ‘whānau violence’ specific goals, as illustrated in the graph on page 22 showing the self-assessed change achieved across all contracted issues in client Goal Plans. Goal plans for each client whānau contained, on average, four contracted issues. (NB: This data relates to all of the issues contained in goals plans for 42 closed files; this data therefore includes client whānau that had left the service prior to any review and self-assessment of changes achieved on issues).

Where files were closed as having met key outcomes, whānau achieved positive change on 65% of their Goal Plan issues:

- 28% of goals achieved with self-rated change at 5 points or greater
- 37% of goals achieved with achieved self-rated change at 1 to 4 points
- 21% of goals self-rated no change
- 14% of goals were not completed, or not rated at review

Changes achieved on whānau violence issues listed in clients’ Goal Plans and contracts

Looking specifically at the issues of ‘whānau violence’ or ‘domestic violence’ in Goal Plans shows that whānau rated themselves as achieving greater change on these issues than on the issues seen as a whole group, with clients achieving positive change on 86% of ‘whānau violence’ goals (see graph on page 22):

- 54% of ‘whānau violence’ goals achieved with self-rated change at 5 points or greater
- 32% of ‘whānau violence’ goals achieved with self-rated change at 1 to 4 points
- 7% of ‘whānau violence’ goals self-rated no change
- 7% of ‘whānau violence’ goals were not completed

---

23 Before finalising a file for closure a case worker records their overall assessment of a client’s progress. As part of initial assessment and final review processes with clients, case workers also assess and rate the family’s situation on the dimensions of safety and care. Clients / whānau are also assessed on a health and wellbeing scale that covers their connections to health services, to education services and to support in their community (where applicable to each client/whānau situation).

24 During the initial assessment process clients identify and agree on the issues included in their Goal Plan for social work assistance and support. These issues are documented in a signed contract which is recorded in the CMS database. Clients rate the severity of their issues on a 10-point scale when the contract is agreed and re-rate issues again when the contract is reviewed and on case closure. The difference in ratings provides an indicator of the changes achieved from the client’s perspective.
CLIENT CHANGE ON CASE CLOSURE

Goal Plan Issues

- Social/Community: 46%
- Parenting: 20%
- Custody: 6%
- Relationships/Family Dynamics: 17%
- Personal Issues: 7%
- Substance Use/Abuse: 3%
- Health: 1%

Change achieved on all Goal Plan Issues on Case Closure - Client-rated

- 7 to 10 point change: 14%
- 5 to 6 point change: 14%
- 3 to 4 point change: 17%
- 1 to 2 point change: 20%
- No change: 21%
- Not completed: 14%

Change achieved on Whānau Violence Goals on Closure - Client-rated

- Change of 7 to 10: 25%
- Change of 5 to 6: 29%
- Change of 3 to 4: 18%
- No change: 7%
- Not completed: 7%
- Change of 1 to 2: 14%
**Goal Plan completion**

Nearly 60% of client whānau who completed the formal closure processes (33/42 files, 79% of those closed as having met key outcomes) had achieved 80% or more of the goals in their Goal Plans, and 87% achieved 50% or more of the goals in their Goal Plans:

- 59% clients/whānau completed 80-100% of the goals in their Goal Plan
- 28% clients/whānau completed 50-79% of the goals in their Goal Plan
- 13% had completed less than 50% of the goals in their Goal Plan

Overall, forty five percent (45%) of client whānau with files closed as having met their key outcomes (42/42 closed files - which includes those who did not complete a final review and closure process) had achieved 80% or more of the goals in their Goal Plans, and 71% achieved 50% or more of the goals in the Goal Plans:

- 45% of clients/whānau completed 80-100% of the goals in their Goal Plan
- 26% of clients/whānau completed 50-79% of the goals in their Goal Plan
- 12% had completed less than 50% of the goals in their Goal Plan
- 14% disengaged before any review and self-assessment of goal achievement

**Outcomes measures from client service evaluation surveys**

Client service evaluation surveys show that 85-92% of clients agreed that the service had helped them to achieve key service outcome indicators, and 90-100% were satisfied that the service met key service quality measures.

In total 54 client service evaluation surveys were completed over the time period of this evaluation, representing a return rate of 102% from client whānau25 - an exceptionally high rate of survey returns.

The Client Service Evaluation Survey questionnaire gives clients the opportunity to provide feedback and to rate the Whakamana Whānau service on a range of criteria which include measures of client outcomes and of service quality (see graphs on pages 24-25).

**Client Outcome Measures:**

- 91% of client whānau agreed that staff helped them to achieve their goals (69% strongly agree, 22% agree)
- 86% agreed that staff helped them learn new skills and strategies (56% strongly agree, 30% agree)
- 92% agreed with the statement ‘together we helped improve my relationships’ (68% strongly agree, 24% agree)
  - for 61% within whānau;  for 26% with others
- 85% agreed that staff helped them feel better prepared for the future (65% strongly agree, 20% agree)

**Service Quality Measures:**

- 94% of client whānau were satisfied overall with the service (72% very satisfied, 22% satisfied, 6% no opinion)
- 90% agreed that the service was easy to access (56% strongly agreed, 34% agreed, 6% no opinion, 2% strongly disagreed)
- 96% agreed that they were satisfied with the relationship with their worker (85% strongly agreed, 11% agreed, 2% strongly disagree)
- 100% would recommend the service to others (91% Yes, 9% Maybe)

---

25 Client Service Evaluation Surveys are offered to all whānau members who have directly received service interventions at the time of service reviews and on case closure. The surveys can therefore be completed by more than one individual from a whānau, and may be completed on more than one occasion. Usual returns rates achieved for these surveys range from 20-60%.
Overall satisfaction with service

- Very satisfied: 72%
- Satisfied: 22%
- Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied: 6%
- No Opinion: 0%

Your staff helped me meet my goals

- Strongly agree: 69%
- Agree: 22%
- No Opinion: 7%
- Disagree/Strongly Disagree: 0%
- Not applicable: 2%

I was satisfied with my relationship with my worker

- Strongly agree: 85%
- Agree: 11%
- No Opinion: 0%
- Disagree: 0%
- Strongly disagree: 2%
- Not applicable: 2%

Your service was easy for me to access

- Strongly agree: 56%
- Agree: 34%
- No Opinion: 6%
- Disagree: 2%
- Not applicable: 2%
FAMILY WORKS WHAKAMANA WHĀNAU CLIENT SERVICE EVALUATION SURVEY MEASURES

Your staff helped me learn new skills & strategies

Not applicable 5%
No Opinion 9%
Agree 30%
Strongly agree 56%
Disagree/Strongly Disagree 0%

Your staff helped me feel better prepared for the future

Not applicable 4%
No Opinion 11%
Agree 20%
Strongly agree 65%
Disagree/Strongly Disagree 0%

Together we helped improve my relationships

Not applicable 2%
No Opinion 6%
Agree 24%
Strongly agree 68%
Disagree/Strongly Disagree 0%

Would recommend the service to others

Yes 91%
No 0%
Maybe 9%

Referrals to Organisations and Services in the Community

The Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service supported whānau to receive any additional services they required and to access assistance from organisations and agencies in the community after completing with the social work support service.

Referrals during Whakamana Whānau service delivery

Whānau were referred on to a wide range of organisations and services in the community as part of the Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service (see text box below), supporting clients to access the resources they needed and linking them into their community supports. Referrals to organisations and services in the community are recorded for 74% (39) whānau.

Some of these referrals were to other services within the suite of services available within Family Works Hawke’s Bay and within the family violence services collaboration with Te Ikaroa Rangatahi, the partner organisation. Many of these were for family therapy interventions with the family therapist based at Te Ikaroa Rangatahi and other referrals were to parenting courses (Toolbox Programmes; Incredible Years, Parenting Inside Out, Home Interactive Programme for Parents and Youngsters (HIPPY)), counselling services and to social work support within schools through SWiS.

Other referrals were for specialist services, for example to the Hawke’s Bay DHB Child and Adolescent Family Service or for addiction treatment; or to organisations offering specific support groups for women, or programmes for children who have witnessed violence and for children dealing with grief.

Community organisations/agencies providing support services on case closure

Community organisations/agencies were named as providing ongoing support services for over one quarter (28%) of whānau on case closure with the Whakamana Whānau service.

Ten (19%) of the whānau from the April 2012 – June 2014 client group included in this evaluation had whānau members who had participated, or were participating, in the Kanohi ki te Kanohi anti-violence group learning programme developed and delivered collaboratively by Family Works and Te Ikaroa Rangatahi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community organisations/agencies referred to:</th>
<th>Community organisations/agencies named as providing services for whānau on case closure:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family therapist – based at Te Ikaroa Rangatahi</td>
<td>Child, Youth &amp; Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Works Parenting Programmes</td>
<td>Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPY – Home Interactive Programme for Parents and Youngsters – Family Works</td>
<td>Family Start - Te Taiwhenua O Heretaunga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Works Counselling – children &amp;/or parents</td>
<td>Tamariki Ora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers in Schools (SWiS)</td>
<td>Plunket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents as First Teachers (PAFT)</td>
<td>Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Start - Te Taiwhenua O Heretaunga</td>
<td>Social Workers in Schools (SWiS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Group – Women’s Refuge</td>
<td>Family Works general Social Work services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamariki Programme – Women’s Refuge</td>
<td>Kanohi ki te Kanohi group learning programme – Whakamana Whānau collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work &amp; Income – Integrated Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB DHB Child and Adolescent Family Service (CAFS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOD Addiction Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family Violence Incidents recorded for Client Whānau - POL 400 Data

Police family violence incident data suggests that the Whakamana Whānau service has decreased the incidence of violence in some client whānau over the time period covered by this evaluation. For half (50%) of the 30 files with POL 400 data, the records indicate a reduction in the incidence of whānau violence triggering police call-outs (and resulting in POL 400 reports) after the whānau had exited the Whakamana Whānau service; for 67% of files, the data shows a decrease in the frequency of police call-outs, or no call-outs, after case closure with the Whakamana Whānau service.

POL 400s

A POL 400 is the code given to a Police form completed by staff members who attend either incidents or offences involving family violence.

Staff completing the POL 400 forms rate the seriousness of the violence that has triggered a police call-out using a continuum scale from 1 to 10 – with 10 being the most serious incidents or offences. Lower ratings may be used where police have been called in to prevent the violence from escalating, for example where calling the police is part of an agreed household Safety Plan.

POL 400 data analysis

POL 400 data was sought from the police for the 38 files closed at the time of the data request. Whakamana Whānau was provided with basic statistics on the number of POL 400s issued while client whānau were with the service and the number of POL 400s since exiting the service for each file where there was data.

- Police held no POL 400 data for 8 files
- Of the 30 files with POL 400 data (indicating that police had records of attending whānau violence incidents):
  - 23% (7) had no POL 400s for either time period, during the service and post-service
    - Referral notes indicate that most of these whānau were dealing with significant historical whānau violence - there had been 6 POLs issued for 1 of these whānau prior to referral to the service
  - 13% (4) had POLs during the service, but there had been no POLs since service completion
  - 13% (4) had fewer POL 400s since exiting the service than during their engagement with the service
    - Closure notes indicate that in 3 of these whānau, the mother had separated from their partner and had protection orders in place; 1 file relates to a client who disengaged from the service
  - 23% (7) had no POL 400s during the service, but had POL 400s post-exiting the service
    - Closure notes suggest that for 5 of these files the POLs are likely to have resulted from activating Safety Plans and calling police earlier to prevent violence from escalating – 2 had protection orders in place; for 1 file the mother and child were no longer living with the offender; 1 file relates to a client who disengaged from the service
  - 7% (2) had the same number of POL 400s during the service as post-service
    - Both files related to clients choosing to continue relationships with a partner prone to violence, with whānau and agency support
  - 20% (6) had more POL 400s post-service than during the service
    - 2 files had protection orders and Safety Plans which included calling police if required; 1 file related to a mother no longer living with the offender and who had relocated from the area with her children; 2 files relate to clients who disengaged from the service; in one instance the POL 400s related to an ‘unknown male’ and could not be correlated with information from file closure notes
For half (15) of the 30 files with POL 400 data, the records indicate a reduction in the incidence of whānau violence triggering police call-outs (and resulting in POL 400 reports) after the whānau had exited the Whakamana Whānau service.

For the other half (15 files) the number of POL 400s remained the same or increased. In the absence of any of the ratings data on the seriousness of the incidents or offences triggering the police call-outs / POL 400s it is not possible to assess what effect participating in the Whakamana Whānau service may have had. It is noted that the POLs for some of these whānau may have had the lower ratings associated with call-outs to prevent the escalation of violence and files notes indicates that protection orders were in place for four of these.

As another approach to analysing the data the frequency of POL 400s (indicating incidents triggering police call-outs) for whānau while engaged with the Whakamana Whānau service was compared with the frequency of POL 400s post-exit from the service.

- 37% (11) whānau had no POL 400s post-exiting the service
- 27% (8) whānau had a decrease in the frequency of POL 400s/police call-outs after exit from the service
- 13% (4) whānau had an increase in the frequency of POL 400s / police-callouts after exit from the service  
  - 2 files had protection orders and Safety Plans which included calling police if required; 1 file relates to a client who disengaged from the service; 1 file had recently been closed on service-exit
- 23% (7) where the frequency comparison is not applicable - no POL 400s during the service, but POL 400s post-exiting the service  
  - Closure notes suggest that for 5 of these files the POLs are likely to have resulted from activating Safety Plans and calling police earlier to prevent violence from escalating – 2 had protection orders in place; for 1 file the mother and child were no longer living with the offender; 1 file relates to a client who disengaged from the service

**Limitations of this analysis**

The POL 400 data suggests that the Whakamana Whānau service has decreased the incidence of violence in some client whānau over the time period covered by this evaluation.

- for half (50%) of the 30 files with POL 400 data, the records indicate a reduction in the incidence of whānau violence triggering police call-outs (and resulting in POL 400 reports) after the whānau had exited the Whakamana Whānau service;
- for 67% of files with POL 400s, the data shows a decrease in the frequency of police call-outs, or no call-outs, after case closure with the Whakamana Whānau service.

However, this analysis is limited by the relatively short time periods covered by the post-service data, the absence of pre-service data, and the absence of incident severity ratings. A more insightful analysis of the impact of the Whakamana Whānau service for client whānau requires detailed POL 400 data with ratings of the seriousness of the incident triggering each police-callout, with pre- and post-service data over an extended period of time.

Any future evaluation of the service could request this extended data set, with the understanding that fulfilling such a request is dependent on the police resources available to extract such a data set.

POL 400 data has the potential to regularly provide the Whakamana Whānau service with ‘hard data’ to track reductions in the incidence of violence in client whānau. It would also be a major indicator of any reduction in the incidence of violence in the Hawke’s Bay region at a whole population level. These are possible developments for discussion with Police and other agency partners in the regional Family Violence Inter Agency Response System.
**STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES ON THE FAMILY WORKS WHAKAMANA WHĀNAU SOCIAL WORK SERVICE**

**Clients’ Experience of the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service**

Clients value the social work support and appreciated being able to talk through their situation with the social worker. They also valued the social worker’s capacity to listen, as well as the advice, information, advocacy and the strategies they were helped to develop.

Clients are satisfied with the service and with their relationship with the social worker. Through client service evaluation surveys, Whakamana Whānau clients expressed their satisfaction with the service, with their engagement with the social worker and with service accessibility.

Those clients who generously participated in interviews said they had eliminated, or reduced, violence in their home; had learnt how to be safe and stay safe, and how to communicate better with partners and children. Most interviewed also said they had removed the use of drugs and/or alcohol in their lives. The social worker’s manner and approach to working with whānau were identified as key to the support for whānau to change their lives. They also identified that they were able to maintain long-term changes within their homes because they felt better equipped to handle issues and set backs on their own. Whakamana Whānau had provided support to empower them to advocate for themselves, helped them to manage their emotions and gave them the ability to discuss issues with partners and whānau. The clients also referred to their learning and how it helped them deal with problems without violence. They reported that they were more confident to reach out into the community for the support they needed to maintain the changes they had made.

**Client interviews**

All of the five clients interviewed had completed their work with the Whakamana Whānau service at least four months prior to the interviews taking place. Each of the five clients interviewed was firstly asked how they found about Whakamana Whānau. They were then asked about changes they had made, how the service supported them and their whānau to make those changes, if they had been able to sustain those changes and what was the most helpful to them. The interviews also covered what may not have gone well for them, if they had been treated respectfully and if they had any recommendations for service improvements. (See Appendices for Participant Information, Consent Form and Semi-Structured Interview outline).

Note that some clients’ feedback on their experience of the Whakamana Whānau service also encompasses their participation in the Kanohi ki te Kanohi group learning programme principally because the clients themselves do not separate out their experience of the social work service and their learning from participating in the programme, which is understandable given that the programme is facilitated by the Whakamana Whānau service staff. Two of the five clients interviewed had participated in the first Kanohi ki te Kanohi programme and one was a participant in the second programme which began just prior to the interviews taking place. These programmes are jointly delivered by the Family Works Whakamana Whānau social worker, the Te Ikaroa Rangatahi community support worker and the family violence therapist.

The interview responses were collated and themes identified. The following presents client responses to the interview questions by themes.

**Referral to the service**

The clients interviewed were referred to the service by whānau members, from ‘Say Ahh!’ the DHB-funded rheumatic fever programme, by a Work and Income case manager or self-referred to Whakamana Whānau.

**Changes made by clients**

The clients interviewed identified that throughout the service process, and upon closing with the social worker, they had reduced or eliminated violence in the home: violence towards their partner,
including emotional and psychological violence; violence towards their children; arguing; and shouting.

*I’m happy, my family’s happy and I’ve changed the cycle of violence and started to look toward the future.*

Clients had not known how to be safe or stay safe until interacting with the Family Works Whakamana Whānau social worker and learning from sessions with the family violence therapist.

*Keep that space, safe space between my Tane and me, which is what they helped me with actually.*

Clients reported communicating better with their partners, their children and their wider whānau. One client identified that the verbal abuse that was happening was directly related to their inability to communicate effectively with each other and was linked with not dealing with past issues.

Most of the clients interviewed stated that a major change to their lives was removing the use of alcohol, drugs or of both.

*It made me give it [referring to drug use] up because it made me realise it [drugs] was in the way of me growing with children.*

Fundamentally, the clients identified that their homes were filled with more aroha, understanding, and kindness.

Support from Whakamana Whānau to make changes in their whānau

The social worker’s manner and approach to working with whānau were identified as key to the support for whānau to change their lives. Clients talked about what they saw as the essential characteristics of the social worker and the Family Works Whakamana Whānau service that enabled them to engage and trust in the social work process. They described the social worker as honest, up-front, open and non-judgmental, reliable and hard-working.

*She’s straight up but loving.
She cares, she’s straight up and isn’t afraid to call someone on something
You can talk to her about anything.
She tries her hardest to find a solution.
Good or bad she’s there.
Whenever you step out of line she puts you back in line.
Consistent, on the ball, and efficient. Going above and beyond.*

The social worker is seen by clients as a role-model for a better way of living, giving them hope that they can change:

*Role modelling and inspiring us
We got to see how and why to change
Change is real. Change can happen. It does, it’s all got to start within ourselves.*

The social worker was a strong advocate for clients with the various agencies involved in their lives and worked with them to ensure that the whānau has their immediate needs met - food, housing, protection order, safety and security.

*[The social worker] works with clients that are on the cusp of making changes and stays with them through set backs and all the chaos in order to ensure they can get through to the other side.*

Clients appreciated that the social worker worked in partnership with the whānau to achieve the goals that whānau and social worker had jointly established, and agreed to, at the beginning of their professional relationship through the assessment and planning processes; and that the work proceeded at a pace that was matched to whānau readiness for the next step.
[The social worker] came in and did her job. She took it on board to give us the information we needed without causing further tension by insisting things needed to be a certain way. She worked with me to achieve MY goals and closed the case when I was ready.

We didn’t need to finish by a specific time or session.

[The social worker] helped us to get counselling and courses ... helped us to connect to whānau ...

The social worker’s commitment to being guided by the needs and goals of the family, including when their goal was to stay together safely as a whānau, was seen as a strength of the service. Clients frequently said that other organisations and professionals in the community were focused on removing the offender from the home and from the whānau despite the wishes of whānau members.

[The social worker] stuck it out through dangerous situations and didn’t try to make the family split. Her professionalism helped build trust.

Most importantly is helping families stay together safely and build stronger whānau rather than trying to split them up.

The clients further identified that the social worker helped them to see the cycle of violence and most importantly the effect it had on their children. The social worker made sure that the focus remained on the children at all times.

She helped me to see my children’s’ needs
... and also helped my partner to see he was being violent with his partner and kids and helped us to make positive choices

Whakamana Whānau had shown them the importance of communication with partners, children and whānau. One client stated that learning to communicate better was helping him to see his children’s needs:

I learned how to communicate with my kids and partner and that helped my kids feel safer.

The social worker was seen as particularly adept at collaborating and coordinating with all the professionals and organisations involved in their chaotic lives. The practice of convening hui for the professionals engaged with a whānau was appreciated by client whānau. It was related (in a specific case of intimate partner violence) that the social worker had organised hui for whānau members and professionals to get all of those involved with the whānau, including Police, Work and Income, Child, Youth and Family, Te Taiwhenua and others, all working together towards achieving the family’s goals while also maintaining the focus of keeping everyone safe:

The social worker helped coordinate and collaborate with police, WINZ, CYF and Te Taiwhenua ... She helped us to reach our goals.

She [the social worker] was really good at holding whānau and professional hui to ensure everyone was on the same page.

Maintaining change in the longer-term

The clients identified that they were able to maintain long-term changes within their homes because they felt better equipped to handle issues and set backs on their own. Whakamana Whānau provided advocacy and support to empower them to advocate for themselves, helped them to manage their emotions, and gave them the ability to discuss issues with partners and whānau as well as to reach out into the community for support.

One client identified that Whakamana Whānau gave her the tools and strategies to support herself and to reach out to whānau in the future. She explained that she feels confident and able to turn to whānau for help without needing Whakamana Whānau intervention in the future.
Working towards their own goals, and to their own schedule, kept whānau members engaged and responsive to change. Further, the clients stated that acceptance was important part of their success.

The clients also referred to their learning and how it helped them deal with problems without violence:

*About strength and where it comes from, about abuse and where it comes from, which I knew a lot about but ... it was so simple and to the point that I could swallow it, not just keep it up here (points to head) or keep it, I could finally take it in... It all sunk in there. Because it was quiet, you didn’t get rushed, there was no pressure or deadlines... it helped me concrete everything and understand.*

**Whakamana Whānau as a service**

Overall, the clients interviewed were very positive about the Whakamana Whānau service. Clients again mentioned the importance for them that the Whakamana Whānau service was guided by the needs and goals of the family, including when their goal was to stay together safely as a whānau.

When asked about ‘any aspects of the service that had not gone well’, all of them had responded that everything was good for them.

Clients were asked if they were well treated and respected throughout the social work process and the clients interviewed unanimously agreed they were.

When asked for any recommendations for service improvements, the clients were eager for the service to continue with more staff and programmes, and to be accessible for more people. Each client identified at least one person in his or her circle who would appreciate and benefit from the Whakamana Whānau service.

*It would be beneficial to have a bigger programme/staff so that more people can access the service.*

*A Facebook page dedicated to Whakamana Whānau- with individual enquiries*

Their suggestions also included requests for a dedicated space for the Kanohi ki te Kanohi anti-violence group learning programme and to ensure it was a mixed programme. Both of these requests (at the time of writing) have been fulfilled.

When asked if there was anything further they would like to add, clients were keen to express their gratitude. All of those interviewed expressed their appreciation of the service and the support they had received.

*They’ve been great. They’ve been a good part of my life and my kid’s lives... now we’re [referring to his partner] both focusing on our kids. Building a good friendship.*

*If you can get one person, one person, it will ripple. And they got all of us. Keep going, please!*

*Thank you for helping to get her life on track. We are at peace. Getting on with life.*
Client service evaluation surveys – qualitative responses

Clients’ feedback on the Whakamana Whānau service gathered from the interview process is supported by the data gathered from the Client Service Evaluation surveys administered to all clients at case reviews and on case closure. These client service evaluation surveys show that 91% of clients agreed that the service had helped them to achieve their goals; and 100% would recommend the service to others.

A synopsis of qualitative responses to these surveys is presented below. Quantitative data on client ratings of the service on the survey measures are presented in text and graphs on pages 23-25 (Outcome Measures from Client Service Evaluations).

Most helpful

Through the surveys, 80% (43) respondents chose to offer comments on what they found most helpful about the service. Many simply said ‘everything’ finding the whole service helpful, while 84% (36) of those offering comments mentioned specific aspects of the social work support – being able to talk through their situation with the social worker, whose capacity to listen as well as the advice, information, advocacy and strategies were greatly appreciated; the counselling and family therapy; the one-to-one weekly home visits; and a few specifically mention ‘homework’ tasks as particularly helpful. Comments included:

- Having the support and somebody you can go to for advice and being able to understand what I’m going through
- 24hr on call service and immediate assistance and advise from [the social worker]
- Advice, practical activities; Straight to the point
- One to one contact and always there
- Advice for my health, safety plan, stress management
- The information and support the social worker provided
- Having weekly contact with my support person. Being able to put plan and goals in place for my whānau
- Advice and strategies, how to communicate and critical thinking.

Further comment

Twenty (37%) clients took the opportunity to offer further comments and feedback, overwhelmingly expressions of thanks and appreciation. Some examples are quoted below:

- I have learnt so much from Whakamana Whānau service and I would like to thank [the social worker and the family therapist] for all that they have taught me and done for me. They have truly turned my life around for the better. Thanks so much.
- I am glad to have been referred to do this programme. I feel I have been able to better myself as an individual, father and partner. Thanks
- Keep up with the good work Family Works. Thanks for all your help, would highly recommend to family and friends in need
- Thank you for looking for the right info in order to contact me
- I thoroughly enjoyed and learnt to open up to services offered with [the social worker and family therapist] the level of trust I value and the relationship we established to help me in my life journey its been a privilege
- Thank you for all your support and truth. I’ve grown in strength; you’ve helped me overcome challenges that have haunted me for years. God bless Angel of God. xoxoxox
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Experience of Government Agency and Community Stakeholders

Responses from the 20 agency and community organisation stakeholders who participated in the online survey show that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service is well-regarded by referring and collaborating agencies/community organisations; and many of the stakeholders responding to the survey took the opportunity to offer their appreciation of the service and to commend the social worker’s professionalism, experience and competence. Ninety-five percent (95%) agreed that the service is making a positive difference to restoring the safety and wellbeing/mauri ora of whānau where family violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

Survey of government agency and community stakeholders

The perspective of government agency and community stakeholders was obtained through an online survey of those with working relationships with the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service. The social worker provided a list of key contacts, a list of 34 professionals from 21 government and community organisations. Twenty (20) responses were received, a 59% response rate, from professionals working in organisations across the social services, health, education and justice sectors as well as from private sector legal and property management businesses; these are organisations that refer to and/or receive referrals from the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service including those who work collaboratively with the service.

- 75% of respondents make referrals to Whakamana Whānau
- 35% receive referrals from Whakamana Whānau
- 35% work collaboratively with Whakamana Whānau

Organisations making referrals to the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service

Of the 15 organisations that identified that they make referrals to Whakamana Whānau:

- 87% (13) were satisfied or very satisfied with the process of making a referral to the Whakamana Whānau service, with 13% (2) giving the response ‘neutral’ with no comment added to enlarge on the response
- 93% (14) agreed that they received acknowledgement of their referral, with 7% (1) responding that they ‘sometimes’ received acknowledgement of a referral
- 100% had received further communication about their referral(s)
- 93% (14) agreed or definitely agreed that Whakamana Whānau is making a positive difference for the families they referred; 7% (1) did not know

Those referring to Whakamana Whānau commented that the referral process was easy, handled professionally with prompt responses and good liaison with referrers. Comments given to elaborate on the satisfaction ratings given for the process of making referrals to Whakamana Whānau include:

- [The social worker] is very good at liaising as necessary
- Clear and fast communication from [the social worker] when working collaboratively with families. There are clear processes that [the social worker] employs to ensure there is not a double up of service delivery - very specific roles of work to achieve results.
- Easy to complete and easy to refer, good response on whether whānau have accepted or declined service
- Very quick uptake of referral - visits to whānau affected by family violence
- Prompt friendly professional service, well informed - great team work approach which facilitates improved outcomes for whānau

Organisations receiving referrals from the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service

Of the seven organisations that identified receiving referrals from Whakamana Whānau:

- 71% (5) respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the process receiving a referral from Whakamana Whānau service, with 14% (1) giving the response ‘neutral’ and 14% (1) not responding to this section of the survey questionnaire
• 71% (5) respondents indicated that referrals received matched the services provided by the organisation with 29% (2) not responding to this section of the survey questionnaire (NB: given that these two organisations provide legal and property services it is assumed that this is an omission and does not indicate inappropriate referrals).
• 86% (6) respondents agreed that they were provided with sufficient information with referrals(s); 14% (1) did not receive sufficient information

Those receiving referrals from Whakamana Whānau commented that referrals were very thorough with all the information required supplied, and that the social worker was readily available for further discussion if required. Comments given to elaborate on the satisfaction ratings given for the process of receiving referrals from Whakamana Whānau include:

- [The social worker’s] referral process is very precise, full of information about referral issues and relationship issues. Any dangers (including dogs on property), any requirements for whānau is noted and discussed before meeting. All information regarding address and phone numbers are clearly documented.
- [The social worker] is always very obliging to have a discussion about the referral whānau when required

Service effectiveness – the perspective of government agency and community stakeholders

One way of assessing the effectiveness of the the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service was to obtain feedback from those in organisations with working relationships with the service. The survey questionnaire canvassed respondents’ knowledge and experience of the service as one that is working to restore whānau safety and wellbeing both in its immediate responses to whānau and longer-term. It also obtained stakeholder feedback on what is currently working well, service gaps and areas for improvement.

The online survey included questions on the funder’s contractual expectations that Family-Centred Services service providers will deliver direct services to families/whānau that restore safety and wellbeing/mauri ora where family violence has, or is at risk of occurring; create longer-term change needed to prevent family violence from recurring; help families/whānau access additional services needed and draw on wider whānau/ community to achieve longer-term change; focus on effective, innovative joined-up ways to meet family/whānau and community need; reduce service fragmentation, duplication and gaps in frontline services.

Of the 20 stakeholders responding to the online survey:

- 95% agreed or definitely agreed that the Whakamana Whānau service is making a positive difference to restoring the safety and wellbeing / mauri ora of whānau where family violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring (1 community partner providing housing responded ‘don’t know’)
- 95% agreed or definitely agreed that Whakamana Whānau supports whānau to make longer-term changes that prevent family violence from recurring (1 community partner providing housing responded ‘don’t know’)
- 80% agreed or definitely agreed that Whakamana Whānau links whānau to their wider whānau / community and to other services to support longer-term change; 20% ‘don’t know’
- 84% agreed or definitely agreed that Whakamana Whānau works collaboratively to meet whānau and community needs; 16% ‘don’t know’
- 68% agreed or definitely agreed that Whakamana Whānau works together with other frontline services to reduce service gaps and fragmentation; 32% ‘don’t know’

Professionals were asked to comment on what they experienced as working well in the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service. Responses covered a range of areas which include the provision of ‘wrap-around’ services to deal with family violence issues; the timeliness of responses to referrals; the experience, approach and competence of the social worker; the communication and collaborative approach; the inclusive relationships which are established with
whānau members; working with/supporting both parents; and the availability of a family therapist to work with whānau. Comments included:

- The person [the social worker] is makes this work. She has expectations and doesn’t pussy-foot around. In many cases this is what’s needed.
- The clear processes  The professional manner The information sharing The competence of the social worker The support and guidance when working collaboratively
- Dealing with the issues of family violence and making whānau aware of steps that need to be taken.
- The consistent visits and messages thus building relationships and supporting change to families affected by family violence
- Ease of communication between agencies - flexibility / prompt contact / experience and approach of social worker

Service gaps and suggestions for possible improvements identified by respondents
Service gaps and improvements suggested by government agency and community stakeholders included requests that funding for the service continues and increases to enable the service have more resources and staffing to reach more whānau; to ensure that the social worker is well-supported; and to ensure regular updates and exit reports are provided. There is also the observation that violence must be named directly and owned by the perpetrator.

- Support for the social worker, regular assessment from management of safety issues the social worker faces
- Ensure that funding for services such as this continues and that staff have the resources necessary to provide best care
- The ability to reach more whānau, more resources/staffing to allow this to happen
- Maybe an additional therapist to assist [the family therapist] as the need is huge regarding the relationship issues.
- Exit report would be useful when finished working with client.
- Feedback on regular basis re mutual families in written form or regular phone updates
- My observation is that at times there is a tendency not to be sufficiently direct about violence - I have heard some of the adults say that they have made "mistakes" (being violent) as opposed to owning their violence and recognising that they chose to be violent. Being direct about the violence that has occurred [is] asking the violent adult to own it, recognising that the violence is not a mistake but a choice, ensuring that the non-violent parent is not asked to be responsible for the violent parents behaviour

Other stakeholder feedback received
Many stakeholders responding to the survey took the opportunity to offer their appreciation of an excellent service and to commend the social worker:

- Thank you!
- Excellent service. I use this service as my first port of call with whānau who fit the referral criteria.
- Service is excellent. Weekly or twice weekly visits from Whakamana Whānau social worker is reassuring to my role also. ‘An extra set of eyes’ that are trained to support our whānau affected.
- I believe it is a very current service that addresses very difficult family situations that are generationally embedded. I believe that [the social worker] does an awesome job with very little recognition of the times of work she does.
- Working alongside [the social worker], who is not only professional in every aspect of her role, she shares the passion and care for the whānau we work with. Our whānau are lucky to have her service in their lives. She is efficient, knowledgeable of community services and advocates with confidence on their behalf.
**Whakamana Whānau Service Staff**

The following section incorporates material from interviews with the social worker delivering the Family Works Hawke’s Bay Whakamana Whānau service and with the Service Managers of both partner organisations in the Whakamana Whānau Collaborative Partnership.

These interviews were conducted to provide a context for the evaluation, to document the service approach and to capture any new service developments in an evolving collaborative practice. (The interview material is not presented here in full - some of the information derived from interviews has informed other sections of this evaluation report).

**Family Works Hawke’s Bay Whakamana Whānau Social Worker**

The Family Works Hawke’s Bay Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service is delivered by an experienced social worker who has worked with Family Works for over eight years, has previous experience in Māori health and elder care, is Māori and is known in the community where many client whānau live.

The social worker has an average caseload of about eight. The child-centred practice of Family Works means that the caseload of the social worker consists of those whānau who have children, particularly where the children are under the age of five.

The social worker is supported by a Service Manager who has a strong interest in the service and its development; and has colleagues to consult with when needed and one in particular who very usefully ‘always comes up with questions from outside the square’. The social worker is also supported by excellent external supervision and has about six other identified individuals in a professional network that are used as needed to support the work and to reflect on practice.

The social worker has a good working relationship with the community worker at Te Ikaroa Rangatahi. At times they will consult each other about strategies and approaches to working with client whānau. If there are whānau with young boys who are perpetrators of violence, they are referred to Te Ikaroa Rangatahi where the (male) community worker can provide them with a positive role model. ‘They are not going to listen to another woman’. And sometimes a whānau will split up, the father working with the community worker and the Family Works social worker working with the mother and the younger children; and the two staff consulting each other about their interventions and whānau progress.

**Building relationships with whānau**

The social worker described herself as being very direct in communicating with whānau and as honest, respectful and transparent in all dealings with them. Success in ‘getting in the door’ is attributed to being very direct about the referral resulting from violence in the whānau and to not being from Child, Youth and Family (CYF). The social worker ensures that the whānau realise that the Whakamana Whānau service is the ‘last step’ before CYF and if they choose not to engage the referral will go straight back to CYF.

The initial meeting with a whānau explains the purpose of the visit and then introduces Family Works, the social worker’s role in the organisation, in the Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service and the social worker’s whānau links. This meeting also sets out what is expected of clients and what they can expect from the social worker, ensuring that clients understand the boundaries of the role. To ensure that the work is culturally safe and respectful, guidance is sought from the woman of the house – ‘how and where to sit, etc.’ This approach supports the social worker to work respectfully, not just with Māori whānau who may not know their iwi affiliations but also with families of other ethnicities, for example Kiribati and Samoan.

**Social work process and approach**

The social worker spends at least two hours doing a social work assessment with the whānau and the immediate concerns are to ensure the safety and care of children, and to deal with the basic
needs of the whānau first – immediate Safety Plans, protection and parenting orders, food, housing, benefits, budgeting.

Children may need their own Safety Plan that covers them while they are at school, or while they are going to and from school. The social worker will make sure that the school principal, and the Social Worker in Schools (SWiS) worker if there is one at the school, know what the whānau situation is and can monitor the children while they are at school – *Are they safe? Healthy? Have they had breakfast and do they have anything for lunch?* The social worker always talks with the school principal - ‘they know a lot of the kids personally, but sometimes there’s a bit they don’t know about’; and keeps the principal informed of progress with the whānau.

An approach that the social worker frequently uses for planning is to provide the whānau with large sheet(s) of paper and magazines with the task of creating a collage of a house with a path leading to it; and using this to show what they want in their house (specifying that this is not about material goods like large screen TVs) and then to identify and illustrate the steps that need to be taken to get to this house, and who can help them to get there. A whānau will sometimes do this altogether, and sometimes the children are asked to do their own if they are old enough. Breaking down the components of the pathway to the house generally forms the starting point in creating the whānau Goal Plan. It is also used to help those whānau members who are at risk to identify who is in their ‘safety circles’ - *Who can they trust? Who can they safely contact and how will they do this?* - and to clarify whānau Safety Plans.

Once the immediate needs of the whānau have been attended to, the whānau is supported to progress through the steps outlined in their Goal Plan according to their priorities. The social worker encourages the whānau to lead this process and ‘stages it’ so that the work goes at their pace without overwhelming the whānau. Social work support for whānau members assists them to work through achieving their goals, advocates and links whānau to other providers and to other resources including to their wider whānau. Referrals are made to whānau therapy so that adults understand violence and learn to manage their anger; and to parenting programmes or family parenting support services (Family Start or Parents as First Teachers (PAFT)) so they learn different ways of parenting their children. Children also need an understanding of violence and may be referred to the Tamariki Programme at the Women’s Refuge.

The social worker challenges whānau members about their behaviours, often by questions about the futures they see for their children. Dads are asked *‘Is this how you want to see your little girl treated when she is older? Is this the life you want for your boy?’* And the men who are involved with gangs are asked to breakdown how they spend their time; how much of it is with the gang, how much with their family and how much for themselves? *‘Ninety nine percent of the time it is mostly with the gang.’* Whānau members are told they have two choices; they learn to manage for themselves or they will continue to be users of the system and *‘have agencies poking their noses in forever’*.

In creating whānau Safety Plans the social worker asks Mum to identify Dad’s warning signs, and vice-versa. These ‘warning signs’ are rated from 1-10, with 10 being the most dangerous. The Safety Plan specifies what each whānau member needs to do if Mum or Dad is at a ‘1-3’ or a ‘4-6’ etc.

Sometimes there are other family members in the house when the social worker has appointments; if the client agrees that it is OK to proceed with others present, the appointment is continued anyway; and most of the time client whānau agree to this.

The social worker reviews progress with the whānau every six to eight weeks and will then form a new contract with them. The whānau determine when they finish and when they have gained the confidence for closure. The social worker ensures that the whānau has the strategies in place to manage for themselves: there is a Safety Plan – laminated, up on the wall and all the children know what to do; the basics are covered; the school is involved; and the whānau have identified trusted
people in their community and wider whānau who are on-board to support the whānau while they continue to build up their wider networks.

*Often they don’t want other whānau members involved because they don’t want them to know. But 90% of the time they know, but have been shut out.*

*Sometimes it is because of intergenerational violence. This is how it’s always been in our whānau. Mum always got the bash from koro, so who are they to tell us how to do any better.*

At review time there are some client whānau who want to keep on re-contracting for the social worker to stay involved. These whānau are asked ‘what do you need me for?’ and the social worker will list the skills and strategies they now have to manage for themselves. Their closure plan always includes the suggestion that they can text if there is anything they are unsure of and the social worker will check in with them.

**The most and least successful aspects of the work with client whānau**

The social worker sees the successful aspect of the work with whānau as being based in an honest and transparent approach to the work; and in ‘giving them some hope – for them and their kids’.

For the social worker, the hardest aspect of the work is concern about those whānau who are not able to be engaged in the service, particularly those where the referrals have come via Child, Youth and Family (CYF) from the Family Violence Interagency Response System (FVIARS) which deals with all POL 400 notifications. When there is no response to phone calls or text messages the social worker will do a number of unannounced home visits, leaving a business card if there is no response at the house. All CYF-referred whānau who are not engaged are referred back to CYF where their files are often closed until there is another whānau violence incident triggering a POL 400.

**Working with other agencies**

Client Management System (CMS) records show the wide range of organisations that the social worker draws on for additional support services for Whakamana Whānau client whānau. The social worker’s practice in referring client whānau to other agencies is to manage the timing, depending on the degree of crisis and who needs to be on board when. It is important not to overload whānau with too many professionals’ appointments at once. The social worker’s comment ‘The family needs a life’ was supported by the example of a whānau with nine other agencies involved.

Client referrals are received from practitioners in a range of agencies/community organisations and many have good referral processes. However, the social worker does not always receive sufficient information about the whānau situation and any risks that may be encountered in making an initial home visit, information that is essential for personal safety. Sometimes these gaps in essential information can be filled by contacting the Police Family Violence Interagency Response Coordinator, particularly if the referral has come through a POL 400. Otherwise the social worker will check if the whānau is known to those in her professional network.

The social worker takes care to keep all the professionals involved with each whānau ‘linked in’, using group emails to keep them informed. The social worker has developed the practice of holding ‘professionals meetings’ to clarify the role of each professional working with the whānau, to clearly establish who the ‘lead professional’ is and to ensure that all are working towards the same goals. This has become regular practice if there is more than one other agency involved with a whānau.

*For some whānau, they are seeing so many professionals that the family doesn’t know what they are there for.*

The social worker has also held hui with both professionals and whānau attending. These have been to assist whānau members to understand why each professional is involved and so that whānau can hear that all of the professionals are concerned for the safety of their children. To-date, this process had been convened twice, both times for the same whānau; and an outside facilitator has been brought in for these meetings.
Whakamana Whānau Collaborative Partnership - Family Works Hawke’s Bay Service Manager and Te Ikaroa Rangatahi Kaiwhakahaere

Service Managers of the Whakamana Whānau collaborative partner organisations were interviewed together. The success of the collaboration is based on good relationships between the managers and between the frontline staff, on the complementary skills and strengths each brings to the partnership, and on addressing issues as they arise. The organisations have similar client-focused and strengths-based practice frameworks, albeit informed by different conceptual frameworks.

Kanohi ki te Kanohi, a 10-week group learning programme, has been developed for whānau who have been clients of either service and this programme continues to evolve. Both organisations have been extending their work with client whānau to members of the wider whānau through holding hui with extended whānau. The vision of Whakamana Whānau is to extend this work further to include hapu, to iwi and marae and to grow community-based responses to whānau violence.

Material gathered in this joint interview from the initial question about the genesis of the service is included in the Introduction – see pages 6-7.

Working in collaboration

The strength of the relationship between the Service Managers, and their ability to bring their respective organisations ‘with them’, has enabled the Whakamana Whānau partnership to continue successfully. Strong working relationships have also been built between the frontline staff of the organisations. There is a formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) but nothing has arisen to-date that required referring back to that document. Both Service Managers are very cognizant that they are in ‘partnership’ for this work and both were very clear that they engage in any discussions of this service together: ‘Talk to us both’.

The Service Managers have scheduled regular two-monthly meetings where they ‘talk lots of things through’; they also meet on an ‘as needed’ basis to deal with any specific issues that may arise in the work of the service or in the partnership.

Each Service Manager brings complementary strengths and skills to the partnership, including their knowledge of the contracting environment and their connections into local communities. And within the partnership the Service Managers have learned from each other, and together have learned how to improve their collective capacity to report the results being achieved by whānau through the complementary services delivered by staff within both agencies. Both Service Managers are committed to ensuring their service can evidence improvements in whānau wellness—“I want to know where we’re at”—and to using results-based accountability (RBA) as a framework for this.

The achievements of the collaboration are facilitated by the ‘frontline’ staff of both organisations. The results of this successful service are enabled through the strength of their abilities to engage well with clients. This engagement is facilitated by ‘working in communities, and amongst their own whānau, where they are known and have relationships’.

Service outcomes are supported by the suite of complementary services available for whānau across those delivered by the partner agencies—social work, counselling, family therapy, Social Workers in Schools (SWiS), programmes for parents and for tamariki, mentoring for rangatahi, after school education and programmes, pathway planning for whānau, budgeting.

Both agencies work collaboratively with other community service providers, including schools, police, lawyers, foodbanks. Working across different service sectors, such as health, welfare, justice and education, is not a challenge because the work is client-led; the role of the caseworkers is to facilitate whānau progress on their plan.

When asked about the challenges of working collaboratively, the Service Managers’ responses indicated that they saw the collaboration as ‘generally pretty good’ and they are able to successfully
deal with any differences that may occur. The challenges are mostly seen arising outside of the partnership and major concerns were with the sustainability of funding to support this work.

**Impact on whānau violence**

In the interview, both Service Managers shared stories of the magnitude of change achieved by client whānau. Change is happening at the individual and whānau level. However, they agreed that these transformations are unlikely to be reflected in any change in the high family violence statistics for Hawke’s Bay. The challenge for the Service Managers is to be able to capture and reflect these changes for whānau in ‘measurable ways’:

*Database–derived statistics don’t convey the magnitude, meaning or depths of these shifts within individuals and whānau.*

One of the indicators of a successful service that works to support longer-term changes to prevent whānau violence from recurring would be that previous clients of the service self-refer back to the service again when they are ready to undertake the next level of addressing their issues26, and/or when previous client whānau refer other whānau members to the Whakamana Whānau services.

*The best place referrals can come from is whānau themselves, but we have to start from somewhere and we have to build our reputation with the whānau, the funders and the police.*

**Service gaps and possible future developments**

Both services are looking at ways of extending the reach of Whakamana Whānau into other communities. There are some Pasifika/Māori families who are currently clients of the services, in particular the work Te Ikaroa Rangatahi does with young offenders and their families. This has allowed some initial relationship-building through attending meetings and being introduced to elders of Pasifika communities. Another gap identified was in the provision of services for Muslim Māori who form a very closed community and are not easily reached even by members of their own wider whānau.

Service Managers also discussed the long-term interventions required to engage and support ‘recidivist’ whānau with entrenched intergenerational patterns of family violence. Issues of how to reach these whānau, of finding ways of engaging whānau members and maintaining connections, are future developments for consideration in consultation with other front-line services, and as permitted by resourcing. They suggested that a first step would be to set up a system with Child Youth and Family (CYF) whereby the Whakamana Whānau collaborative services are alerted to any repeat referrals or notifications for whānau who have been clients of the services – *’we want to know if they are coming back to CYF’s attention’.*

Creating a ‘Navigator/Community Development’ role within Whakamana Whānau would usefully support families to access the resources they need immediately, help to build community supports and enable whānau to manage their own lives more sustainably. Caseworkers, who at present spend a lot of time addressing immediate needs, could then focus more on child protection and therapeutic interventions within whānau. Families are dealing with lifelong patterns of deprivation and do not have the capabilities to access the resources available in the community for themselves. Some of the barriers are a lack of transport, mistrust, shame and no knowledge about where to go to get support. These whānau are not accessing community services such as foodbanks, community gardens, budget support and WellChild or Tamariki Ora services; and their first points of contact with services are with police, hospitals and schools.

There is much to do in the wider community, including finding ways of addressing the underlying issues for whānau – poverty, alcohol and drug use, unemployment and the boom and bust pattern of manual work in the region. *‘More work needs to be available for our men. They have little self-*

---

26 Note that the CMS data for the time period covered by this evaluation shows that 3 previous clients had self-referred to the service to undertake further work to address further issues underlying violence in their whānau
esteem and finding work would help’. There are some promising community-based initiatives and these could be supported to become involved in community-level campaigns to address violence at a local level.

**New Approaches developing in the Whakamana Whānau Collaboration**

**Whānau Hui**

Both organisations in the collaboration have been extending their work with client whānau to bring in members of the wider whānau through holding hui with extended whānau attending. At the time of this interview the Service Managers reported that there had been four or five of these hui convened and the process had been valuable in supporting change for client whānau.

However, there has also been the experience of setting-up a big whānau hui and most of those expected to attend eventually not coming to the hui. The learning from this experience has been to recognise that it takes time and preparation for each member of the whānau to build their understanding and confidence in the benefits of meeting with wider whānau to discuss and address whānau violence. Each whānau member needs to ready and cannot be pushed or compelled to attend a whānau hui.

The aspiration for this process of discussing and addressing violence as a whānau is ‘to eventually take it back to the marae’. There is the hope that the process of addressing whānau violence will extend out organically from Whānau, to Hapu and eventually to Iwi, starting from work with whānau members individually at first. The vision of the Whakamana Whānau partners is to extend this work further through hui with extended whānau, to hapu, to iwi and marae and to grow community-based responses to whānau violence. The ripple effect of extending this work through whānau is, however, limited by workers’ time because the relationship with the worker is the key to whānau understanding and confidence in the process. Building on this work will require more resources and building collaborations with other community-based organisations.

**Professionals Meetings**

The Family Works Whakamana Whānau social worker has developed the practice of holding ‘professionals meetings’ to clarify the role of each professional working with a specific client whānau, to establish who the ‘lead professional’ is and to ensure that all are working towards the same goals.

**Group Learning Programme**

The Kanohi ki te Kanohi programme, a 10 week group-based anti-violence learning programme, has developed as a way of consolidating and progressing the changes being made by whānau as a result of their individual engagement with Whakamana Whānau. The programme enables participants to meet others and to learn from others’ experience, learning to become independent of violence and to build on their strategies for preventing violence. The goal is to support participants ‘not just in completing the programme, but also in getting the insight and push to really make changes for themselves, their relationship with their partners and/or with their children’.

The first programme started in March 2014, with separate groups for men and women. At the time of writing a second programme had been completed and a third was in progress. Both of these programmes were delivered to mixed groups with both men and women participating, based on participant feedback from programme one and on the experience of the facilitation team.

The programme is seen as a way of progressing open discussions and learning about stopping violence, bringing the issues out from individual whānau and into a community of others also dealing with whānau violence.
Discussion and Conclusion

This evaluation of the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service assesses the service delivered, the client population it reached, its effectiveness in providing a quality social work service and the outcomes achieved by client whānau. The evaluation focuses on service implementation and the outcomes achieved by clients over a two-and-a half year timeframe.

Establishment and Implementation of Service

Family Works Hawke’s Bay has established and implemented an effective and respected social work service. The Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service has employed one social worker since the service was initiated. The work of establishing this new service and implementing what has become a service that is well-regarded, both by client whānau and by referring and collaborating agencies/community organisations, has been undertaken by an experienced Māori social worker who has worked with Family Works Hawke’s Bay for over eight years.

The evaluation findings, discussed below within a results-based accountability (RBA) framework and in terms of the set of key evaluation questions informed by the funding contract expectations, show that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service has been well-implemented and provides high quality social work services to the intended target population - Māori whānau/families where whānau violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

The social worker has a caseload of high and complex clients; care must be taken that the social worker has access to all the support and skilled supervision required to assist in continuing to deliver high quality professional social work services safely – without personal or professional risk. The social worker must also be supported in efforts to educate staff in referring agencies/community organisations about the necessity for complete referral details including information about the whānau situation and any risks that may be encountered in making an initial home visit, information that is essential for personal safety.

Results-Based Accountability Outcomes

The evaluation has been structured by a programme logic and results-based accountability (RBA) matrix for the service which establish the available data sources to inform evaluation of service processes and of client outcomes (see Appendix 2).

The results-based accountability (RBA) matrix for the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service, presented again for reference on page 45, shows a selection of the measures which have contributed to this evaluation and summarises the outcomes of the work with the 53 client whānau of the service from April 2012 to June 2014. The client work contributing to each of these indicators is presented in detail in the evaluation findings.

The data presented in the Service Volumes quadrant of the RBA matrix demonstrate that the social work service is being delivered to the intended target population group - Māori whānau/families where whānau violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

The second quadrant contains Service Quality indicators. These demonstrate the delivery of a high quality service: the social worker made timely responses to an often hard-to-engage client group; most client whānau remained engaged with the service through to case completion; client service satisfaction rates are high; and all referring agencies were satisfied with the referral processes.

The two lower quadrants contain Service Effectiveness indicators. These show that, on case closure, a high percentage of client whānau had increased whānau safety and improved care of their children. Whānau had also improved their connections to community services (health & education) and to their extended whānau and community. Whānau members assessed themselves as having made significant achievements on the contracted issues addressed in their Goal Plans, particularly on those concerned with whānau violence. Most clients told us that the service had helped them
meet their goals, improve their relationships, learn new skills and feel better prepared for the future. All of them would recommend the service to others. Agency and community stakeholders also told us that the service is making a positive difference for the whānau they referred.

These RBA outcome indicators show that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service is reaching its target population and providing high quality social work services that are effective in supporting change for Māori whānau where whānau violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

Key Questions for the Evaluation
The following section discusses the evaluation findings in terms of the set of key questions to be addressed by the Whakamana Whānau evaluation (see Appendix 3). These questions were created to guide the evaluation and shaped by the funding contract expectations of service providers.

Is the service reaching the intended client group?
Demographic data shows that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service is successfully reaching the intended client target group – Māori whānau where whānau violence has occurred, or is at risk of occurring. Overall, 98% of client whānau were assessed by the service as high risk; 11% had known gang-affiliations.

Is the service appropriately resourced and supported within the organisation?
The Whakamana Whānau Service is delivered under a fully funded contract with Family and Community Services (FACS), and the social work role is resourced and supported by Family Works Hawke’s Bay.
Once the service was established, the social worker has managed a caseload of five or more high and complex client whānau, with an average monthly caseload of eight. However for a period of six months the caseload was 10, and at times up to 14. This is a heavy caseload when working with such high risk and complex client whānau clients; care must be taken that the social worker has access to all the support and skilled supervision required to assist in continuing to deliver high quality professional social work services safely – without personal or professional risk.
The social worker is supported by a Service Manager who has a strong interest in the service and its development, and has some colleagues within the organisation to consult with when needed. The social worker is supported by excellent external supervision, accesses cultural supervision regularly and also uses her professional network as needed to support the work and to reflect on practice.

Does the service follow good social work processes?
Data gathered from the Client Management System (CMS) casework records, from interviews with Family Works staff and from stakeholder surveys attest to the thorough professional practice of the social worker.
CMS records show that social worker responded very promptly to referrals received and was persistent in efforts to establish contact with all whānau referred for social work support to address whānau violence. Assessment and goal planning were completed with all clients; and Goal Plans were reviewed with client whānau regularly every six to eight weeks. CMS records also document case management sessions.
Feedback obtained from stakeholder surveys shows that the social worker maintained communication and shared information appropriately with both referring and collaborating agencies/community organisations. The social worker keeps all of the professionals involved with each whānau up-to-date and informed through group emails; and is developing the practice of convening professionals meetings where there are multiple services involved in supporting a client whānau. The social worker is also developing ‘pro-forma’ email formats to ensure that professionals in referring and collaborating agencies/community organisations receive regular progress updates and case closure information.
**Outcomes Summary April 2012 – June 2014 (inclusive)**

### Outcome 1: Changes achieved in issues listed in Goal Plans – whānau ratings
- 65% of all contracted goals were rated as improved (using scale of 1 to 10)
- 86% of all ‘whānau violence’ goals were rated as improved (using scale of 1 to 10)
- 28% of whānau achieved self-assessed improvements of 5 points or greater
- 31% of whānau achieved self-assessed improvements of 1 to 4 points
- 45% of whānau completed 80% or more of the goals in their Goal Plan
- 71% of whānau completed more than 50% of their Goal Plans
- 14% of whānau disengaged before review & self-assessment of goal achievement

### Outcome 2: Social worker assessed changes in Whānau Safety and Well-being/Maori Ora
**Gains in Whānau Safety and Care on case closure:**
- 90% assessed as having improved overall
- 98% increased whānau safety
- 98% had improved care of their children

**Gains in Whānau Community Connection on case closure:** (where applicable)
- 98% were better connected to their extended whānau & community
- 98% improved their health / use of health services
- 80% improved children’s participation in school

### Outcome 3: How well did we do it? (Service Quality)
- Timeliness of first contact following referral:
  - 74% within 1 day; 83% within 7 days
  - 17% required from 1 – 7 weeks to establish contact with whānau & get engagement with service
- Completion rates:
  - 88% (42) key outcomes met; 6% (3) referred on; 6% (3) disengaged

### Outcome 4: How much did we do? (Service Volumes)

#### Social Work Support
- 53 whānau / clients

#### Demographics
- **Ethnicity**
  - 94% Māori; 2% Pasifika
  - 2% Other; 2% Unknown
- **Whānau Structure**
  - 68% with children under 5
  - 116 children in client whānau
  - *51 aged under 5; 39 aged 5-12; 26 youth aged 12-24*
  - 25% sole parents
  - 42% living as extended families
  - 21% employed; 70% benefit recipients
- **Goals**
  - 54% had improved overall
  - 98% increased whānau safety
  - 98% had improved care of their children
- **Children under 5**
  - 26% **aged 5**
  - 51% **aged under 5**

### Outcome 5: Is anyone better off? (Service Effectiveness)

#### Whānau Feedback
- As a result of Whakamana Whānau interventions, clients told us that:
  - 91% had met their goals
  - 92% had improved their relationships; 61% within whānau & 26% with others
  - 86% had learnt new skills or strategies that are useful
  - 85% felt better prepared for the future
  - 100% would recommend the service to others
  - “I am glad to have been referred to do this programme. I feel I have been able to better myself as an individual, father and partner.”

#### Feedback from agency partners/stakeholders:
- 100% of referring agencies were satisfied with referral processes
  - “[The] referral process is very precise, full of information about referral issues and relationship issues. Any dangers (including dogs on property), any requirements for whānau is noted and discussed before meeting.”
Is the service well placed in the community to do the work?

Responses from the stakeholder surveys show that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service is well-regarded by referring and collaborating agencies/community organisations; and many of the stakeholders responding to the survey also took the opportunity to offer their appreciation of the service and to commend the social worker. Stakeholder responses included specific references to the timeliness of responses to referrals, and to the experience, approach and competence of the social worker.

Client Management System (CMS) casework records also show the wide range of agencies and community organisations that the social worker draws on for support for Whakamana Whānau client whānau.

Are clients satisfied with the service they receive?

Clients are satisfied with the service and with their relationship with the social worker. Through client service evaluation surveys Whakamana Whānau clients expressed their satisfaction with the service, with their engagement with the social worker and with service accessibility: 94% were satisfied with the service overall, 96% were satisfied with the relationship with the social worker and 90% agreed the service was easy to access. Just 2% of clients found their relationship with the social worker less than satisfactory or found the service difficult to access.

Has the service restored whānau safety and wellbeing/mauri ora?

The Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service is successfully meeting the needs of whānau and supporting them to deal with the wide range of issues in their lives, particularly those around whānau safety and wellbeing.

The social worker assessed that 98% of clients increased whānau safety and improved the care of children in the whānau; 80% had improved children’s participation in school or early childhood education and 98% had improved their health/use of health services. Client whānau assessed themselves as having achieved positive change on 86% of their ‘whānau violence’ goals, and on 65% of their goals overall.

Client interview participants said they had eliminated, or reduced, violence in their home; had learnt how to be safe and stay safe, and how to communicate better with partners and children. Most interviewed also said they had removed the use of drugs and/or alcohol in their lives.

Of the 20 agency/community organisation stakeholders responding to the online survey, 95% agreed or definitely agreed that the Whakamana Whānau service is making a positive difference to restoring the safety and wellbeing / mauri ora of whānau where family violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring (1 community partner providing housing responded ‘don’t know’).

Has the service supported longer-term change to prevent family violence from recurring?

Clients interviewed and agency/community organisation stakeholders informed the evaluation that client whānau had gained the knowledge and skills required to sustain longer-term changes after successfully exiting the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service.

This evaluation sought information from both previous clients of the Whakamana Whānau service and from agency/community organisation stakeholders about the longer-term changes that client whānau may, or may not have, maintained in their lives. This information is not usually known to the service since client casework information is only available up to the point of case closure and exit from the service.

Client interview participants identified that they were confident of maintaining longer-term changes within their homes because they felt better equipped to handle issues and set backs on their own. Whakamana Whānau had provided support to empower them to advocate for themselves, helped them to manage their emotions and gave them the ability to discuss issues with partners and
whānau. The clients also referred to their learning and how it helped them deal with problems without violence.

Of the 20 agency/community organisation stakeholders responding to the online survey, 95% agreed or definitely agreed that Whakamana Whānau supports whānau to make longer-term changes that prevent family violence from recurring (1 community partner providing housing responded ‘don’t know’).

One of the indicators of a successful service that works to support longer-term changes to prevent whānau violence from recurring is that previous clients of the service have self-referred back to the service again when they are ready to undertake the next level of addressing their issues. Client Management System (CMS) data for the time period covered by this evaluation shows that three previous clients had self-referred to the service to undertake further work to address further issues underlying violence in their whānau.

The Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service has not been providing services for the extended period of time required for an assessment of the long-term sustainability of changes achieved by client whānau. Such an assessment may be able to be undertaken through further evaluation of the service in the future.

**Has the service supported whānau to access additional services and draw on the wider whānau / community to achieve longer-term change?**

Clients interviewed and agency/community organisation stakeholders informed the evaluation that the service had supported client whānau to access formal and informal supports in their community, and in their wider whānau, to sustain longer-term change.

Clients reported that they were more confident to reach out into the community for the support they needed to maintain the changes they had made. One client specifically identified that Whakamana Whānau gave her the tools and strategies to support herself and to reach out to wider whānau in the future. She explained that she feels confident and able to turn to whānau for help without needing Whakamana Whānau intervention in the future.

Of the 20 agency/community organisation stakeholders responding to the online survey, 80% agreed or definitely agreed that Whakamana Whānau links whānau to their wider whānau/community and to other services to support longer-term change (20% ‘don’t know’).

**Does the service have a focus on effective, innovative joined-up ways to meet whānau and community need?**

The Whakamana Whānau service is an innovative collaborative approach between Family Works Hawke’s Bay and Te Ikaroa Rangatahi Social Services and provides a multi-systemic approach in supporting whānau to become, and remain, safe and violence free. Service outcomes are supported by the suite of complementary services available for whānau across those delivered by the collaborative partners – social work, counselling, family therapy, social workers in schools (SWiS), programmes for parents and for tamariki, mentoring for rangatahi, after school education and programmes, pathway planning for whānau, budgeting. Both agencies work collaboratively with other community service providers, including schools, police, lawyers, and foodbanks. Working across different service sectors, such as health, welfare, justice and education, is not a challenge because the work is client-led; the role of the caseworkers is to facilitate whānau progress on their plan. Note that this evaluation focused on those services delivered by the Family Works social worker.

Both organisations in the collaboration have been innovative in extending their work with client whānau to bring in members of the wider whānau through holding hui with extended whānau attending. At the time of the managers’ interview, they reported that there had been four or five ‘whānau hui’ convened and that the process had been valuable in supporting change for client
whānau. There is an aspiration to extend the process of addressing whānau violence through whānau hui organically from Whānau, to Hapu and eventually to Iwi, starting from work with whānau members individually at first.

The Family Works Whakamana Whānau social worker has developed the practice of holding ‘professionals meetings’ to clarify the role of each professional working with the whānau, to clearly establish who the ‘lead professional’ is and to ensure that all are working towards the same goals. This has now become a regular practice where there is more than one other agency involved with a client whānau.

Client Management System (CMS) casework data shows the extent of referrals for client whānau to support services within the Whakamana Whānau suite of complementary services, and to community organisations / agencies.

Innovation within the Whakamana Whānau collaboration is also shown by the evolution of the Kanohi ki te Kanohi programme, a 10 week group-based anti-violence learning programme which has been developed as a way of consolidating and progressing the changes being made by whānau as a result of their individual engagement with Whakamana Whānau. At the time of writing, the third programme was being delivered.

Survey responses from agency/community organisation stakeholders showed appreciation of the provision of ‘wrap-around’ services to deal with family violence issues, and of the collaborative approach of the Whakamana Whānau social worker.

Of the 20 agency/community organisation stakeholders responding to the online survey, 84% agreed or definitely agreed that Whakamana Whānau works collaboratively to meet whānau and community needs (16% ‘don’t know’).

**Has the service reduced service fragmentation, duplication and gaps in frontline services?**

The social worker has taken steps to reduce service fragmentation and duplication in the services supporting client whānau. Feedback from agency/community organisation stakeholders shows that many regard these steps to be effective in helping to reduce service fragmentation and service duplication. Note that referral data in CMS showed that 51% of client whānau had other agencies involved at the time of referral, with the number of agencies involved ranging from one to eight.

As part of social work practice, the social worker takes care to keep all of the professionals involved with each whānau ‘linked in’ and will use ‘block emails’ to keep them informed as appropriate. The practice of holding ‘professionals meetings’ also serves to reduce service fragmentation and duplication in the services supporting client whānau.

Those clients participating in interviews saw the social worker as particularly adept at collaborating and coordinating with all the professionals and organisations involved in their chaotic lives. The developing practice of convening hui for the professionals engaged with a whānau was appreciated by client whānau.

Of the 20 agency/community organisation stakeholders responding to the online survey, 68% agreed or definitely agreed that Whakamana Whānau works together with other frontline services to reduce service gaps and fragmentation (32% ‘don’t know’).

**Overall Assessment against Key Questions**

Assessing the evaluation findings in response to these key questions shows that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service has been successful in meeting the expectations of the funding contract over the period of service provision that was evaluated:

- delivering direct services to families/whānau that restore safety and wellbeing/mauri ora where family violence has occurred, or is at risk of occurring;
• creating longer-term change needed to prevent family violence from recurring;
• helping families and whānau access additional services needed and draw on wider whānau/ community to achieve longer-term change;
• focusing on effective, innovative joined-up ways to meet family/whānau and community need; and
• reducing service fragmentation, duplication and gaps in frontline services.

Other Issues Arising

Responding to family violence effectively and reaching the ‘really-hard-to-reach’

Throughout the interviews and discussions conducted for this evaluation reference was made to those who are ‘really-hard-to-reach’ — whānau/families known to be experiencing violence and who not engaged with their wider whānau or community services. The first points of contact with services for members of these socially-isolated whānau are likely to be with police, hospitals and schools. Those of immediate concern are those whānau/families where there has been a family violence incident triggering a police POL 400 notification who do not engage with support services. However the high rate of family violence in the Hawke’s Bay region is of great concern and effective responses must include ways of engaging harder-to-reach communities, such as the Pasifika and Māori Muslim communities, as well as community-based support and community-based initiatives to address the issues underlying family violence.

Engaging POL 400 referrals with support services

In spite of sustained effort the Whakamana Whānau social worker was unable to reach or engage with a significant proportion of referred whānau where violence is known to be currently occurring (i.e. a POL 400 notification had triggered the referral from Child, Youth and Family (CYF) via the regional Family Violence Inter Agency Response System (FVIARS)). Currently these whānau are referred back to CYF where their files are frequently closed until there is another whānau violence incident triggering a POL 400.

The analysis of service referral data undertaken as part of this evaluation provides information that can be used to initiate discussions with the regional FVIARS agencies to create more effective ways of responding to the high number of whānau referrals arising from POL 400s who do not engage with support services.

Collaborative integrated responses to whānau violence

There is understandable concern that the family violence ‘response system’ in Hawke’s Bay as a whole does not have the resources to persist in coordinated efforts by key agencies to engage and support whānau known to be experiencing violence.

Discussions could be broadened to create a collaborative, integrated, multi-agency approach to responding to family violence which has the capacity to provide ‘integrated system responses’ that emphasize the safety of women and children, and the accountability of the abuser” – as recommended in the 2014 Family Violence Death Review Committee (FVDRC) report27 and discussed in the literature review of this report. The FVDRC report also recommends that ‘responses to violence require sustained interventions by wrap-around services trying multiple ways of engaging and staying involved (in the short- and long-term)’.

Creating change through a network of community supports

There are a range of community-based organisations that play important roles in providing support for whānau/families in their local areas. A collaborative multi-agency approach to responding to family violence can include coordinating the many ways of creating ‘wrap-around’ support for those

whānau where it is known that family violence is occurring – examples could be by ensuring that children from these whānau are supported while they are at school, or by outreach at the immediate local neighbourhood level through community-based NGO’s, churches or marae-based organisations.

As indicated by the Service Managers of the Whakamana Whānau partnership, there is much to do in the wider community to address family violence. This includes addressing the underlying issues for the client whānau referred to the Whakamana Whānau service – poverty, alcohol and drug use, unemployment and the boom and bust pattern of manual work in the Hawke’s Bay region. There are some promising community-based initiatives and these could be supported to become involved in community-level campaigns to address violence at a local level.

A Community Development/Navigator role within the Whakamana Whānau service

The Navigator’s role would be to connect whānau to community resources - to access the resources to alleviate their immediate needs, to help to build their community supports and to enable whānau to manage their own lives more sustainably. Families are dealing with lifelong patterns of deprivation and do not have the capabilities to access the resources available in the community for themselves. These whānau are not accessing community services such as foodbanks, community gardens, budget support and WellChild or Tamariki Ora services; some of the barriers are a lack of transport, mistrust, shame and no knowledge about where to go to get support.

Creating a Community Development or ‘Navigator’ role within the Whakamana Whānau service would enable the caseworkers, who at present spend a lot of time addressing these immediate whānau needs, to focus more on child protection and therapeutic interventions within whānau.

In Conclusion

This evaluation was undertaken to assess the implementation of the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service and the effectiveness of the service in achieving its intended outcomes.

The evaluation findings show that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service is well-established and has been implemented effectively. The service is reaching its intended target population and is providing high quality social work services that are effective in supporting change for Māori whānau/families where whānau violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

These findings also show that the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service has been successful in meeting the following expectations of the funding contract over the period of service provision evaluated:

• delivering direct services to families/whānau that restore safety and wellbeing/mauri ora where family violence has, or is at risk of occurring;
• creating longer-term change needed to prevent family violence from recurring;
• helping families and whānau access additional services needed and draw on wider whānau/community to achieve longer-term change;
• focusing on effective, innovative joined-up ways to meet family/whānau and community need; and
• reducing service fragmentation, duplication and gaps in frontline services.
Recommendations Arising

The findings of this evaluation support the following recommendations:

- That Family Works Hawke’s Bay and the Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service social worker be commended for the high standard of professional practice exhibited as the social worker has worked to implement a new service within Family Works Hawke’s Bay, and for establishing an effective social work support service for Māori whānau where family violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

- That a Navigator/Community Development role be established within the Whakamana Whānau service to connect whānau to community resources and to enable the caseworkers, who at present spend a lot of time addressing these immediate whānau needs, to focus more on child protection and therapeutic interventions within client whānau.

- That an evaluation of the Kanohi ki te Kanohi group learning programme to reduce violence is undertaken by the Whakamana Whānau partners, Family Works Hawke’s Bay and Te Ikaroa Rangatahi Social Services, to document the programme and the outcomes it is achieving and to support further development of the group learning programme.

- That a further evaluation of the Whakamana Whānau service be commissioned in 3 to 5 years time to enable evaluation of any changes made within whānau needed to prevent family violence from recurring and to establish the longer-term outcomes achieved for client whānau; and that funding be allocated for this evaluation.

- That any future evaluation of the service requests an extended data set of POL 400 data for analysis; with the extended POL 400 data to include ratings of the seriousness of the incident triggering any police-callouts and pre- and post-service data over an extended period of time, on the understanding that fulfilling such a request is dependent on the police resources available to extract such a data set.

- That the Whakamana Whānau partners engage in discussions with those agencies which form the regional Family Violence Inter Agency Response System with the aim of creating more effective ways of responding to the high number of whānau referrals arising from POL 400 who do not engage with support services.

- That the Whakamana Whānau collaborative services are alerted to any repeat referrals to Child, Youth and Family (CYF) or repeat POL 400 notifications for whānau who have been clients either of the services.

- That these discussions include the potential of using an extended set of POL 400 data to routinely track reductions in the incidence of violence for client whānau who have been referred to the Whakamana Whānau and other family violence intervention services.

- That steps are undertaken in Hawke’s Bay to create a collaborative, integrated, multi-agency approach to responding to family violence which has the capacity to provide ‘integrated system responses’ that emphasize the safety of women and children, and the accountability of the abuser’ – as recommended in the 2014 Family Violence Death Review Committee report

Appendices

APPENDIX 1: DESCRIPTION OF DATA SOURCES

Client Whānau Interviews

Client whānau were interviewed in order to gather their views on the service provided to them by the Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service.

The interviews were conducted with five clients of Whakamana Whānau. Interview participants were selected from a list of clients who had agreed, via the Family Works Client Service Evaluation Survey (see Appendix 7: Survey Instruments), to be contacted in future for discussion to inform service improvements and who had completed with the service at least four months prior to the interviews. The social worker was given the name of every third client whānau on this list so that she could re-establish contact with them, invite them to participate, explain the interview purpose and process using the participant information sheet (Appendix 4) and gain their informed consent (Appendix 5). The social worker also ensured that the interview schedule suited whānau needs.

The face-to-face interviews with client whānau were conducted by a Master of Social Work student on a research placement. The student was supported throughout interview processes by the Presbyterian Support East Coast Māori Cultural Advisor, a trained counsellor, who could not only lead a culturally safe process for participants, facilitating engagement and ensuring that appropriate tikanga were observed throughout, but he could also provide for the physical safety of all. Interviews were held in a private room at the Family Works Hawke’s Bay premises. Participants were offered koha at the end of the interview process in a small gesture of reciprocity to their generosity in giving of their time and experiences.

Open-ended questions were used as a guide for the semi-structured interview process to ensure that all areas of interest were covered and that participants could raise further issues as they wished. The sessions were recorded and the qualitative information from interviews was thematically analysed to identify key words and themes, which were organised into categories based on the questions asked. Selected quotes are included in the report to illustrate participants’ experience of the Whakamana Whānau.

All those interviewed were invited to attend a hui where the findings of the client whānau interviews were presented before being finalised for inclusion in this evaluation report.

Family Works Client Management System Database (CMS)

Client demographics and data on client case-work processes and client outcomes have been sourced from the Family Works electronic Client Management System (CMS) database. In addition to client demographic information, this database has a scheduler function for all case-worker activity (client and non-client related) and is used for all client records. This database is used by Family Works to produce operational statistics for internal and external reporting.

CMS database reports were downloaded into Excel spreadsheets for statistical analysis. Where custom report functions were not available to generate information required for the evaluation source documents have been analysed and the data manually entered into spreadsheets.

The following notes are included to provide further information about the handling of specific data sources:

- Contract Issues: During the initial assessment process, clients work with the social worker to identify and agree on the issues for social work assistance and support. These issues are documented in a signed contract which is recorded in the CMS database. Clients rate the severity of their issues at the time the contract is agreed and rate these issues again when the contract is reviewed on case closure. Issues identified in the assessment and agreed in a
contract with the client may not necessarily be the issues that the social worker regards as the most important for a client to be addressing.

- Client Assessments and Goal Plan formation: CMS database reporting of client contracts and contract reviews is used as an indicator of the process of client assessment and formation of a Goal Plan with the client. (During the initial assessment process clients identify and agree on the issues to be included in their Goal Plan for social work assistance and support. These issues are documented in a signed contract which is recorded in the CMS database.)

Family Works Client Service Evaluation Surveys
All those clients who have received Family Works services are asked to complete the standard Family Works Client Service Evaluation survey (Appendix 7). This survey is designed to gather quantitative and qualitative data across a range of indicators specifically designed as results-based accountability performance measures and is used by Family Works services across the national federation of Presbyterian Support New Zealand.

Surveys of Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Work Service Stakeholders
A survey of those organisations in the community referring whānau to the service, receiving referrals from the service and/or working with clients/whānau while they are receiving social work support through Whakamana Whānau was conducted using an online survey tool, SurveyGizmo. Identified individuals within these organisations received a covering email containing a link to the online survey. For those with no professional email address, hard-copy of the survey was mailed out with a covering letter. Covering letters and surveys are included in Appendix 7.
APPENDIX 2: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

FAMILY WORKS WHAKAMANA WHĀNAU SOCIAL WORK SERVICE – PROGRAMME LOGIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Collaborative engagement with programme partners</td>
<td>Contracts with whānau</td>
<td>Whānau members engaged, and supported, in addressing the issues identified in their Goal Plan:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families identified</td>
<td>Engagement with whānau</td>
<td>Goal Plans for whānau</td>
<td>Developing a Safety Plan to ensure safety and protection of whānau members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW staff with required capabilities &amp; capacity</td>
<td>SW Assessment</td>
<td>Safety plans</td>
<td>The whānau is a safe place:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referring Agencies</td>
<td>Goal Planning and Contracting</td>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>The whānau is a caring, nurturing and stable environment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services / wider whānau &amp; community support</td>
<td>Safety Planning</td>
<td>Goal Plan reviews / completions</td>
<td>Whānau members have good parenting, relationship and living skills / strategies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community education programmes</td>
<td>Social Work interventions</td>
<td>Case completions</td>
<td>Whānau is connected to wider supportive whānau &amp; is accessing community services as needed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referrals to other agencies for appropriate services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whānau is in charge of their own future – advocating for themselves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referrals to community education programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safer whānau with increased mauri ora / wellbeing for all whānau members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation of wider whānau / community support</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The whānau is a safe place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up on referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The whānau is a caring, nurturing and stable environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular progress reviews with clients</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Whānau members have good parenting, relationship and living skills / strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Whānau is connected to wider supportive whānau &amp; is accessing community services as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Whānau is in charge of their own future – advocating for themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best possible safety and wellbeing / mauri ora outcomes for whānau

- Whānau violence free
- Tamariki - Healthy and Safe
- Whānau - Healthy and Safe
## FAMILY WORKS WHAKAMANA WHĀNAU SOCIAL WORK SERVICE – INDICATORS / PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Quality of activities:</td>
<td>Tracking Outputs:</td>
<td>Whānau engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics of clients</td>
<td>• Client service evaluation survey – satisfaction with service quality</td>
<td>• Timeliness of first contact following referral</td>
<td>Changes in whānau to prevent / reduce the risk of family violence recurring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client match with target population</td>
<td>• Interagency relationships – FW partner agency satisfaction</td>
<td>• Closures / completion rates / reasons for non-completion</td>
<td>• Changes achieved in Issues listed in Goal Plans – whānau assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral sources</td>
<td>• Stakeholder relationships – stakeholder satisfaction</td>
<td>• Social work practice – client assessment &amp; plans, workloads, resources, support, etc.</td>
<td>• Social worker &amp; whānau assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals to community services/programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gains in Safety, Stability, &amp; Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider whānau / community support facilitated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gains in community connections, health &amp; mauri ora/wellbeing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Indicators / Performance Measures

- Short-term (During FW intervention)
- Medium term (On closure with FW)

### Quality of activities:
- Demographics of clients
- Client match with target population
- Referral sources
- Referrals to community services/programmes
- Wider whānau / community support facilitated

### Tracking Outputs:
- Timeliness of first contact following referral
- Closures / completion rates / reasons for non-completion
- Social work practice – client assessment & plans, workloads, resources, support, etc.
  - # clients
  - # sessions
  - # hours / client
  - # Goal Plans / plan reviews

### Whānau engagement
- Progress on issues identified in client Goal Plans / contracts

### Changes in whānau to prevent / reduce the risk of family violence recurring
- Changes achieved in Issues listed in Goal Plans – whānau assessed
- Social worker & whānau assessments:
  - Gains in Safety, Stability, & Care
  - Gains in community connections, health & mauri ora/wellbeing
- Outcomes measures from Client service evaluation surveys including #/% whānau for whom service made a positive difference
- Feedback and comments from whānau/clients feedback on changes achieved by whānau to prevent whānau violence from recurring
- Partner agency stakeholder feedback on service effectiveness
## FAMILY WORKS WHAKAMANA WHĀNAU SOCIAL WORK SERVICE – RESULTS-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY MATRIX FOR SERVICE OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs - Effort</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOW MUCH DID WE DO? (Outputs)</td>
<td>HOW WELL DID WE DO IT? (Service Quality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* # clients</td>
<td>* Timeliness of first contact following referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Demographics of clients</td>
<td>* Closures / completion rates / reasons for non-completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Client match with target population</td>
<td>* Social work practice – client assessment &amp; plans, workloads, resources, support, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Client service evaluation survey – whānau satisfaction with service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Interagency &amp; stakeholder relationships – FW partner agency &amp; stakeholder satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs - Effect</th>
<th>IS ANYONE BETTER OFF? (Service Effectiveness)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOW MANY ARE BETTER OFF?</td>
<td>WHAT PROPORTION ARE BETTER OFF?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* # Changes achieved in Issues listed in Goal Plans – whānau assessed</td>
<td>* % Changes achieved in Issues listed in Goal Plans – whānau assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Social worker &amp; whānau assessments:</td>
<td>* Social worker &amp; whānau assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o # Gains in Safety, Stability, &amp; Care vs initial assessments</td>
<td>o % Gains in Safety, Stability, &amp; Care vs initial assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o # Gains in community connections, health &amp; mauri ora/wellbeing vs initial assessments</td>
<td>o % Gains in community connections, health &amp; mauri ora/wellbeing vs initial assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Outcome measures from Client service evaluation survey including # whānau for whom service made a positive difference</td>
<td>* Outcome measures from Client service evaluation survey including % whānau for whom service made a positive difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Feedback and comments from whānau/ clients feedback on changes achieved by whānau to prevent whānau violence from recurring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Partner agency stakeholder feedback on service effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 3:
## Key Questions & Data Collection for Family Works Whakamana Whānau Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Data to Be Collected</th>
<th>Means of Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Population** | Is the service reaching the intended client group: whānau where family violence has occurred, or is at risk of occurring? | Client demographics  
Client risk profiles | Agency client management system (CMS) data |
| **Service Quality** | Is the service appropriately resourced and supported in the organisational context? | SW workload  
Organisational support for service  
SW resourcing | Service / agency documentation  
FW staff interviews  
- Service manager  
- Social worker |
| | Does the service follow good social work processes? | Social work practice:  
- Engagement with whānau  
- Assessments, planning & review processes  
- Case management  
- Communication with referring/collaborating agencies | CMS casework data  
FW staff interviews  
- Service manager  
- Social worker  
Community / agency surveys |
| | Is the service well placed in the community to do the work? | Service links with referrers and community agencies / networks  
Standing with referrers and community agencies / networks | CMS casework data  
Community / agency surveys |
| | Are clients satisfied with the service they receive? | Service accessibility  
Engagement with case worker | Client service evaluations  
Client interviews |
| **Service Effectiveness** | Has the service restored whānau safety and wellbeing/mauri ora? | Service meets whānau needs  
Whānau goals achieved, particularly in areas of whānau safety & wellbeing | CMS casework data  
Client service evaluations  
Client interviews  
Community / agency surveys |
| | Has the service supported longer-term change to prevent family violence from recurring? | Whānau sustain change after completion with service  
Gains in knowledge and skills  
Implementation of closure plans / Safety Plans | CMS casework data  
Client service evaluations  
Client interviews  
Community / agency surveys  
POL 400 data |
| | Has the service supported whānau to access additional services and draw on the wider whānau / community to achieve longer-term change? | Whānau report ongoing connections with formal / informal supports | CMS casework data  
Client service evaluations  
Client interviews  
Community / agency surveys |
| | Does the service have a focus on effective, innovative joined-up ways to meet whānau and community need? | Evidence of collaborations  
Evidence of innovation / new approaches to working with whānau | Service / agency documentation  
CMS casework data  
FW staff interviews  
- Service manager  
- Social worker  
Community / agency surveys |
| | How has the service reduced service fragmentation, duplication and gaps in frontline services? | Examples of collective / collaborative whānau-focused services | Service / agency documentation  
FW staff interviews  
- Service manager  
- Social worker  
Community / agency surveys |
APPENDIX 4: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Participant Information – Family Works Whakamana Whānau Service evaluation:

This is a study of the Whakamana Whānau Service to see how well it is working. It will look at the areas of the service that let us know how good it is and we will get feedback from all of those people who have worked with the Whakamana Whānau social worker, including other community services.

We also need to talk to those who have used the service to answer the most important question – “Does Whakamana Whānau help clients and their whānau to make safer choices and longer-term changes in their lives?”

Your comments and suggestions are important to help us make sure the service can better help whānau who need it in the future.

We invite you to talk with us about your experience of the Whakamana Whānau Service and the ways in which it has supported you and your whānau to make changes and to become a safer place for you and your whānau. We are interested in hearing about the kinds of support you got, what was most helpful and any changes you would suggest so that the service can do things better.

- The hui will be for about 1 hour.
- Your participation is voluntary – it is your choice and you can leave at any time.
- Anything you say is completely confidential and anonymous.
  - Your names and any other identifying details will not be included in any notes or in the written evaluation report.
  - We would like to make a recording of the conversation so that there are accurate notes of what you tell us. Both the recording and the notes will be deleted when the study report is written.

Please ask questions at any time.

Thank you for helping us to understand what the Whakamana Whānau Service does and how we can make it better in the future.

If you have any questions after the hui please contact:

   Angela Lalonde, your interviewer
   at Family Works: 876-2156
   or you can email Angela.Lalonde@familyworks.eastcoast.org.nz

OR contact the Family Works Whakamana Whānau social worker
APPENDIX 5: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Participant Consent Form – Family Works Whakamana Whānau Service evaluation

☐ The purpose of this evaluation study has been explained to me

☐ My questions about the study have been answered and I know that I can ask more questions at any time

☐ I know that my participation is voluntary

☐ I agree that our conversation can be recorded and that those recordings will be deleted once the report is submitted

☐ The confidentiality conditions have been explained to me and I understand them.

☐ I agree to be part of this study with the understanding that my information will be kept confidential.

☐ I understand that any identifying information will be removed as soon as possible from the recording, written documents and the final report.

☐ I know that a summary of the report will be given to me (either a one page written document or via a hui).

Participant’s Name: ______________________________________________________

Participant’s Signature: ____________________________________________________

Date: ___/___/____
APPENDIX 6: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Client Interviews - Semi-structured Interview Question Outline:

1. How did you find out about Whakamana Whānau?
   
   Prompt: Who referred you?

2. What changes have you made?
   
   Prompts: to your relationships/parenting/safety/wider supports?

3. How did the service support you and your whānau to make those changes?

4. How have you been able to keep these changes for your whānau?

5. What has been the most helpful to you and your whānau?
   
   Prompts: Why?

6. What, if anything, didn’t go well?
   
   Prompts: Was challenging? Was difficult?

7. Are there any changes that you would like to see changed in the service to make it better for future whānau?

8. Did you feel well treated and respected throughout the process?
   
   Prompts: Dignity? Culturally?

9. Is there anything else you would like to say about the Whakamana Whānau service?

Interview Questions - Key Stakeholder (Police)

1. Tell me briefly about your family violence policing role and what the job involves. How long have you been in this role?

2. Tell me about your experience of the Family Works Whakamana Whānau service.

3. What difference has this made to the police family violence role?

4. What difference is it making for the whānau you work with? ..... Long-term changes?

5. So, what is it that the social work service does to make a difference? i.e. what is working well?

6. And what is less successful? ..... Are there gaps?
Interview Questions - Service Manager Family Works Hawke’s Bay

1. Tell me about how the Whakamana Whānau service came about i.e. the background and context to the proposal for the service and for funding

2. What does Whakamana Whānau require in terms of organisational resourcing and organisational support? Is what you are able to provide adequate? How do you manage the SW workload?

3. How do you manage and support quality social work processes? How do you manage communication and collaborations with other agencies and with the wider community to support Whakamana Whānau?

4. Tell me about any different or new approaches that have developed out of the Whakamana Whānau service / the work with whānau

5. So, what is it that Whakamana Whānau does to make a difference? i.e. what is working well? What makes it successful?

6. And what is less successful? ..... Are there gaps? ... Are there changes you’d like to see?

Interview Questions - Service Managers of Collaborating Organisations, Te Ikaroa Rangatahi and Family Works Hawke’s Bay

1. Tell me about how the joint FACS contract for whānau experiencing, or at risk of, family violence came about? i.e. the background and context to the proposal for the service and for funding

2. The agreement was signed nearly 2½ years ago so both organisations are well into the contract term now:
   a. What do you see as working well with the contracting arrangements?
   b. What are the challenges of having the joint contract for both organisations?
   c. What do you see as the benefits of the joint contract? (Both organisations receiving funding to do the work) - ?other advantages?

3. Tell me about any different or new approaches that have developed / are developing out of the joint contract?

4. Is it making a difference in the area of family violence? i.e. what is working well in supporting whānau to make changes in their lives? What makes it successful?

5. And what is less successful? ..... Are there gaps? ... Are there changes you’d like to see?

6. Anything else that you’d like to tell me about the context
Interview Questions – Family Works Whakamana Whānau Social Worker

1. Tell us briefly about your experience as a social worker? Training? How long in practice? Types of roles?

2. What were your expectations of the Whakamana Whānau role when you started?

3. Tell us about any differences in your practice in working with the Whakamana Whānau families?

4. What is required to build good relationships / trust with your whānau?

5. What is your social work approach? What guides your approach to this work?

6. What do you think you are most successful at delivering to your whānau?

7. What do you think you are least successful at delivering to your whānau?

8. How do you go about linking your whānau into other support in their community? Other services? Wider whānau? Neighbours and community?

9. How do you manage communication and collaborations with other agencies and with the wider community to support Whakamana Whānau?

10. Tell us about any new or different approaches you’ve tried with Whakamana Whānau?

11. Are there gaps? ... Are there changes you’d like to see? ... Things you’d like to try or do differently?

12. And what’s the workload like with this type of work? How are you supported in this by Family Works?

13. Do you have anything else you would like to say about Whakamana Whānau and your role? Anything we’ve missed?
## APPENDIX 7: SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

### Family Works Client Service Evaluation survey

**Name of Family Works staff you saw:**

**The service you used:**

**PLEASE TICK ALL THAT APPLY**

1. How did you hear about our service?
   - [ ] Advertising
   - [ ] Through a referral from
   - [ ] Word of mouth
   - [ ] Signage
   - [ ] Other, please specify

**PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER**

2. Your service was easy for me to access
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] No opinion
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Not applicable

3. I was satisfied with my relationship with my worker
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] No opinion
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Not applicable

4. Your staff helped me meet my goals
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] No opinion
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Not applicable

5. Together we helped improve my relationships
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] No opinion
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Not applicable

   Who with? [ ] Family/Whanau [ ] Others

6. Your staff helped me learn useful new skills and strategies
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] No opinion
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Not applicable

7. Your staff helped me feel better prepared for the future
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] No opinion
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Not applicable

**8. Which part of the service did you find most helpful?**

**9. What do you think we could do to improve, or add to, our service?**

**10. Would you recommend our service to others?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Maybe
   
   **because:**

**11. Rate your overall satisfaction of our service**
   - [ ] Strongly dissatisfied
   - [ ] Dissatisfied
   - [ ] No opinion
   - [ ] Satisfied
   - [ ] Very satisfied

   **Any further comments:**

**Optional**

Would you be happy for us to contact you in the future to provide further feedback for service improvement?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

If yes, please provide your contact details

**Name:**

**Address:**

**Phone:**

*Thank you for taking the time to complete this evaluation*
Survey of Stakeholder Organisations — covering information and survey

Survey cover email / letter to staff in stakeholder organisations

Kia ora

I am contacting you because you work for one of the organisations in the community that refers whānau to the Whakamana Whānau service, receives referrals from the service or works with whānau while they are receiving social work support from the Whakamana Whānau Social Worker, [social worker’s name].

My name is Sally Harvey and I work as the Evaluation and Research Advisor for Presbyterian Support East Coast.

I am conducting an evaluation of Whakamana Whānau, the Family Works Hawke’s Bay Social Work service for whānau/families where family violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring. This programme evaluation is assessing the degree to which the Whakamana Whānau service is achieving its objectives and providing a quality service.

I am inviting you to provide feedback on your experience of the Whakamana Whānau service through an online survey.

This online survey requires about 5 minutes to complete – you will need to allow sufficient time to complete it in one session.

The survey is anonymous – your name and personal details are not required. However you are asked to identify the organisation you work for and your role in this organisation.

Here’s the link to the online survey: http://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/1718220/Whakamana-Whānau-Social-Work-Service-Stakeholder-Survey

Please ‘Ctrl + Click’ on the link and follow the survey instructions – or cut & paste the link into Windows Explorer.

Please return this survey by Friday 25th July

And, please contact me if you have any questions about the online survey or about the evaluation process.

Many thanks for your participation

Sally

Dr. Sally Harvey
Evaluation & Research
Presbyterian Support East Coast
T: 06 8778193 ext 720
M: 0275 222 012
E: sally.harvey@psec.org.nz
STAKEHOLDER SURVEY: EVALUATION OF FAMILY WORKS WHAKAMANA WHĀNAU SOCIAL WORK SERVICE

I am conducting an evaluation of the Whakamana Whānau, the Family Works Hawke’s Bay Social Work service for whānau/families where family violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring.

As part of this evaluation I would value your feedback as one of the organisations in the community that refers whānau to the service, receives referrals from the service or works with clients/whānau while they are receiving social work support from Whakamana Whānau.

This survey will require no more than 5 minutes to complete. It begins with a couple of questions about your organisation and your role.

1. What organisation do you work with?

2. What is your role in this organisation?

3. What is your role in relation to Whakamana Whānau? [Choose all options below that are applicable]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Make referrals to Whakamana Whānau</th>
<th>Receive referrals from Whakamana Whānau</th>
<th>Provide services in parallel to Whakamana Whānau</th>
<th>Work collaboratively with Whakamana Whānau</th>
<th>Other: Please specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you or your organisation make referrals to Whakamana Whānau, continue with Q.4; If not, please go to Q 9

4. Please rate your satisfaction with the process of making a referral to the Whakamana Whānau Social Work service.

   - Very satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

   Please add comments to explain your response to Q.4:

5. Have you received acknowledgement of your referral(s)?

   - Yes
   - Sometimes
   - No

6. Have you received any further communication about the referral(s)?

   - Yes
   - Sometimes
   - No

If you, or your service, have ongoing involvement with the client(s) you referred to the Whakamana Whānau Social Work service, please rate your level of agreement with the next two statements (Q.7 and Q.8). If not, please proceed to Q.9.

7. Whakamana Whānau is making a positive difference for the client(s) I referred.

   - Definitely Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Definitely Disagree
   - Don’t Know

8. Whakamana Whānau is making a positive contribution to the work I / my organisation is undertaking with the client(s) I referred.

   - Definitely Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Definitely Disagree
   - Don’t Know
If you or your organisation receive referrals from Whakamana Whānau, continue with Q.9; If not, please go to Q 12

9. Please rate your satisfaction with the Whakamana Whānau referral process.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Please add comments to explain your response to Q.9:

10. Did the referral(s) you received match the services your organisation provides? 
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Did you receive sufficient information with the referral(s)? 
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Whakamana Whānau service is making a positive contribution to restoring the safety and wellbeing/mauri ora of whānau/families where family violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring. 
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Definitely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Whakamana Whānau supports whānau/families to make longer-term changes that prevent family violence from recurring. 
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Definitely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Whakamana Whānau links whānau/families to other services and to their wider community to support longer-term change. 
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Definitely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Whakamana Whānau works collaboratively to meet whānau and community needs. 
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Definitely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Whakamana Whānau works together with other frontline services to reduce service gaps and fragmentation. 
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Definitely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. In your experience, what is working well in the Whakamana Whānau service?
18. Are there any suggestions that you could make to improve the Whakamana Whānau service or to fill gaps in the service?

19. Are there any suggestions that you could make to improve the support available for whānau/families where family violence has occurred or is at risk of occurring?

20. Please add any further feedback or comments:

Thank You

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your response is an important contribution to evaluating the Whakamana Whānau Social Work service.

Dr. Sally Harvey
Evaluation & Research
Presbyterian Support East Coast
T: 06 8778193 ext 720
M: 0275 222 012
E: sally.harvey@psec.org.nz