

# Designing the New Service Delivery System

Submitted by Julie Halfnights, Greg Robertson, Kuo Wong

Attachment 3

<b>Homework</b> from the April 15 <sup>th</sup> Community Working Group Meeting	Who is Responsible for what? Who is accountable?		What relationships need to be developed? Why did you choose those relationships	How will it be ensured community needs are met?	How is the Community Involved? Why are they involved?	Why is it financially, socially and environmentally sustainable?
	What is City's role?	What is Community's role?				

# Designing the New Service Delivery System

Submitted by Julie Halfnights, Greg Robertson, Kuo Wong

<p><b>Governance</b> Definition: Council, PRCS Committee Council Advisory, Decision-making authority</p>	<p>Elected Representatives</p>	<p>To lead, to serve, to listen and to respond. Elected and/or appointed volunteers serve as they see a fit for themselves. The organizations take full responsibility for finances, governance and planning, with assistance and direction from the City to ensure City policy applicable to the area is applied</p>	<p>Most relationships are already in place. The system works now though it needs clear roles, responsibilities and operating agreements to be re-defined. Most are already constituted, funded and stocked with volunteers, resources</p>	<p>The agreements the City forges with the Associations will ensure accountability by both parties</p>	<p>Community volunteers become involved in a variety of levels and may contribute as much or as little time as they are able. They are involved because they care, because they want to serve and because they want to learn new skills and meet new people. Some want to become community leaders.</p>	<p>The city's support, in the form of infrastructure and human resources, underpins the volunteer efforts. As the organizations have been around for up to 50 years, and remain viable to this day, the future looks clear. Stewardship of the environment is applicable to some organisations only.</p>
<p><b>Management</b> Definition: Resources, Policy, Standards, Evaluation Systems</p>	<p>Define Resources, Policy, Standards, Evaluation Systems</p>	<p>Definition of policy and procedures that are facility or association-specific, annual planning and budget creation, participation in evaluation as agreed upon by the City and the Organisations.</p>	<p>Current City/Association staff/Association volunteer relationships require significant work to define roles, responsibilities, expectations and areas that require cooperation</p>	<p>Clearly stated agreements, negotiated as required.</p>	<p>Oversee body works with the City as a sounding board on long term strategic planning  The community is engaged by City staff and the volunteers of the Board in a variety of ways; everyone is encouraged to become involved, if not at a facility, within their own neighbourhoods</p>	<p>Ensure direction is according to vision and values - insight</p>

# Designing the New Service Delivery System

Submitted by Julie Halfnights, Greg Robertson, Kuo Wong

<p><b>Work / Operations</b>                  Definition: Facilities and Asset Management, Labour Relations, Capital Projects, Budget Management, Plant Operations</p>	<p>Support, expert advice, facility maintenance and upkeep</p>	<p>Some organizations will look after all of these, always working with City staff or within clearly outlined City guidelines. Other organizations may limit themselves.</p>	<p>There are some areas that require more definition, but many of these areas are already well-defined. There is a need to coordinate City and Association priorities for capital and maintenance projects and define protocols for associations to move projects ahead.</p>	<p>Adequate resourcing, both City and association, planning, political support, clear understandings, annual, open priority setting, with timelines and opportunities for association input.</p>	<p>As involved as they want to be, to ensure their needs are being met</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p><b>Service Planning &amp; Customer Service</b>                  Definition: Implementation of Management Area above (policies, standards, evaluation systems), Short-term Strategic planning, Information Technology and use of technology, Seasonal Program Planning</p>	<p>Some of this requires negotiation and further study; some organizations will require more City support than others. Generally, the current system of front end customer service is seen as likely. A base level of service needs to be defined – hours of operation, staff complements, and other supports</p>	<p>Through revenues received, customer service can be enhanced and added, as each organization is able. The Opportunity Fund would allow the development of such initiatives where an organization is not able to provide from its own budget. Annual planning is a key to success and integration of each association's goals with those of the City and the other associations.</p>	<p>Clear roles needed</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Volunteers take seriously their responsibility, are well-informed about that responsibility and supported by staff, when required</p>

# Designing the New Service Delivery System

Submitted by Julie Halfnights, Greg Robertson, Kuo Wong

<p><b>Service Delivery</b></p> <p>Definition: Direct Service Delivery, Support for service delivery, Use of technology</p>	<p>We see City delivery of IT, program registration, facilities and facility maintenance. Assistance would be provided in the areas of human resource supervision and planning, volunteer/leadership planning and recruitment, special needs planning and delivery, and specific areas of interest.</p>	<p>Direct service delivery; PRCS should remove itself from the direct delivery of all programs and services except aquatics. This would allow City staff to focus on their role as facilitators. Continued City participation puts non-union status at risk, and confuses models of Partnership.</p>	<p>Most are already in place; some require clarification, some may require negotiation</p>	<p>Adequate resourcing, both City and association, planning, political support, clear understandings, annual, open priority setting, with timelines and opportunities for association input. In addition, clear statements of expectation from all parties involved are required</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Has more flexibility than City staffed and operated models, costs less, is more responsive and is in touch at the neighbourhood level. IT services from the City ensure up-to-date technology. Access to funds and grants unavailable to gov't, access to expertise and resources not available to gov't</p>
--	---	--	--	--	-----------------	---

**Please illustrate your system for delivering service.**

**Identify how the system is financially sustainable, the accountability structure, where current associations are involved, and what you are trying to achieve by your service delivery system.**

*Illustration of the system*

- 1) Attached, as outlined in the Organization Chart and supporting statements
- 2) The one part worth mentioning is the Opportunity Fund. In the case of Community Centres, and possibly with others, the idea is to dedicate 1/3 of all income in excess of expenditures to further Community Recreation projects, to be allocated annually (it is assumed the Associations would have a large, but not exclusive, role in the choice of these projects)

# Designing the New Service Delivery System

Submitted by Julie Halfnights, Greg Robertson, Kuo Wong

*Identify how the system is financially sustainable, the accountability structure, where current associations are involved, and what you are trying to achieve by your service delivery system*

- 1) Financial sustainability: this has been a foundational principle of the Community and Seniors Associations. The income from them has been predictable and usable for decades, well within the norms of predictability for business organizations. The partnership of Associations and City should also be predictable. An enforceable defined Operating agreement will make this so.
- 2) Accountability: Financial relationships between the Associations and the City currently are accountable. Monthly statements are circulated to Board members and City facility staff. All Associations have audited or reviewed annual statements. These are provided to members, City staff and Council members at annual general meetings.  
: Actions: The Societies Act and the contracts between each Association and the City govern accountability for actions and outcomes. These are carefully monitored and the responsibility falls squarely on the members of the Boards. This separation of responsibility gives the City a measure of protection and enables such things as a non-union atmosphere in the Centres.
- 3) Goals of the Associations: All Associations are attempting to foster a sense of community in their areas, and Richmond in general. A sense of community is the most important part of governance in any area. With a sense of belonging, citizens willingly do things that they would not otherwise do. Without it, communities expect “the Government” to do everything for them, while fighting payment for those services in the form of taxes. Clearly having citizens who view themselves as members of the organization rather than customers is key to success in our future.

# Designing the New Service Delivery System

Submitted by Julie Halfnights, Greg Robertson, Kuo Wong

Attachment 3

Homework for CWG presented by 8 Community Associations and Minoru Seniors Society

We Recommend and Support a Model that will Add Value and be Cost Effective

1. Service and Recreation delivery must be community based. 'Communities' are either geographical or interest based.
2. After 40 years of proven success with Richmond's unique model – a few changes are needed.
3. Positive changes to our current model will retain existing volunteers and prove cost effective.
4. Contracts are needed with the City and Associations to define deliverables and funding for both.
5. We support sharing of excess revenues:
  - 1/3 retained for reinvestment into their community
  - 1/3 shared with smaller Associations
  - 1/3 to PRCS general revenues
6. An efficient system could include oversight decision-making bodies with volunteer and Council appointed members.
7. PRCS would be the source of specialized skills and staff support to all Associations. These resources need not be on site every day.
8. PRCS would increase communications and foster volunteerism to maximize the cost effectiveness and value volunteers provided to Richmond programs.

# Designing the New Service Delivery System

Submitted by Julie Halfnights, Greg Robertson, Kuo Wong

Attachment 3

## Advantages of the proposed organization:

- Minimal implementation costs
- Makes use of current legally established organizations
- Honours past volunteer commitment and builds upon it
- Allows “stratification” of City services
- Reduces the number of bodies with which the City must meet and negotiate
- Leaves community decision-making with the people who know their community best: community members and facility users
- Provides the City with revenue not currently available without penalizing the “have not” communities
- Retains staffing flexibility – organizations need to be nimble to respond to changing needs
- Allows opportunities for contracting out, if future Councils would like to pursue this

*Please see attached PowerPoint presentation handouts.*