



**MINISTRY OF SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT**
TE MANATŪ WHAKAHIATO ORA

Impact of Budget-19 on Sexual Violence Services and the Sector

Baseline Survey

Authors

Natalie Gregory, Kasia Momsen, Dr Deborah Platts-Fowler & Dr Roma Watterson,
Research & Evaluation Team, Insights, Ministry of Social Development.

Acknowledgements

We are deeply grateful to all the people who participated in this research, for giving their time and sharing their experiences with us. We give particular acknowledgement to those who work with people affected by sexual violence. Their time is precious. We also acknowledge those who strategize, manage, and organise, to make this work possible.

We also want to acknowledge the support and assistance we received from colleagues within the Ministry, in particular, the members of the Sexual Violence Team for providing information about the sexual violence funding and contracts and reviewing the report.

Disclaimer

The views and interpretations in this report are those of the researchers and not the official position of the Ministry of Social Development.

Published

Ministry of Social Development

PO Box 1556

Wellington

www.msd.govt.nz/insights

Published September 2021

ISBN

978-1-99-002363-7 (Online)

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	4
Background	4
The specialist sexual violence services	5
Services included in the baseline survey	6
Aims of the baseline survey	7
Research methods	8
Two stages of data collection	8
Seventy-three people participated	8
Research ethics were reviewed	9
Data was analysed thematically	9
The report has been quality assured	9
Contextual factors	11
Contracting models have changed	11
COVID-19 Alert Levels restricted access to support	12
Public campaigns increase demand for support	12
Capacity in the wider support system	13
Impact on demand	14
Many agencies think that COVID-19 increased demand.....	14
More children and young people seem to need support	15
The limited capacity of other services increases demand	16
The funding has alleviated some of the demand	17
Impact on the workforce	18
Growing the workforce is a priority	18
Agencies hope to recruit more diverse staff	19
Salaries are higher, but pay inequity remains a challenge	20
Workforce expansion is limited by the inability to recruit	21
Agencies are investing in training and development.....	23
The workforce is becoming more culturally competent	24
Agencies are investing in staff wellbeing	25
Job satisfaction and retention are likely to improve	26

Impact on organisational development	28
Agencies are investing in technology	28
Agencies want to invest in more and better premises	29
New offices are will improve access to support.....	30
Agencies are being more strategic.....	31
The funding is supporting continued professionalisation	32
Impact on service design	34
Agencies can be more flexible and responsive.....	34
Initiatives are being developed and refined	36
Post-crisis initiatives are plugging gaps in the system	37
Contracting models limit what agencies can do	38
Impact on service user experiences	40
Money for travel costs is improving access to support.....	40
Increasing cultural responsiveness is a key focus	41
A welcoming environment can support engagement	42
Increasing the support offer for family and whānau	43
Family and whānau support requires specialist skills.....	44
Impact on inter-agency relationships	46
There is integration at the service level.....	46
Funding is likely to strengthen relationships	46
More staff and flexible funding are enabling networking	47
Stronger relationships provide better referral pathways	48
Training and knowledge-sharing are future priorities	49
Minimal impact on relationships with <i>Safe to talk</i>	49
Most agencies refer to <i>Safe to talk</i>	51
There is low confidence in <i>Safe to talk's</i> expertise	51
Impact on relationships with the Ministry	53
Most agencies have a good relationship with the Ministry	53
Individuals build relationships on behalf of the Ministry	53
Agencies want to be consulted more.....	55
Strategic support can add value to the funding	56
Service-specific findings	58
Crisis Service.....	58
HSB Service	58
MSSA Service	59

Over-arching findings	60
Timeframe for impacts.....	60
Impacts, achieved and planned.....	60
Factors limiting the impacts of the funding	62
Additional support for the sector	62
Next Steps	63
Notes	64

Executive Summary

Background

Budget-19 announced \$90.3 million over four years for the Ministry of Social Development (the Ministry) to invest in sexual violence services. A proportion of this (\$1.39 million) was allocated for a programme of research and evaluation. This aims to:

- evaluate the impact of the Budget-19 investment in building the capability of specialist sexual violence services and in creating a more integrated, efficient, and responsive system for all those affected by sexual violence
- increase understanding of how best to support people affected by sexual violence, with a focus on the needs of select priority groups.

The programme comprises a range of projects, including exploratory research to fill knowledge gaps, service-specific evaluations, and the design of new service measures for continuous monitoring and improvement. A baseline survey has been conducted to inform the later evaluation activities. The findings are discussed in this report.

Services included in the baseline survey

A range of sexual violence services and initiatives received funding from Budget-19, and these are the primary focus for the programme:

- 1 Sexual Harm Crisis Support Service (existing service)
- 2 Peer support for Male Survivors of Sexual Abuse (existing service)
- 3 Harmful Sexual Behaviour Service for non-mandated adults (existing service)
- 4 Concerning Sexual Ideation Service for adults (new initiative)
- 5 Court Support Service (new initiative)
- 6 Kaupapa Māori specialist sexual violence service (new initiative)

A team of Kaupapa Māori researchers will evaluate the impact of Budget-19 on the Kaupapa Māori service. For this reason, it was excluded from the baseline survey. The Court Support was also excluded because it was in the early stages of development. Although not funded by Budget-19, the national helpline, *Safe to talk - kōrero mai ka ora*, was included because it plays a key role in the sector.

The focus of the baseline survey

The baseline survey involved semi-structured interviews with the sexual violence support agencies and national bodies funded by Budget-19, as well as their local contract managers. Seventy-three people participated. The primary research question was:

- How, and when, is the Budget-19 investment expected to impact services and the sector?

Secondary questions encouraged participants to consider the impact of Budget-19 on key areas, including workforce, organisational development, service design, experiences for service users, inter-agency relationships, and relationships with the Ministry.

Key findings

Participants reported the Budget-19 funding had already impacted their agency, especially workforce expansion and capability. They said that other impacts would take longer to see as things like organisational development take years to achieve.

The impacts of Budget-19 are likely to be limited by factors beyond the control of support agencies. These limiting factors include increased demand for support; the inability to recruit; blockages in the wider system, especially support for long-term recovery; and contracting models used by government agencies.

Key thematic findings are detailed below:

Workforce

Most agencies had prioritised recruitment, to increase the number of staff and expand the breadth of experience. A larger workforce was helping to clear or reduce waitlists. A larger workforce was also helping to reduce caseloads, which was important for staff wellbeing and seemed to be improving the quality of care for service users.

Organisational development

Agencies were investing in organisational assets, such as laptops and phones. This enabled them to engage more flexibly with service users, providing home visits and virtual sessions. Agencies were developing processes and strategies to improve service delivery. They were also increasing their professionalism by focusing on governance, hiring specialist staff, and investing in things like staff uniforms and logos.

Service design

The Budget-19 funding and more flexible contracts had started to broaden the range of support. This was taking agencies towards a wraparound model of care. This is best practice for people affected by sexual violence. This wraparound model was increasingly important due to waitlists for other services. A shortage of long-term recovery support was forcing agencies to expand their service to include 'post-crisis' support.

Experiences for service users

Agencies were increasing access to support through geographical expansion, opening satellite premises and funding travel expenses for staff and service users. There was a focus on making premises more welcoming. Agencies were investing in ways to be more culturally responsive and in family and whānau support. Agencies suggested that more funding was needed to meet the additional costs of family and whānau support.

Inter-agency relationships

A larger workforce was creating more time for networking with other agencies. More flexible funding was allowing people to travel and provide hospitality. Improved relationships were supporting referral pathways. Agencies were not confident that *Safe to talk* was helping to integrate the sector and wanted a better relationship with them.

Relationships with the Ministry

Agencies were largely positive about their relationship with the Ministry. Relationships were built by people in the Ministry, and high staff turnover was perceived to be problematic. The Budget-19 funding made some agencies feel more valued. The Ministry could add value to the funding by providing more strategic and sector-wide support.

Part 1 – About this research

Introduction

This report presents the findings of a baseline survey. The survey involved interviews with sexual violence agencies and national (or peak) bodies that are funded by the Ministry through Budget-19, as well as the Ministry's local contract managers.

This report is divided into three parts. The first part provides background information on the Budget-19 allocation and the funded specialist sexual violence services. It also discusses the method adopted for the baseline survey. The second part presents the thematic findings from the research. The third, and final, part provides some over-arching findings, explores the implications, and identifies the next steps.

The term 'sexual violence' is used throughout this report. This is because people working within the sector, especially in Crisis Support agencies, prefer this to 'sexual harm'. They thought the term 'sexual harm' minimised the experience.

Background

The Budget-19 investment announced funding of \$320.9 million over four years to support initiatives across ten government agencies who are working together as a Joint Venture to prevent and respond to family and sexual violence. The Ministry received \$90.3 million to invest in sexual violence support services. A proportion of this funding (\$1.39 million) was allocated to research and evaluation.

With this funding, the Ministry's Research and Evaluation Team (the research team), in the Strategy and Insights group, has developed the Sexual Violence Research and Evaluation Programme (the programme). This programme has been co-designed with the Sexual Violence Service Development Team (the sexual violence team), in Safe Strong Families and Communities. The over-arching aims of the programme are:

- to evaluate the impact of the Budget-19 investment in building the capability of specialist sexual violence services and in creating a more integrated, efficient, and responsive system for all those affected by sexual violence
- to increase understanding of how best to support people affected by sexual violence, with a focus on the needs of select priority groups.

The programme comprises a range of projects, including exploratory research to fill knowledge gaps, service-specific evaluations, and the development of new service measures and client voice measures, for continuous monitoring and improvement. The programme aligns with the four-year investment period for Budget-19, which began on 1 July 2019 and finishes on 31 June 2023.

A baseline survey has been conducted to understand the early and expected impacts of Budget-19 investment from the perspective of recipients. The findings, discussed in this report, will inform the later evaluation activities. The findings will also inform the mid-term report to the Cabinet Social Wellbeing Committee (expected by July 2021).

More generally, the findings from the baseline survey will increase the Ministry's knowledge about the sector, at a time when the findings can be used to maximise the impact of Budget-19 investment. By sharing the findings with participants, they may also increase the sector's own knowledge, enabling agencies to learn from each other.

The specialist sexual violence services

The Ministry is using its Budget-19 allocation to invest in a range of specialist sexual violence services and initiatives. These are the primary focus for the programme. There is an additional focus on the national 24/7 helpline, *Safe to talk - Kōrero mai ka ora*. *Safe to talk* is not funded by Budget-19, but is a key part of the system for people affected by sexual violence. These services are briefly described below:

Sexual Harm Crisis Support Service (existing service)

The Sexual Harm Crisis Support Service (Crisis Service) offers support to adults in crisis due to experiences of sexual violence. It supports victim-survivors¹ and their family and whānau². Crisis is a subjective experience that can occur at any time. It is not limited to the period immediately after an incident. People can cycle in and out of crisis. Support includes emergency response, advocacy, and practical and emotional support (including counselling). The Ministry funds 35 Crisis Support agencies. Six identify as Kaupapa Māori and, so, they also sit within the Kaupapa Māori specialist sexual violence service.

Peer support for Male Survivors of Sexual Violence (existing service)

The Male Survivors of Sexual Abuse (MSSA) Service offers specialist support aimed at enabling long-term recovery and wellbeing. The support includes peer support, advocacy, case planning and information for adult male survivors, their families and whānau and/or support network. The Ministry funds 11 agencies³ to provide support for MSSA. Through Budget-19, the Ministry also funds a national body, Male Survivors Aotearoa (MSA), to which all the MSSA agencies belong.

Harmful Sexual Behaviour Service for non-mandated adults (existing service)

The Harmful Sexual Behaviour (HSB)⁴ Service for non-mandated adults offers specialist behaviour change interventions. The support is delivered in a community setting by clinicians trained and experienced in the assessment and treatment of sexual offenders. The Ministry funds four agencies⁵ to deliver HSB support across Aotearoa New Zealand. From 1 July 2019, these agencies were also contracted to deliver psycho-social support. This support is an additional component of the HSB service.

Concerning Sexual Ideation Service for adults (new service)

This new service provides adults who exhibit concerning sexual ideation (CSI)⁶ access to early intervention and support, reducing the chance of them engaging in harmful behaviours to others. The same three agencies that make up the Tauīwi non-mandated HSB service also make up the Ministry's CSI service. Hence, throughout the report 'HSB agencies' is used for the agencies that deliver either HSB or CSI support.

Court Support Service (new service)

The Court Support Service provides emotional, spiritual, and practical support to adult victim-survivors going through the criminal justice process. The service aims to reduce secondary victimisation by the criminal justice system. People will typically enter the service when a charge is filed. The service will help them prepare for court, to manage the process, to understand the outcome, and get access to ongoing support if necessary.

Developing a Kaupapa Māori specialist sexual violence service for victim-survivors, perpetrators and their whānau (new initiative)

This initiative aims to close a gap in service delivery by enabling the development of holistic, whānau-centred Kaupapa Māori specialist sexual violence services. Services will be developed 'by Māori for Māori' and include prevention and early intervention through to long-term support. The initiative will also address geographical gaps.

Safe to talk - kōrero mai ka ora (Budget-19 initiative)

Safe to talk, which is funded by Budget-16, primarily offers virtual crisis counselling. It also provides information and advice, and aims to connect people to timely and appropriate support by signposting and making referrals to other services. The service is for anyone affected by sexual violence.

Table 1, below, illustrates the Budget-19 allocations across these sexual violence services, by funding type and year.

Table 1: Full breakdown of the Ministry's Budget-19 allocation, by service and funding type

Service Type	Funding type	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	4-year total
		(\$m)	(\$m)	(\$m)	(\$m)	(\$m)
Crisis Support	Service delivery	5.380	14.915	14.915	14.915	50.125
	Design, implementation and evaluation	0.115	0.115	0.115	0.083	0.428
Male Survivors of Sexual Abuse	Service delivery	1.438	3.374	3.374	3.374	11.560
	Design, implementation and evaluation	0.115	0.115	0.115	0.093	0.438
Court Support	Service delivery	0.104	0.943	1.885	2.828	5.760
	Design, implementation and evaluation	0.179	0.179	0.115	0.115	0.588
Harmful Sexual Behaviour	Service delivery	2.309	3.002	3.002	3.002	11.315
	Design, implementation and evaluation	0.115	0.115	0.115	0.093	0.438
Concerning Sexual Ideation	Service delivery	0.309	0.494	0.618	0.741	2.162
	Design, implementation and evaluation	0.179	0.179	0.115	0.115	0.588
Kaupapa Māori	Service delivery	1.059	1.295	1.363	1.532	5.249
	Design, implementation and evaluation	0.475	0.475	0.410	0.345	1.705
TOTAL		11.777	25.201	26.142	27.236	90.356

Services included in the baseline survey

Some of these sexual violence services were excluded from the baseline survey. The Kaupapa Māori sexual violence service was excluded because the Mātauranga Māori workstream will evaluate the impact of Budget-19 on this service. The Mātauranga Māori workstream is designed and managed by a separate team of Kaupapa Māori researchers.

The findings from the Mātauranga Māori workstream will be synthesised with the findings from the wider evaluation, towards the end of the programme, to provide a consensus on the overall impact of Budget-19.

The Court Support Service was also excluded because it was in the early stages of development. During the data collection period, the Ministry was finalising contracts with seven agencies. These agencies also deliver Crisis Support, so were included in the survey, but only as representatives of the Crisis Service.

The remaining services are the focus of the baseline survey: Crisis Support, the MSSA service, the HSB and CSI services (provided by the same agencies), and *Safe to talk*.

Aims of the baseline survey

The main aim of the baseline survey was to understand plans and expectations for the Budget-19 investment, and how the investment may have already impacted. The interview topic guide was similar for all participants. The primary research question was:

- How, and when, is the Budget-19 investment expected to impact services and the sector?

Secondary questions encouraged participants to think about the impact on the following:

- workforce
- organisational development
- service design
- experiences for service users (primary clients and family and whānau)
- inter-agency relationships
- relationships with the Ministry

Within the topic of inter-agency relationships, participants were asked about the expected impact on referral pathways and on their relationship with the national helpline, *Safe to talk - kōrero mai ka ora*. Participants representing the MSSA national body, Male Survivors Aotearoa (MSA), were asked some additional questions, including about the impact of the funding across all MSSA agencies and on strategies for responsiveness to Māori.

The findings of the baseline survey will help to refine the focus of later evaluation activities. In-depth data collection will take place from late 2021 through to early 2023. This will follow-up on recipients' plans and expectations for the funding, to explore the extent to which they were realised, the challenges and unanticipated impacts.

Within the baseline survey, impacts for service users were only explored from the perspective of the support agencies and contract managers. During the in-depth data collection, a wider range of stakeholders will be involved, including service users.

The involvement of service users will increase understanding of how to respond to people affected by sexual violence. The evaluation approach aims to go beyond the simple question of 'does it work?' or 'what works?'. It aims to understand 'what works for whom, in what circumstances, and how?'. This is important for improving service design.

Research methods

Two stages of data collection

The data collection for the baseline survey comprised two stages. The first stage involved interviews with local contract managers, known as Partnering for Outcomes (PFO) Advisors. PFO Advisors are employed by Oranga Tamariki but manage sexual violence contracts for both Ministries. They help agencies access funding, quality assure contracts, and support community development and strategic planning.

The PFO Advisors were interviewed due to their knowledge of the regions and the range of agencies that operate within them, including the sexual violence support agencies, whose contracts they manage. The PFO Advisors were interviewed first because the research team wanted to understand any sensitivities before contacting the support agencies. At the second stage, all the peak bodies and support agencies funded by Budget-19, were invited to an interview, within the eligible services (detailed above).

Seventy-three people participated

The survey response rate was high. Interviews were achieved with most of the eligible population. The response rate was 76 percent for the PFO Advisors, and 90 percent for the sexual violence support agencies.

All PFO Advisors who manage sexual violence contracts for the Ministry were invited to participate in the baseline survey. They were contacted by email and telephone. Additional information was provided via the usual channels, including Advice Notes and managers' updates. Of the 28 PFO Advisors invited, 22 participated in 21 interviews.

Each support agency funded by Budget-19, for the Crisis, MSSA, HSB, CSI, and national were invited to participate in the baseline survey. One agency was excluded, due to risk of overburdening them at a busy time. The remaining agencies were contacted by email and telephone and asked to nominate one or more members of staff. Interview topics were shared in advance to help them decide who to nominate. In total, 36 of the 40 eligible agencies participated. This involved 51 people in 36 interviews.

Across both stages of the data collection, a total of 73 people participated in 57 interviews. See Table 2 below.

Table 2: The number of interviews and participants

	No. of interviews	No. of participants
PFO Advisors	21	22
Sexual Violence Services	36	51
Crisis	25	34
MSSA	7	9
HSB / CSI	3	6
National Helpline	1	2
Total	57	73

Research ethics were reviewed

All participants were provided with information about the baseline survey in advance of the interviews, to ensure they were making an informed decision to participate. They were told that they could refuse to answer any question and withdraw from the research at any time. They were also assured of confidentiality and anonymity. The research team agreed to seek explicit permission to share any findings that may be disclosive.

The approach and methods for the baseline survey were reviewed by the Ministry's Ethics Committee in September 2020. The review ensures that no harm is done within the context of the research.

Data was analysed thematically

The baseline interview notes and transcriptions were thematically coded using the Framework Method⁷ and a software package called NVivo. In most cases, the researcher coded the interview(s) that they, themselves, had conducted. It is best practice to ensure the person most familiar with the data codes it.

Themes were identified deductively and inductively. This means that the research team identified data relevant to the themes in the interview guide (deductively). The team also looked for themes that seem to be important to participants (inductively).

Quotations were extracted from the data if they provided a good example of a finding, or captured well what several participants had said. On their own, the quotations do not indicate the full breadth of views and experience. Quotations were used almost verbatim. Minor changes were made where the verbatim text impeded the readability of the quotation. Any details that risked identifying participants, or agencies, were redacted.

The report has been quality assured

This report was reviewed by each member of the research team, and the programme lead. The participants of the research have also been provided with the opportunity to review the report, to ensure the findings appropriately represent what they said and that individuals cannot be identified. Staff at the Ministry were also asked to review the details about the Budget-19 funding and contract models to ensure these were correct.

Part 2 – Findings

Contextual factors

Several changes preceded or accompanied the Budget-19 investment in sexual violence services. Because these changes are likely to influence the impact of the Budget-19 investment and/or perceptions of the impact, these changes are key contextual factors. The contextual factors identified in the baseline survey include the Ministry's new contracting model, COVID-19, and public campaigns about sexual violence.

Contracting models have changed

Contracts are longer

The Ministry moved to longer-term contracts for most services at the same time as the Budget-19 funding was being allocated. The longer contracts gave sexual violence agencies additional security and seemed to be impacting when, and how, agencies were using the funding. The timeframes and details of these contract changes varied by service, as detailed below:

Crisis Service: the move to three-year contracts happened on 1 July 2017 (F18) through Budget-16.

MSSA Service: the move to three-year contracts happened on 1 July 2020 (F21). Before that, the MSSA agencies were given yearly contracts through Budget-16. Initially, the MSSA agencies received funding through grants.

HSB Service: the move to four-year contracts happened on 1 July 2019 (F20). Prior to that, they were given two-year contracts (through Budget-16). Prior to that, the HSB agencies were given 12-month contracts, while service design activities took place.

CSI Service: The CSI contracts are aligned with the HSB contracts. When the service was first piloted, from 1 July 2018 (F19), agencies had 12-month contracts and were funded on a 'fee for service' basis. This meant they received payments for every service user needing CSI support rather than a lump sum payment.

Contracts have shifted to an FTE funding model

Many agencies spoke about the change from a volumes-based contract model to a full time equivalent (FTE) contract model. A volumes-based contract is one that requires agencies to achieve a minimum number of outputs, such as to support a minimum number of clients or conduct a minimum number of assessments. By comparison, an FTE contract requires that a minimum number of staff are in place.

This shift to an FTE contract, for most agencies, coincided with the allocation of Budget-19. The findings from the baseline survey indicated that this shift was affecting how agencies were using the funding. Consequently, it was also affecting how Budget-19 was impacting services and the sector.

Crisis Service: the first move to an FTE model happened on 1 July 2017 (F18) through Budget-16. The initial FTE rate they received was \$80k per FTE. From 1 July 2020 (F21), through Budget-19, an updated FTE model was developed and adopted for the Crisis Service at \$138,919 per FTE per annum.

MSSA Service: the move to an FTE model happened on 1 July 2020 (F21) at \$136,409 per FTE per annum. Budget-19 also introduced a minimum level of service at 1.5 FTE.

HSB and CSI Services: these services still have volumes-based contracts. They are funded per assessment or treatment.

COVID-19 Alert Levels restricted access to support

The global pandemic changed the way in which services were able to operate. On 25 March 2020, Aotearoa New Zealand declared a State of National Emergency and entered a national lockdown (Alert Level 4)⁸. At Alert Level 4, people were required to self-isolate at home, travel was severely limited, and all non-essential businesses were closed.

Aotearoa New Zealand moved to Alert Level 3 on 27 April 2020. Restrictions under level 3 were similar to level 4. The main difference was that households could join with another exclusive 'bubble'. During alerts levels 3 and 4 agencies had to shift from face-to-face to virtual support (online or via telephone). Sexual violence agencies were only able to meet face-to-face with victim-survivors in limited instances.

Alert Levels 3 and 4 introduced additional risks for sexual violence. People may have been in unsafe 'bubbles'. Victim-survivors were unable to go to safe houses if they were suspected of having COVID-19. The police were prioritising only acute or critical cases for sexual assault and reports of concern about children (RoCs). The police also stopped interviewing historic cases unless there was an immediate risk.

New Zealand moved to Alert Level 2 on 13 May 2020. During level 2, agencies were able to return to providing face-to-face services, but with special requirements to ensure physical distancing. Level 2 might have been the first chance since the lockdown that some victim-survivors were able to seek help.

On 26 March 2020, the Government announced \$27 million of funding to ensure essential social services could keep delivering for communities after COVID-19⁹. Of this, \$1.86 million was made available as grants to sexual violence services. These grants were to help people at imminent risk to access appropriate support, locally. This funding was additional to the Budget-19 allocation.

Public campaigns increase demand for support

Participants felt that demand for sexual violence support was affected by high profile events and public campaigns. For example, participants suggested that the *Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care* may be increasing demand for support. The *Inquiry* is looking into what happened to children, young people and vulnerable adults in State and faith-based care in Aotearoa New Zealand between the years 1950-99¹⁰.

Many agencies reported an increase in demand for support from young people. They attributed this partly to the *Me Too* movement. This movement was founded by survivor and activist Tarana Burke in 2006¹¹. The movement went viral in 2017 following widespread sexual-abuse allegations against leading figures in Hollywood. Celebrities began sharing their personal experiences of sexual violence. This prompted an outpouring of disclosures on social media, by millions of people, using the hashtag *Me Too* (#MeToo).

The coverage of the *Me Too* movement started public conversations about the best ways to stop sexual violence. Young people were perhaps more receptive because discussions

were taking place on social media, which is popular among young people. In response to these discussions, sexual violence agencies began to increase their online visibility. Participants suggested that these developments together may have increased demand for support, especially by young people. This will be discussed in more detail later in the report.

Capacity in the wider support system

People affected by sexual violence require many types of support because the impacts are wide-ranging¹². While the Ministry's contracts offer some flexibility, and the agencies work flexibly to meet the needs of services users, service users typically need to be referred to other services. Thus, the sexual violence services are dependent to some extent on the ability of these other services to provide timely and effective support.

Sometimes, these additional services are required alongside the specialist sexual violence support and, other times, before or after. For example, drug and alcohol support may be required alongside specialist sexual violence support and, in doing so, may ensure that service users are more responsive to the sexual violence support. On the other hand, referral to long-term counselling typically happens when someone leaves the Crisis Service.

Waitlists for these additional services affected the ability of the sexual violence services to achieve the best possible outcomes for their services users. Waitlists can mean that service users do not get the support they need when they need it. Waitlists can also mean large caseloads for the sexual violence support agencies, which can erode staff wellbeing. Participants reported problems associated with waitlists for long-term counselling, for mental health services, and for specialist sexual violence support services for young people, especially older teens.

These other services are part of the wider system of support for people affected by sexual violence. As such, their availability is a contextual factor, with the ability to enhance or limit the impact of Ministry's Budget-19 investment. For example, the uplift in funding is less likely to be invested in capability-building, if the sexual violence agencies are 'fire-fighting' due to gaps in the system. Alternatively, some agencies reported investing in new types of provision to plug these gaps. Yet, these innovations may be re-directing agencies from their contracted service goals. Consequently, the Ministry may be subsidising services for other government agencies.

Impact on demand

Agencies were not specifically asked about demand for support, but it was a thread running through most interviews. Participants reported that demand is typically higher than their agency can meet, and that demand has been increasing. This increasing demand, at least at a local level, seems to be affecting how some agencies are planning to use the Budget-19 funding. Increasing demand might dampen the impacts of Budget-19 if it merely funds more of the same instead of being used for capability building.

Higher demand can mean growing waitlists for services. For agencies that do not turn people away, this can mean high caseloads. High caseloads can impact the quality of the service that the agency is able to provide, as this participant suggested:

We work as best as we can within the contract to provide, sometimes, the minimum service required to care for the people. We have timeframes within some of our contracts. We meet those, but ... the work that we do could be an awful lot better if we had some more time. For example, we've got 55 people on our waitlist. They're all managed, and they're all spoken to each week, but ... they're in maintenance mode. We've dealt with their safety. ... Our team has to manage caseloads daily and we have to work at who we're closing. So, on a practical level, we can't hang onto people. ... We could do that, because they're not quite sorted, but we've had to get a bit harder. [Interview 16, Crisis]

Managing the demand for services is a priority for agencies. However, it is a complex issue. Participants explained that a variety of 'external factors' were contributing to high demand. As discussed above, these include COVID-19 Alert Level restrictions, public campaigns about sexual violence, and the limited availability of other services. This section will say more about how these things were affecting demand. Agencies were also aware that their activities could affect demand. For example, promotional activities and improving referral pathways increased access to support and, therefore, demand. These 'internal factors' will be explored later in the report.

Many agencies think that COVID-19 increased demand

Many participants felt that the global pandemic had increased demand for sexual violence services, either during or after the Alert Level restrictions that required people to stay in their homes, or in 'lockdown', as this participant did:

And, actually, since COVID, that's happened all year. So that's brought an increase in demand. Well yeah, yeah you know we've got a lot more people that have been triggered in different ways. We've got people that have come forward – you know it's probably more so the historical stuff. But we've been quite busy. [Interview 22, Crisis]

For some agencies, demand decreased during lockdown, but increased immediately after. They thought this was due to a backlog caused by people's preference for face-to-face support. Some people may also have been unaware that services were still operating during lockdown. Alternatively, some participants suggested that people

seeking support may have assumed that demand for virtual services was high. This is why they chose to wait until after lockdown, as this participant explained:

So the demand I think we saw over lockdown that went down a little bit for calls to our crisis line but we do know that was because they thought the line would be backed up by other people, but then once lockdown finished we started seeing waitlists for referrals so our highest week was 40 referrals coming in and right now I think in [region] it would be over 30 still waiting for counselling on our counselling waitlist. [Interview 24, Crisis]

One participant reported that not only were more people seeking support, but that service users were requiring support for longer periods due to anxiety caused by COVID-19:

...taking the example of COVID at the moment, the high level of anxiety in the community generally, let alone someone who's already experiencing high trauma and anxiety, so building on that we found this year that our clients are staying with us longer because there's more need, and because of the lockdown. Even though we had the remote service, like through Zoom or [indistinct], for some people that just didn't work. They couldn't or didn't feel it was right for them, so now they've had to wait, so now we have a backlog that we need to catch up with. [Interview 2, Crisis]

More children and young people seem to need support

Several crisis agencies reported that an increased number of children and young people were approaching their service. One participant said that "most of the people on our waiting list at the moment are young people". Some agencies suspected that demand would continue to increase with the use of technology:

The other stuff we recognise is I guess the risks for children and young people going forward with everything that's in front of them now, it's such a global world and they are so impacted by technology, by screens, by the content that they're seeing, not to mention if they've been targeted or groomed as well. [Interview 19, Crisis]

Agencies described how the increase in demand by young people was impacting their service. Some agencies admitted to supporting people under 18 years, even though their contract with the Ministry did not fund them for this. Agencies were more likely to work with people under 18 years if there were no specialist sexual violence services for young people in the local areas, as this person described:

Equally (and this an issue which I know MSD's working really hard to resolve) we don't have any services in this region for under 18-year olds. And, so, because we can't ignore teenagers who are sexually assaulted, we provide the service anyway; and we stretch our funding to manage that. ... We're nervous that we won't have the capacity for the younger ones and we're just hopeful that MSD will be able to move in that space as quickly as possible. [Interview 9, Crisis]

Agencies that had contracts with Oranga Tamariki to support young people affected by sexual violence could respond better to the increase in demand. Those without, felt that the MSD contracts needed to be more flexible, especially to help them support older teens who sometimes want to access an 'adult service'.

The limited capacity of other services increases demand

The capacity of other support services seems to be limiting the impact of Budget-19. One participant noted that "it's the funding of other services, that back up the work that [we] do, that's an issue". Several participants reported that the under-resourcing of services outside of the sexual violence sector, such as mental health services, was adding to their caseloads. Either sexual violence support agencies were unable to refer people to other services during their support period, or at the end.

It was reported that women were increasingly approaching the MSSA agencies for peer support. This was problematic because MSSA agencies are only contracted to support male survivors and their support network. It was unclear why this was happening. It might be that other local services are not appealing to these women. Alternatively, it might be because other local services have limited capacity to help.

The limited availability of Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC) support for people affected by sexual violence is a primary contributor to the high demand for MSD-funded services. ACC provides counselling support for people affected by sexual violence. This counselling is typically for long-term recovery and usually starts when someone is out of crisis. This service is known by ACC as the Integrated Service for Sensitive Claims (ISSC). The limited availability of ISSC is especially problematic for the Crisis Service. That said, it was reported to be a problem for all the services.

Crisis agencies had developed several strategies to "hold people ... in a safe way while they're waiting for counselling support" from ACC. One participant explained:

So because ACC always said no ... because there aren't enough counsellors and [we] thought well we can't have these people waiting on a waiting list for 3 or 4 months with nobody contacting them because who knows what their state of mind will be, so we've now developed this tool so we have a [counsellor] working with people on the waiting list, making appointments, checking in with them, looking after them until they get in with an ACC counsellor. [Interview 10, Crisis]

Despite never wanting to turn people away, one participant from the Crisis Service emphasised that providing 'post-crisis' support was not their area of expertise. For this reason, they felt that a solution must be found:

We could say we've done the initial crisis (which is part of our contract) and we could say we've got you okay and we could say you're done and you just have to wait until the next – but that's not appropriate ... We absolutely strive to refer people to where they need to be. We're not the long-term support that's not our skill. So that's certainly a need that I don't think is ours to fix but it's ours to raise. And whether it's MSD (or whoever) somebody needs to address the other end of the support. [Interview 16, Crisis]

The issue of how agencies are responding to the shortage of ACC support will be discussed again in the section on 'service design'.

The funding has alleviated some of the demand

Agencies reported that the increase in funding has helped them to respond to the high demand for their services, as mentioned by this participant:

The other good thing too is that it enabled us to clear some of the waitlist. We'd always had a backlog, quite a significant waitlist and that waitlist is still there in some ways. [Interview 26, HSB]

The main way in which agencies have been able to reduce their waitlists has been through increasing their workforce. However, some agencies had struggled to recruit staff. The reasons for this are discussed later in the report.

Participants reported that the Budget-19 investment itself had also increased demand. This was because increased investment in things like service promotion and referral pathways, was improving access to services. Improved access is a goal for the Ministry and contracted agencies. However, this impacts on waitlists and caseloads, which was a concern for some agencies, as demonstrated in the extracts below:

To be honest I wouldn't want to be drumming up more business. That might be a little bit more than we can handle. [Interview 20, Crisis]

And it's always that balance I guess because like you said if it is promoted that leads to increased demand so it's Catch 22 I guess and we don't want to turn people away (and we don't) but we need to juggle how we can best serve the people that are coming to us. [Interview 27, HSB]

Some agencies felt that the continued or increasing demand for their service was dampening the impact of the Budget-19 funding. In trying to keep up with demand, agencies were unable to invest in improvements. For example, when asked if the Budget-19 investment would impact organisational development, this participant responded with the following:

To some extent, although the demand for our services is so high, it so outstrips supply, but we try and put as many of our resources as we can into direct service delivery. Yes, we use obviously our funding to cover those elements, but how much we can use it to develop those areas is still quite [indistinct] because all of our efforts are trying to meet the demand for services, rather than these other things. ... We obviously have extra funding, which is great, but we don't have extra time, so anything that requires greater use of our staff time cannot be delivered. [Interview 3, Crisis]

Impact on the workforce

Participants were asked whether they expected the Budget-19 investment to impact on their workforce, including recruitment, skills and experience, training and development, job satisfaction and staff retention.

The need to build capacity to cope with the high and increasing demand was a prominent theme across all interviews. Most participants indicated that building capacity would be achieved by growing and developing their workforce. Agencies described their workforce as “the most significant consideration” and “critical”. Therefore, they planned to use the Budget-19 funding for this. However, most agencies also said that they faced recruitment challenges, which might hinder their plans for the Budget-19 funding.

Growing the workforce is a priority

The Budget-19 investment was supporting the recruitment of new staff across all service types. This was not only due to the uplift in funding, but due to the longer-term contracts. The longer-term contracts assured agencies that they would be able to pay their staff in the coming years. Some contracts required agencies to recruit more staff, but this alone did not explain the focus on workforce expansion. Most participants wanted to increase their staff numbers simply to provide quality support to all their service users, and without having to operate a waitlist, as this participant explained:

We've hired another person to increase our availability so that we can never have a waiting list for the sexual harm crisis work. [Interview 8, Crisis]

Most agencies reported a focus on recruitment for frontline roles, such as social workers and counsellors, as described by this participant:

By the end of last year, whenever we got additional funding, my priority was to increase frontline delivery services. So, now we have three social workers, we have three counsellors, we have a team of six ACC contractors, we have a services manager and a service co-ordinator. [Interview 4, Crisis]

While hiring frontline staff increased resource to work directly with service users, it placed demands elsewhere on the organisation. Additional staff placed demands on the administrative and managerial capacity of an agency. Hence, many agencies discussed the need to employ staff for human resources (HR), finance and administration, as well as management and leadership. For example:

We're looking to bring in a HR advisor, a part-time comms person, a part-time financial manager. We do already have financial management but we need our business manager to be able to focus on strategy more than doing accounts, so we'll bring more capacity into that financial area and we are getting another administration assistant because with more properties there's more property to look after, there's more staff to pay. [Interview 12, Crisis]

For a few agencies, the expansion of their workforce had already taken place. For the majority, recruitment was still underway or planned. Some agencies emphasised that recruitment was resource intensive. Recruitment especially put strain on smaller organisations, as this participant highlighted:

*It's always very expensive timewise, it's actually a lot of effort to do it because we're actually [too] small to have some of the HR specialists. When you run a small agency like this you tend to have to be over everything. It's exhausting work and so you think hard about it.
[Interview 7, Crisis]*

As agencies grow their workforce, it seems that staff are beginning to work in more specific roles, rather than stretching themselves across multiple roles. Some participants indicated that an increase in administrative staff was providing more time for senior managers to spend on strategic planning and exploring ideas for future service improvements, as this participant explained:

*With the expansion of the survivor service, for example, we've done a restructure. They've allowed me not to be doing the clinical work ... [name]'s stepped into the larger clinical role [and] I've accepted more the governance and accreditation, for example of compliance.
[Interview 29, MSSA]*

Agencies hope to recruit more diverse staff

Many participants hoped that recruiting additional staff with a range of characteristics across ethnicity, gender, and age, would create a more diverse workforce. This was expected to increase an agency's ability to understand and respond to the specific needs of service users, as described by this participant:

I think it's really just about having a number of staff from different cultural backgrounds and gender identification and so on, trying to diversify our staff as much as we can. That would be definitely one of the priorities. I don't mean to blow our trumpet, but I think as a service we see that what we are already doing is effective for the majority of people that we work with. In terms of service delivery, I don't see that that needs to change. It would be more, the ideal would be able to recruit staff from different backgrounds. [Interview 3, Crisis]

Agencies were especially keen to increase their responsiveness to Māori and Pacific peoples. In some parts of the country, agencies were aiming to be more responsive to other ethnic minority groups as well. Some agencies had already increased their cultural capability through staff recruitment. Other agencies were either planning to recruit or hire consultants, possibly on a case by case basis, as this participant suggested:

The cultural appropriateness and cultural safety of the service will be the other I think improved part of the service for client outcomes, definitely, and that's part of what I'm wanting to do in terms of recruitment ... when there's a need where there's a particular client of maybe Pacific ethnicity ... is then we would bring in the Pacific practitioner and then they would be able to manage that client or

provide that service specifically for that client. So being able to bring in a cultural service that way rather than having someone in the team full-time, we can kind of bring it in as the need is there. [Interview 12, Crisis]

Salaries are higher, but pay inequity remains a challenge

The ability to offer a competitive salary is important for encouraging skilled applicants. There was a common view across participants that historic under-funding of the sexual violence sector meant that many staff were being under-paid, particularly considering the specialist skills required for the work. This might explain why many participants, across all service types, felt that the Budget-19 investment should be used to offer higher salaries.

However, while this would be “a terrific step in the right direction”, several participants reported that they were still unable to compete with other sectors, as this participant explained:

We’re paying at a higher level but we’re still not the same as Government and we’re certainly not at the same level as private practice, with things such as ACC funding. It still hasn’t enabled us to really compete at the same level as those two other groups. [Interview 3, Crisis]

Several agencies suggested that the inability to offer the same salary levels as other sectors, not only discouraged new applicants, but also contributed to high staff turnover. This was because staff leave for higher paid roles when they become available, as this participant identified:

The social services, our sector, can never offer the same wages as government or statutory organisations, so we lose staff all the time to the move into Oranga Tamariki where they get more money [Interview 11, Crisis].

The pay gap was reported to be most pronounced between services delivered by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) compared to services delivered by government sector workers.

Agencies that have multiple contracts to provide different types of services, were additionally challenged by the variation in rates for pay. They welcomed the provision for higher salaries in the Ministry’s recent contracts but felt this had resulted in inequities between members of their staff. Participants described the realities of this situation in various ways. For example, one questioned: “how can we pay this job at \$35 an hour when we’re paying these other really important jobs at \$20 an hour because they’re only philanthropically funded?”. Another participant said:

So, again with an FTE model, the challenge a little bit is around the pay equity ... What about the 20 that we’ve got that are being paid this and could only be paid that because that’s all we could afford? Their contract doesn’t allow for it to be paid equitably yet the contracts are from the same government, but because you have an FTE model versus service deliverable model ... it still creates inequity amongst the rest of

the organisation because other contracts we don't receive funding at that same level yet it is still an MSD contract. [Interview 16, Crisis]

Workforce expansion is limited by the inability to recruit

There was a strong consensus across participants that money is not the only barrier to workforce expansion. It was frequently reported there were an extremely limited number of people with the appropriate specialist skills and training for the number of roles. One participant concluded:

It's not just about the money. The money needs to match the rest of the environment because when you're too far away from that goalpost people don't apply, but I actually don't think it's just the money. I don't think there's enough professionals out there that have the capacity to do the work. [Interview 20, Crisis]

For crisis agencies, it was also frequently reported that "there's not a lot of people who are actually qualified in trauma and particularly sexual violence trauma". This was frequently attributed to deficits in the training offered by the tertiary sector and professional bodies, which meant people completing social work and counselling courses were not 'fit' to work in the sexual violence sector. For example, participants reported that trauma was an optional module on counselling courses at some universities. Job applicants that were trauma-informed¹³, were still unlikely to have been trained to respond to trauma caused by sexual violence.

It was suggested that the Budget-19 investment may have exacerbated recruitment struggles, as it had resulted in numerous positions being advertised across the sector at the same time. Pfo Advisors suggested that the challenges associated with a limited pool of potential candidates were exacerbated by the preference of agencies to hire part-time rather than full-time positions. This could help to reduce the risk of burnout, but perhaps left fewer people in the pool.

The HSB agencies faced service-specific challenges in recruiting skilled staff, including: a lack of knowledge of the HSB sector and associated career options; the potential stigma of working with this group of people; and no HSB-specific training courses. For example, this participant said:

This workforce is probably the most challenging area. Working with adults who've engaged in harmful sexual behaviour is not the first career choice for many clinicians ... working in harmful sexual behaviour as a career option is kind of new and there's a lot of work to do in terms of promoting this as a really satisfying and enriching career choice, and we're not there yet. [Interview 28, HSB]

Another participant explained the additional challenge of finding staff with the 'right' personal characteristics:

A concern is finding the right people for the work that we do within the sexual violence area. Not all people want to work in that area and not all people have the personal characteristics and have done their own personal development to be able to work in the area. There's no

standard core training for harmful sexual behaviour training. ... Our number one concern is recruitment. [Interview 27, HSB]

Several Pfo Advisors suggested that the COVID-19 border restrictions and the expense of quarantine may have increased recruitment difficulties. This is because applicants for roles in the sexual violence sector are often from overseas. Several agencies suggested that recruitment difficulties may be more pronounced in rural areas where the population is smaller, as this participant highlighted:

We're a rural community so obviously there are challenges specific to rural communities in terms of getting people who have the expertise and experience. [Interview 9, Crisis]

Within the limited pool of qualified and/or experienced professionals, the number who can bring a Māori world view into their work with service users is even smaller, as stressed by this participant:

And I guess another big one in amongst all of this is trying to attract and ensure we have Māori staff and/or staff who can work in te reo Māori or the world of Māori and Māori world views ... but one of the challenges I think is that it's not always easy, there's not many, and it's not easy to find and attract Māori staff to work in the sexual assault field, and so while we are recruiting and we in every way possible encourage people with a Māori world view to apply, sometimes those are few and far between. [Interview 17, Crisis]

It was also difficult to recruit male staff, with one MSSA agency emphasising:

When we look at services like social work, counselling, they are 80-90% female still. I can't get a social work student next year because there just isn't a man doing the class ... and to find men to come and work here is very difficult for us. [Interview 30, MSSA]

As agencies feel that "the funding is there but the workforce isn't", some reported using part of the funding to take a proactive approach, or were considering doing so, by liaising with educational institutions. This participant, for example, explained:

So, this money, one of the things it enables us to do is to take a much more proactive approach to workforce. It means that we are going to recruit a team leader level kind of recruiter person who will be recruiter in terms of both immediate recruitment but also longer term ... so, we'll look after students on placements, we'll go into tertiary institutions, counselling and social work courses, to talk about the work that we do to get people interested early on. [Interview 12, Crisis]

It was, therefore, suggested by some Crisis Service agencies that part of the impact of the Budget-19 investment on the workforce may be long-term rather than immediate, as they attempt to put initiatives in place to mitigate recruitment struggles.

Agencies are investing in training and development

As a result of recruitment, agencies need to deliver more staff inductions. Several agencies reported that the Budget-19 investment had enabled them to introduce a more substantial induction. More staff had increased capacity within the team to do staff inductions, to provide initial support, and offer training, as this participant described:

We'll provide better inductions and holding for staff in the first six months ... Although we have a training and induction plan, it always kind of goes out of the door because you have to meet the demand of the work; we can't not provide service and so people get pulled off to do that ... then they get a really disjointed training program ... So, to have someone dedicated to recruiting people and then being able to train and induct them and look after that first two or three months will just be amazing. [Interview 12, Crisis]

Many agencies reported that increased funding would be used in the future to provide more substantial training programmes for staff. Investing in a larger workforce and more training for staff was expected to provide greater flexibility when staff are unwell, on annual leave, or need to travel off-site. It should be noted that some rural agencies felt that their staff would still struggle to attend training courses, which are typically located in urban centres. This incurs significant costs in terms of staff time and travel.

Whilst agencies gave attention to staff training and development prior to Budget-19, many reported that they had made it a greater focus, as this participant explained:

We've always allocated a percentage of our budget to professional development and because it's a percentage then that's obviously been able to increase as well, as our funding has increased. That enables staff to juggle professional development opportunities less, so they don't have to pick and choose as much. [Interview 3, Crisis]

Some participants also indicated that having a larger training budget meant they could provide in-house training. This allowed them to recruit new people with less knowledge and experience, and then upskill them. In-house training takes staff off the frontline but is increasingly necessary due to the lack of sexual violence trauma-informed training courses being offered elsewhere. In-house training also reduces dependence on external organisations, as this participant described:

In the past we've had to rely on organisations like [name] to offer that training and ... we come at the bottom of the list, so the core training [of] our clinicians often got overlooked, so having extra money to fund it ourselves was a huge step forward. [Interview 27, HSB]

For HSB agencies, professional development was a key focus. This meant keeping all staff up to date with the latest innovations and best practice in the design, development, and delivery of HSB support. They advised that the Budget-19 funding had supported investment in IT systems to monitor staff training, as well as freeing up time for staff to attend training:

We're looking at the moment at a human resources information system so we can match staff to clients, keep track of staff training and so on, so there's a real commitment to staff development, which is supported by having this additional funding. ... That funding allowing us to free up a bit of time and resource meant that we could focus on attending teletherapy workshops ... and review some of the literature and best practice ... if we were too stretched for staff and time due to not having that funding then we just wouldn't have been able to allocate that to that degree. [Interview 26, HSB]

Additionally, one of the HSB participants explained how they expected the offer of professional development to help with staff retention, which was a priority for many agencies due to recruitment difficulties:

I think in terms of retaining staff, because of the nature of the work, and we do work with a difficult population and a difficult topic. Having that training, often people are [then] confident to work in a room with the client. ... Sometimes we get good people and we can't hold them, they leave ... so it's for our benefit to invest into our staff so that we get the longevity. [Interview 27, HSB]

The workforce is becoming more culturally competent

Improving cultural competency was a key driving force behind plans for staff training and development, as this participant emphasised:

And we're looking at how we can improve the cultural responsiveness in what we do. I mean, all staff at the moment are doing 50 modules, which is a priority we have put in, so that's around Māori culture. [Interview 31, MSSA]

It must be noted that seeking to deliver a culturally responsive service, for example, to Māori service users, is not new, and many agencies reported good relationships with Kaupapa Māori agencies in their localities. Most participants, however, felt that the additional funding had allowed, or will allow, them to increase their focus.

Some participants reported beginning to explore "traditional Māori healing pathways". Several agencies also reported being able to implement a more formal process for cultural supervision, as this participant, who also spoke to learning te reo Māori, explained:

The staff also attend fortnightly cultural consultations ... where staff can bring cases to that group and basically develop their cultural competency. ... One week we have te reo Māori for all staff and then the next week we have cultural consults, so every week staff are getting that te reo Māori cultural input, and again the funding has helped us to be able to invest in that. [Interview 28, HSB]

Some agencies indicated that the funding meant they could now afford to take the whole team to attend external training, as this participant said:

Also, we will be able to undertake cultural training. Some trainings are quite expensive, but we will be able to do more training in-depth. So, we do put a lot of emphasis on professional development in training but sometimes with cultural [responsiveness] it's a whole team approach, so we need to be able to take the whole team somewhere ... it [the funding] certainly will allow us to do that. [Interview 10, Crisis]

Additionally, some Crisis agencies reported that the Budget-19 funding had given them more time to deliver cultural training to other agencies. They were able to do this because some had staff with a high level of cultural competence, for example:

Part of that is training even ethnic people to work well with different ethnic cultures because we've all had mainstream training. ... It [the funding] means that people have got a bit more time to come to training, a bit more eagerness to do the work. ... So hopefully there might be an increase in cultural responsiveness across the sectors, that's the goal, all organisations are culturally safe. [Interview 11, Crisis]

As a result of recruitment and initiatives like this, many agencies expected there would be an increase in cultural responsiveness across the sexual violence sector, facilitated by the additional funding from the Budget-19 investment.

Agencies are investing in staff wellbeing

Agencies emphasised the importance of managing staff wellbeing to reduce the emotional and psychological impacts of working with sexual violence trauma. Several participants explained that staff wellbeing is associated with retention, through improved job satisfaction and reduced risk of burnout. Staff wellbeing had always been a priority for most agencies, but the Budget-19 investment was resourcing it better, as this participant explained:

We want to build our staff wellness model. ... We want to be able to provide more within a wellness model, look at a good EAP [Employer Assistance Programme] system for staff, but that's quite expensive. We do it, but it's a bit ad-hoc at the moment, so we want to set up a robust and good system for staff. [Interview 2, Crisis]

Participants described plans to increase the amount of supervision, and to begin supervision that is more specific to individual needs, for example to help staff stay "culturally safe". One participant stated that they have already "upped all supervision" as a result of the additional funding. Another explained how the funding will allow them to provide immediate supervision and additional support if a worker has a difficult call-out:

It's making sure, that's an important fact too, that your staff are well cared for and putting correct processes in place for them so they don't, for example, that they're not expected to come back to work the next morning and they'd be able to access external supervision if they need more than their normal monthly one, they'd be able to go back again and again ... they're all the things that sort of funding has covered, it's given a lot of flexibility. [Interview 15, Crisis]

For MSSA agencies, supervision is especially important and approached from a slightly different perspective. This is because peer support staff work in the area of their own trauma. One agency was planning to create a role within their team to help address the challenges of recruiting people who can cope with the demands of peer support:

... a professional counsellor who could source new providers, source new peer support people coming through, so he's actually going to do that and manage that side ... bringing these people through, like even with our peer support workers, you have to be ready for this work; it's like, I'm a survivor myself and I'm not saying I've got it all together but ... but a lot of guys do struggle and it's pretty well known so we try and put a lot of things in place. [Interview 31, MSSA]

The participant went on to say that the person in this role would actively seek potential candidates and assess the resilience of applicants during recruitment.

Overall, agencies across the service types were grateful that they could either invest more time and resource into staff wellbeing as a result of the Budget-19 investment or continue their wellbeing practices with less financial pressure.

Job satisfaction and retention are likely to improve

In addition to the increased focus on wellbeing initiatives, participants reported that staff wellbeing and job satisfaction were improved by the bigger teams and job security. Many agencies reported that the bigger teams meant they were able to share the workload between staff to avoid stress and burnout. Crisis workers sometimes have to work through the night to ensure 24/7 support. Having a larger workforce means that other staff can cover their work on the following day, as this participant described:

It's also quite hard work to do, so often people hit the wall at three months because this work is such that you come to understand that the world is not the place you thought it was... in the city our staff are working with people who have just been raped every day, all day, and so it changes your ideas about what this world is. ... We provide good supervision already, but the shifts are so busy so another thing this allows us to do, which is going to help, that is to put in what we're calling a twilight shift. We have a day shift and a night shift, and then we're going to have a bridging shift over those... We'll actually have adequate staff to meet what the work is, so that's another move that this money allows us to improve the working circumstances. [Interview 12, Crisis]

It was reported that, historically, some staff members had been anxious about poor job security, which was a symptom of short-term and unstable funding of sexual violence agencies. The higher level of funding, as well as the longer-term contract, seemed to be reducing some of this anxiety, as this participant highlighted:

The clinical staff or the frontline crisis staff have always worried about the funding. ... Now that they can see that, you know, we have a Government that supports us, we have now multi-year funding, multi-year contracts anyway with MSD ... The satisfaction if you're looking at it from another angle is that they don't worry. They're doing their work,

which is upfront and full on and hideous a lot of the time, but they also used to ... carry the burden of the service being able to carry on.
[Interview 5, Crisis]

Finally, the Budget-19 funding was supporting wellbeing just by being there. Repeatedly, participants referred to the challenging nature of sexual violence support. The additional funding offered some acknowledgement, as this participant explained:

When we receive that money, it feels like it's being acknowledged, the work that we do, and the work that we do is beneficial, and it is wanting to be kept going. If you're not getting much, you kind of feel like nobody really understands or acknowledges the specialness of certain roles. [Interview 23, Crisis]

Most PfO Advisors also emphasised how under-valued the sexual violence sector had previously felt, and how the Budget-19 investment was demonstrating that the sector is valued.

Impact on organisational development

The participants were asked if they expected the Budget-19 funding to impact on organisational development, including such areas as real estate, client management systems (CMS), performance monitoring, governance and other business processes and systems.

Most agencies indicated that the funding enabled a focus on the development and improvement of organisational strategies and processes, as well as investment in assets and expansion. For many agencies the need to invest in organisational development was a direct result of their investment in the workforce and service expansion. The impact of staff recruitment and the subsequent increase in organisational size on organisational development, was summed up by this crisis participant:

...if you move from a small organisation to a medium-sized organisation, you need to have really robust performance frameworks, you need to look at your whole structure of you know, line management, you need to be able to deal with all sorts of human resource level situations. ... I guess there's the increased administration, when you increase your staffing levels you increase your overall HR administration. You increase your payroll, so your finance changes, your budgets change, your level of administrative support increases as well...on one level we can say look we're going to employ three new counsellors and three new social workers, but what comes with that is we're also going to employ a new coordinator, or a manager, or a practice leader or an accountant or an HR specialist. So, it has a bigger impact than just recruiting staff. [Interview 17, Crisis]

Some PFO Advisors were cautious that smaller agencies might need more guidance and support as they expanded and managed the change from being a small to a medium-sized organisation.

Agencies are investing in technology

Some agencies reported using COVID-19 grants to purchase technology to facilitate remote working. Others, however, said they had used the Budget-19 funding, or would use it in the future, to purchase IT hardware, such as mobile phones and laptops. A small number of agencies had also invested in motor vehicles, which had vastly improved the ability of staff to travel to reach service users. The investment by agencies in these assets had already resulted in greater workforce mobility and allowed for increased flexibility in service modality.

Many agencies also had been, or would be, using the Budget-19 funding to invest in their CMS. The HSB agencies were already using the funding to continue their development of an integrated CMS that will enable the three Tauwiwi agencies to securely share data. They reported that a common CMS for the service will enable benchmarking between agencies. It will also provide standardised client level data that will be a valuable resource for research and policy development for Aotearoa New Zealand.

The MSSA agencies, supported by the MSA national body, were, similarly, using the Budget-19 funding to continue their roll-out of a common CMS for the service. This will

replace their existing CMS, with the aim of providing improved data and analysis, for driving performance, as this participant described:

So, we'd hope that by the end of fiscal year '22 that everybody will be on the same [CMS] platform. And we're just starting to get reasonably good statistical data across the country for numbers of survivors and numbers of staff and those sorts of things and the level of services provided. [Interview 33, MSSA]

The Crisis Service did not have a common CMS, nor plans to introduce one. It was suggested by some participants that a common CMS for the Crisis Service would be of value to funded agencies and the Ministry. A common CMS would provide consistent data that can be more easily shared, as this participant indicated:

I was talking about this at a recent managers meeting, because everyone has different databases or no databases, okay it's like 2020, I mean really, you know...I think MSD wants to understand the picture better and they want consistent data, I think it's a minefield when people get all these reports back with all these completely different things on them. ... So, I'd really like TOAH-NNEST to work with MSD to eventually fund a useful database for them and for us. ... I think it would meet all of MSD's needs and it would solve a massive problem for us and then we would be able to get the right data to create consistent understanding of the problem over time. [Interview 4, Crisis]

In the absence of any support from the Ministry or TOAH-NNEST for a common CMS for the Crisis Service, several participants said they were using the Budget-19 funding to buy a new CMS for their own agency. TOAH-NNEST, or Te Ohaakii a Hine-National Network Ending Sexual Violence Together, is the national network of those providing specialist services for sexual violence prevention and intervention¹⁴. Most of the sexual violence support agencies funded by the Ministry are members.

The three HSB agencies were also planning to use Budget-19 to invest in an integrated HR information system to further strengthen information sharing and continuous improvement across the HSB sector.

Agencies want to invest in more and better premises

For many agencies, the Budget-19 funding had been, or will be used in the future, to rent or buy extra space in current locations, or expand into new locations. Agencies reported that this was driven by several things, including the increased demand for support; increased staff numbers; expansion into new types of support which required new types of spaces; and, importantly, to offer exclusive spaces that would make service users feel safer and more comfortable, as this participant described:

The funding ... has enabled us to find more suitable premises that are exclusively ours so when they [survivors] come in there won't be any non-survivors or other people, it'll be their space and we're call it their office, rather than our office. That could not have happened without the MSD funding. [Interview 32, MSSA]

A welcoming environment is important, especially for people affected by sexual violence, who may feel unsafe or anxious. This topic is discussed more in the section on 'impacts on service user experiences'.

Despite their aspirations, agencies reported challenges in acquiring larger and better premises. Firstly, some participants reported that the Budget-19 uplift did not fully reflect the overheads associated with renting suitable premises. Participants reported that other health agencies were funded better, for example, those funded through district health boards. This left some sexual violence agencies feeling less valued.

Secondly, even the three-year contracts were not long enough to secure some leases or mortgages, especially not at competitive rates. Thirdly, it was reported that some property owners were reluctant to lease to sexual violence organisations, due to stigma surrounding the sector.

New offices are will improve access to support

Several agencies reported opening satellite offices to reach service users right across their geographical service area. Several participants spoke about how difficult it can be for people affected by sexual violence to reach out for help. Therefore, it was important to make the process as easy as possible, and to find ways to sustain engagement. One participant, for example, emphasised the positive impact their new office will have for service users, by making the service more accessible:

Being able to provide an office that's much closer to them that they can easily access will absolutely encourage that engagement and encourage them getting to sessions ... It will make an absolutely huge difference for them. [Interview 12, Crisis]

In addition to satellite offices in existing locations, agencies reported expansion into new locations. For MSSA agencies, this type of expansion was especially strong. It was reported that the Budget-19 funding had helped to establish five new MSSA agencies across the country and supported the expansion of a few existing agencies into new areas.

There was some uncertainty, at this early stage, about how far the Budget-19 funding would stretch. They hoped the funding would stretch to meet the substantial costs associated with maintaining their new site, as one participant explained:

Now that's a big ask to set up three centres on the funding I've received ... when you look at the funding we're given, it looks good, but when you start breaking that into all of those areas, it's not a heck of a lot of money. [Interview 30, MSSA]

Overall, whether through reaching out into new locations or opening satellite offices in existing areas, participants felt that the Budget-19 investment had and would continue in the future improve the accessibility of services.

Agencies are being more strategic

As discussed earlier in the report, the Budget-19 funding has been used by many agencies to grow their frontline staff. To meet the needs of their larger workforce, agencies were also using some of the Budget-19 funding to recruit more back-office staff, including administrative, HR, finance, and other operational support staff. Alternatively, some agencies were outsourcing some of these back-office functions.

Recruiting specialist staff for back-office functions was not only providing benefits for staff; participants said it was improving service quality too:

It gave us the ability to have an operations manager who is able to drive that quality improvement, to make sure that we're on track and up-to-date with where we need to be, doing those network liaisons, looking for continuous improvement of service and support the team, which we didn't have before. [Interview 14, Crisis]

Participants noted that another advantage of a larger workforce was that it freed up time for managers and team leaders to strengthen and develop strategic agendas, policies, programmes, and organisational processes. This participant explained how the extra time had benefited them:

The other thing we're doing is reviewing our whole adult programme. So [team lead] is leading that. So, part of the benefit of the additional funding is that we can free up staff like [team lead] to focus on those more strategic initiatives. [Interview 26, HSB]

A key strategic focus for many agencies was being more culturally responsive. For example, last year, the MSA established *Kia Mārire*, a national strategy to ensure the MSSA Service is effective for Māori. The development of the strategy was funded through Budget-19, but via the allocation for the Kaupapa Māori Service, rather than the MSSA Service. This MSSA participant highlighted how the extra funding had enabled a focus on service effectiveness for Māori:

...this additional budget allows us to put a lot more resource, it allows us to fund the investment into making our services more effective for Māori. [Interview 33, MSSA]

Another major focus for MSSA agencies has been to ensure there is alignment across the service. Participants discussed how Budget-19 funding had been used to develop, review, and implement quality national policies, guidelines, and processes. The Ministry's requirement that MSSA agencies gain Level 2 Accreditation was another reason that Budget-19 funding had been invested in organisational strategies, policies, and processes, as this participant suggested:

Well clearly in the context of us going to Level 2 MSD Accreditation...the extra money was really helpful to support that process because it has taken a lot of effort by staff. [Interview 29, MSSA]

While the majority of participants expressed that longer contracts had enabled them to make longer-term plans, a few agencies were worried about the continuity of funding beyond their current three-year contract. Concerns about the sustainability of the funding had, in some cases, limited how agencies were planning to spend the Budget-19 funding. This risk-averse behaviour might limit the overall impacts.

The funding is supporting continued professionalisation

The Budget-19 funding is supporting the continued professionalisation of sexual violence support services. The investment in specialist staff, training, assets, strategies, and review processes were all contributing to this (see Case Study 1).

Case Study 1 – Continued professionalisation

The Budget-19 investment has provided MSSA agencies with both the time and funds to focus on the continued professionalisation of their organisations. Many MSSA agencies spoke of how the funding has enabled them to strengthen the capacity and capability of their services.

They are now able pay their volunteers, employ additional peer support workers and operational support staff, and engage with expert consultants. The funding has also contributed to the substantial work necessary to achieve Level 2 MSD Accreditation Standards.

In addition, the Budget-19 funding has also supported the national body, Male Survivors Aotearoa (MSA), in their work to ensure the delivery of professional, sustainable and credentialed services for male survivors across their member organisations.¹⁵ The Budget-19 funding has contributed to MSA's continued advocacy work. It has also enabled the MSA to develop staff education and training.

The funding has also supported MSA to oversee the rapid growth in MSSA services, provide member organisations with quality frameworks and develop *Kia Mārire*, a national strategy to provide a range of support services that are effective for Māori.

A few agencies were investing in governance. The funding had been, or would be, used for governance training. One participant highlighted the value of this training and how it would not have been possible without the Budget-19 funding:

*For example, two weekends ago, we actually had a Saturday where we got an outsider in and we did governance training for the whole day. We simply couldn't have done that without the MSD funding and so it looked at the difference between governance and operational and it's had some huge impacts already. Up until now our trustees really haven't had much in the way of understanding of governance.
[Interview 32, MSSA]*

The Budget-19 funding has also enabled quality assurance checks across the MSSA agencies to ensure compliance with policies. It has also been used by a small number of agencies to invest in items such as staff uniforms and business cards to ensure they can present professionally. A small number of agencies explained that investment in these “minor things” can greatly aid staff morale, which can have a positive impact on job satisfaction and staff retention. The impact of the funding on one agency’s ability to invest in their continued professionalisation is captured below:

We’ve just purchased a logo – we’ve never done that. We’ve never had the money. It’s important that people see us as professionals as well. Yes, we are still NGOs and we have the right to be just as professional as government organisations and have the proper work attire, systems, and all that. So that money has let us be able to do that. [Interview 23, Crisis]

Impact on service design

Participants were asked whether they thought the Budget-19 investment would impact on their service design or support model, which means the types of interventions offered, as well as the timing and duration of these interventions.

A small number of agencies felt that their service design was already well established and effective. The majority, however, reported that they were enhancing their service. Participants discussed using the Budget-19 investment to expand their activities to be more responsive to the wide-ranging needs of service users. Agencies were also exploring or planning to introduce new types of support.

Agencies can be more flexible and responsive

Evidence from previous studies indicate that wraparound service models are best practice for responding to victim-survivors of sexual violence¹⁶. Participants in the baseline survey, similarly, emphasised the value of wraparound support. A wraparound service involves providing a range of support types to ensure that all needs are met. This participant felt that increased wraparound support was beneficial to service user outcomes because practical support contributes to psychological wellbeing:

It actually deescalates your other needs. It makes a really tangible difference to someone's coping strategies and whether or not they are able to employ them themselves. If everything is going haywire then it's really hard to see the wood for the trees, so if you can deal with some of those basic things it just gives people a better shot. [Interview 20, Crisis]

Agencies said they were more able to provide responsive, wraparound support due to the uplift in funding, as well as the shift to an FTE-based contract, as this participant highlighted:

We are all things to all people some days and I'm grateful there's some money that again sometimes is flexible enough to just move in that direction, and we'll find ourselves doing some of the weirdest support work and are very grateful that it says 'support work' and that's when the nonprescriptive contract is really of benefit. [Interview 16, Crisis]

The ability to be flexible was especially important for some service users. For example, one participant recalled how the flexible funding had enabled them to meet the unique needs of an international tourist (see Case Study 2), concluding that:

I believe the organisation went above and beyond and partially having more robust funding helped with that ... and I'm not saying we wouldn't have done it if we didn't have the funding but having the funding made it easier. [Interview 9, Crisis]

The additional flexibility also meant that agencies could provide more timely support, as demonstrated by this quotation:

It is going to provide that little bit of extra flexibility so that we can turn around on a very small rotation. ... Particularly if it's at a point of crisis, because they're needing the support right here and now, it's no good saying 'oh well, we'll wait until next week because we'll look at the budget and see if we can afford it next week.' ... The Budget will allow us to have that flexibility to be able to do it, which I think is an absolutely great thing. [Interview 15, Crisis]

Agencies also reported working with service users for longer. While some crisis agencies had always delivered support for an unlimited duration, others reported that they had only recently been able to do this, due to the new funding arrangements:

The contract as it stands at the moment, we don't have any timeframes on clients, so I would say that the difference is just it allows us at the moment to support as long as is needed. ... It takes that pressure off, I guess. Don't get me wrong, we're busy and have a lot of clients through but it stops that 'ouch, have we seen enough of you? Do we need to move this one off to get another one on?' kind of pressure. [Interview 25, Crisis]

Case Study 2 – Meeting the needs of an international visitor

The Budget-19 investment, paired with the move to an FTE contracting model, had enabled many crisis agencies to consistently offer more or better-quality wraparound support to victim-survivors. The ability to readily and more routinely provide services that are “above and beyond” was detailed in a story shared by one participant in a Crisis Support agency.

The participant described how “having more robust funding” helped them respond to the needs of an international traveller who was sexually assaulted and robbed. The participant recounted how the extra funding had allowed them to assist the victim-survivor with such needs as hotel accommodation, food, and a mobile phone with credit to get in touch with family overseas. A member of staff accompanied the victim-survivor to the medical examination and kept in close contact with them over the weekend, helping to facilitate long-term support.

The participant highlighted that, while their agency always did all they could to support victim-survivors, the funding made it easier. The ability to readily offer this level and types of support to victim-survivors not only impacts positively on service users, as highlighted in this case; it can also provide staff with a sense of satisfaction in the work they do. The participant reflected “that was a really rewarding piece of work”.

Initiatives are being developed and refined

In addition to working more flexibly to accommodate individual needs, agencies were refining their interventions and implementing new initiatives. For example, all the HSB agencies reported plans to align their service with best practice. This involved using part of the Budget-19 investment to review the research. The duration of their contract with the Ministry had given them the confidence to invest in this large piece of work. This participant explained how the review was already enabling a wider range of programmes to be delivered, to meet the individual needs of service users:

It's putting the latest international evidence around the work because the field is changing, and it has changed significantly in the last ten years ... so we're reviewing that sort of scope of programmes that we're offering. ... That really gives us the scope to tailor a programme to the client's need based on their risk and need level. Now in the past we just didn't have that capability because we didn't have the level of funding that would allow us to do that and, of course, that's consistent with best practice. [Interview 28, HSB]

Several MSSA agencies discussed launching or expanding group activities, including running day trips and walks, and opening a "drop-in centre" for their service users to play games or watch TV. One agency had taken time to conduct some research with service users to see what new activities they would like. These MSSA agencies described the importance of providing a safe space, encouraging service users to leave their houses, facilitating socialisation, and the therapeutic benefits of spending time in nature.

Most participants reported increasing their community engagement and, in some cases, launching new promotional campaigns to raise awareness of sexual violence and reduce the stigma. This type of work lets people know what support is available and how to access it. Yet many agencies said they were unable to fund it previously, as this participant described:

As a direct result of the MSD funding, we'll be doing a marketing plan and rebranding, and get a suitable logo and wording, rewriting the brochures, which has been necessary for a long time but we didn't have the funding to do much about it. So, it's enabled a more comprehensive look at the marketing. [Interview 32, MSSA]

Many agencies also reported increasing their online presence, including advertising the service through social media, improving or creating a website and, in some cases, beginning to offer support through online messaging. One participant explained how this was helping them to reach a wider demographic of service users:

The vast majority of our clients self-refer... Some of that, you know, is really, really connected to our growing presence on social media, so we've been really growing our Instagram accounts, we're getting a lot of young people reaching out because of that ... we obviously need all the demographics so Instagram has been a really growing stream of engagement ... Facebook as well. [Interview 4, Crisis]

However, some agencies were concerned about their ability to manage any further increase in demand. They said they would not be investing in promotional activities because they were afraid of being unable to cope, and of failing service users.

As mentioned elsewhere, capacity and waitlists are a key challenge. Consequently, many participants were using the Budget-19 funding to adapt their support model to provide interim support to people on waitlists. For example, the Budget-19 funding had funded a new psycho-social support initiative, which was being delivered by the HSB agencies. This was being used to support people waiting to begin one of their clinical interventions.

The psycho-social support was described as “really significant” because it was helping to meet a range of additional support needs during the interim period. By addressing these additional needs, service users were expected to respond better to the HSB interventions when they became available. Crisis agencies were also providing interim support, while victim-survivors waited for other specialist services, such as mental health, alcohol, and drugs services. These services were also “under the pump”.

Several PfO Advisors emphasised that establishing something new can take more time and resource than expanding an existing initiative, and this difference needs to be recognised when considering the impact of the funding.

Post-crisis initiatives are plugging gaps in the system

Crisis agencies expressed concern that “unequal investment” in the system will put more pressure on existing bottlenecks. Increasing the capacity of the Crisis Service enables more people to enter the system. Most of these people will eventually need long-term recovery services, which are already in short supply. Agencies that also have contracts to deliver long-term support said they still struggled to progress service users because they were “inundated”. PfO Advisors also stated their concern about this. One participant powerfully referred to the under-funding of some parts of the system as unethical:

I think one of the big issues for us as an organisation is that the government has put way more money into Crisis Services which is fantastic and needed but they've completely neglected increased investment in long-term support and recovery, so our therapy services are woefully neglected. ... We're now telling lies because as we increase access at the front end, there's then nowhere for them to go for the rest of the journey. And so we're all there and present and great and then we let everybody down and that really is not okay because survivors don't expect us to let them down because we're the people who should understand their needs and should be there for them. ... That's just not ethical. [Interview 12, Crisis]

The long waitlists for ACC counselling presented emotional and practical challenges for sexual violence agencies. Many participants emphasised the importance of ‘continuity of care’. For this reason, many said they were unable to turn people away, or leave people on waitlists without support, because this would be “detrimental” to wellbeing. A few PfO Advisors agreed that gaps in support for people affected by sexual violence was likely to impact mental health. These gaps may even increase rates of self-harm and suicide. In any case, support gaps were likely to have a knock-on effect for mental health services.

Due to the importance placed on 'continuity of care', some Crisis participants thought it was problematic that victim-survivors had to move to an entirely new service to receive long-term counselling. For this reason, or to address the shortage of ACC counselling, some agencies reporting using the Budget-19 funding to provide 'post-crisis' support. Some were offering 'group programmes' for this purpose, and one agency described plans to upskill social workers to provide interim psychological support:

We have a real issue here due to ACC not having any available counsellors. ... They have between and four to six month waiting list ... so we're looking at upskilling and we're in the process of upskilling so that we are able to hold people who have been severely traumatised in a safe way whilst they're waiting for counselling. [Interview 18, Crisis]

For many agencies, their post-crisis support, simply, involved regular phone check-ins with people. This held service users in a "symptom management space", sometimes for years. This means agencies are working to prevent service users cycling back into crisis but recovery is not being progressed. Despite filling a crucial gap in provision, participants felt that this type of post-crisis support was not the most effective. Moreover, it took resources away from people in crisis, as this participant described:

... the thing is that the earlier stuff, the crisis stuff, becomes a much longer piece of work and a much more costly piece of work if you can't get your follow-on to happen in a reasonable timeframe, because you end up holding them in the crisis space for longer. [Interview 7, Crisis]

Many felt there was value in co-locating crisis support with long-term recovery. In fact, there was an appetite for co-locating more of the services for people affected by sexual violence because the different stages of recovery support should not be "sitting in silos". Victim-survivors "shouldn't have to go and see a whole different person" as they make their recovery journey. Doing so increased the risk of secondary victimisation. Many felt that allowing a single worker to make the whole journey with the victim-survivor – from Crisis, to Court Support, through to long-term recovery – is "what benefits survivors".

Contracting models limit what agencies can do

Agencies noted some limitations on how they could invest the Budget-19 funding, associated with their contract. There were also limitations on how far the funding could stretch. Pfo Advisors expected the 24/7 crisis response to benefit greatly from the uplift in funding. On the other hand, some Crisis agencies felt that their current contracts did not fully recognise the cost of providing a 24/7 crisis response. This point was well made by this participant, who highlighted that 24/7 responses were better resourced in the health sector:

When you factor in a service that needs to operate 365 days a year 24/7, it [the funding] doesn't actually cover the needs. If it was just Monday to Friday that would be fine but it's not. ... You look at the DHB, for example, they get an additional call out or on call fee on top of their salary. [Interview 22, Crisis]

Although a few participants mentioned that the FTE model has allowed them to work beyond frontline service delivery (in areas such as community engagement, which was previously unfunded), several participants stated that a greater amount of funding is needed to deliver effective prevention and education programmes. Some agencies aspired to “prevent reoccurrences of sexual violence in the community” through education. One participant, for example, reported:

There needs to be more of a prevention focus, so I'd like to see the budget extend or our funding extend to education and prevention.
[Interview 21, Crisis]

The MSSA contracts specify that the peer support service is for those who have disclosed experiencing sexual violence. Participants explained that many service users approach the MSSA service before feeling comfortable enough to disclose. Or they may not initially realise that what happened to them was sexual violence. In light of this, MSSA agencies called for increased flexibility in their contracts to enable them to support men better within the peer support funding. It was suggested that the service might be re-named as a ‘Male Trauma Service’, to improve access to support for male survivors.

The Budget-19 funding will not help the many crisis agencies struggling to respond to the increase in young people coming to them for help. Agencies without an Oranga Tamariki contract still felt unable to turn away a young person in crisis. This meant stretching their resources thinly. Agencies with contracts to work with children reported having long waitlists. This is another reason that agencies with adult-only contracts did not want to turn young people away. This participant, with both types of contract, described the challenges associated with high demand from children and young people.:

...the bigger portion of the work that we do in the crisis area is with the children and there's much less money for that part and so we sought to interweave those two things ... it's kind of artificial and frustrating that the division of the ages makes life complicated. We see anyone from zero to hero, basically of age that needs the service. ... We have waiting lists of six months not being unusual, which is terrible if you think about six months in the life of a child in particular, it's a very long time.
[Interview 7, Crisis]

Agencies with multiple contracts, across different age groups, expressed “frustration” at the complexity and administrative burden. Government requirements to separate their service users and staff into different funding streams was challenging. Many thought that “splitting” adults and children undermined whānau-centred outcomes. Participants also referred to a “stark difference between what’s on offer for adults compared to what’s on offer for children”. Some felt that the Crisis Support Service offer for children was poor. In particular, there was a gap identified in court support for under 18s.

Impact on service user experiences

Interviewees were asked whether they thought the Budget-19 investment would impact how service users experience support, including primary service users and their family and/or whānau. This could encompass the ability of service users to access and remain in the service for the duration of their support, cultural responsiveness, and factors that promote and undermine outcomes for service users.

Money for travel costs is improving access to support

Agencies across urban and rural regions identified the struggle for service users to attend appointments as a key barrier to initial and ongoing engagement. Many participants spoke of the strain that travel costs, such as the expense of fuel or reliance on public transport, can cause their service users. The time commitment was also raised as an issue, especially for service users who are unable to take time out from work or who do not want to approach their employer about their circumstances.

Many agencies across all service types and locations were using the Budget-19 funding to make their service easier and more affordable to access. For example, they were paying for taxis, issuing petrol vouchers, and purchasing bus tickets to reduce the financial burden of travel of attending sessions. Many participants reported covering travel costs for staff too. This enabled staff to provide home visits, which was especially valuable for people living in remote locations. Home visits were also expected to be able to increase, due to the increase in staff numbers, as this participant explained:

As we recruit more staff, we're able to get out to outlying areas a little easier. So that's been a bit of a challenge for us, but we kind of work in quite innovative ways so that we can still do that, so we do go out and see clients ... as we grow and as we get more staff onboard, being able to reach those outlying areas is kind of something that we should be able to do a lot easier. [Interview 17, Crisis]

Remote working was being facilitated by the purchase of new technology. Laptops and mobile phones were making it easier to work out of the office, as discussed earlier in the report. At the same time, technology was reducing the need for travel. Online platforms, like Zoom and MS Teams, were making it easier to hold virtual support sessions:

All our staff now have laptops and mobile phones, which proved to be really good during COVID, so we've been able to work remotely so clients don't have to come into our office as much. We can go to clients in remote locations in our region and support clients through video links and deliver tele-therapy and so on; it's a significant investment for us. [Interview 26, HSB]

Some agencies referred to the increase in remote and virtual working as an impact of the Budget-19 investment. Many others said that their new devices were paid for by the COVID-19 grants. It was also noted by several participants that, whilst some service users have benefited from virtual engagement, many others had advised that they preferred face-to-face support. For virtual sessions, there is also a reliance on network coverage, which is limited or non-existent in some parts of the country.

A few participants suggested that rural agencies face some unique challenges in regard to travel time and costs, and telephone or internet coverage (as well as additional recruitment challenges). It was recommended that funding bodies should be cognisant of these challenges when determining allocation models. Thus, it appears that the impacts of the Budget-19 may be slightly diminished for rural agencies or agencies with a particularly large geographical coverage.

Increasing cultural responsiveness is a key focus

Cultural responsiveness was another key area that agencies reported focusing on, with the goal of improving the experience of, and outcomes for, service users. A culturally inappropriate response can damage the relationship between an agency and service user and cause further harm to someone who is already in a vulnerable situation. Previous research has found, for example, that western models of practice can not only be ineffective for Pacific peoples but can contribute towards a traumatic experience of re-victimisation¹⁷.

As previously discussed, agencies reported employing or seeking more culturally diverse staff; investing in training to improve their knowledge of Māori, Pacific peoples, and ethnic minority cultures; implementing new culturally responsive strategies; and reviewing their current practices. A few agencies spoke to the impact having culturally diverse staff has had on helping service users feel at ease, as this participant recalled:

We've noticed the difference ... we got a young Māori walk-in the other day; as soon as he was introduced to [staff name removed] we could see, we both noticed he felt safer. [Interview 29, MSSA]

Another agency recounted a powerful story about a service user who had been very hesitant and was struggling with a lack of understanding from their whānau. Having a staff member who could meet their cultural and individual needs, enabled the initial barriers to be gradually broken down. Meeting their needs involved being able to speak their language and understand their cultural values (see Case Study 3). The agency described the positive impact this approach had on the service user's engagement and their view of the service:

By the end we couldn't stop him talking and he loved coming here, he was coming to all our groups, and he's been really hard. He was kind of like one of the most resistant people that I have worked with and he just opened up. [Interview 27, HSB]

The value of having a high level of cultural competency is clear and, for Māori, cultural appropriateness is a treaty obligation. Several participants felt that the Budget-19 investment will free up time to strengthen interagency relationships. These inter-agency relations can be a source of knowledge and expertise on how to deliver culturally competent support. This will be especially valuable for agencies struggling to recruit culturally diverse workforce, as previously mentioned.

Case Study 3 – More flexibility to be culturally responsive

The Budget-19 investment, including the funding for the new contracts for the CSI service and psycho-social support, has given HSB agencies freedom to engage with clients and their family and whānau in ways they have not been able to in the past. One story of client engagement, told by an HSB agency, illustrates how the funding had allowed for greater flexibility to provide treatment that was culturally responsive and occurred beyond the four walls of the organisation.

The client was reluctant to engage with a Tauwiwi agency at first, until a member of staff fluent in te reo Māori began working alongside the clinician. This helped the clinician to communicate and build trust with the client. After a period of initial treatment, both staff members also worked with the client's whānau. On many occasions, they travelled a long distance, to a fairly remote location, to meet with the client and their whānau. Staff took the time to help them understand the treatment being provided by the Tauwiwi organisation.

The ability of the agency to work with this client and his whānau in a culturally responsive way, to "bridge those gaps", resulted in a "good outcome for that client". The agency reflected upon how the extra funding had impacted the client's outcomes:

Really cool stuff that like can happen from a really resistant, negative, I don't want anything to do with you at all [client]. So that funding, those contracts, we can't speak highly enough for those. For those types of clients [there are] really beneficial outcomes and for their whānau as well. [Interview 27, HSB]

A welcoming environment can support engagement

A few agencies reported using some of the Budget-19 funding to make their premises more welcoming for service users. Welcoming premises are particularly important for sexual violence services because people may be feeling distressed and uncertain about visiting. The reception area was important because this might be a person's first contact with an agency and, likely, the start of their recovery journey. One agency discussed the impact that their new receptionist has had on making service users feel welcome:

This place in all of its years has never had a receptionist, yeah, so that's been one of the major shifts that we've made around that, people walking in the door and feeling welcomed ... people like it, people come in and they feel welcomed. Often, it's a really hard thing for them to do, walking in the door ... [name removed] is just a lovely person and she just talks away and they tell her their life story. She probably hears harder stories than what we do at times. She just chats away and makes people feel welcome and shows them where to make a cup of tea and does all of that stuff. So, actually, that's a real encouragement for people to keep coming back. [Interview 19, Crisis]

Other participants spoke about the influence of the physical environment. Providing a welcoming environment was one way to demonstrate to service users that they are valued. Conversely, furniture in need of repair, or a lack of adequate heating, can make service users feel that they are not worth investing in. Participants highlighted the importance of investing in therapeutic spaces to help people feel comfortable in their support environment:

It's important that we take them and start that journey with them, and that we start it off in a good space for them, yeah, in a way that they're going to feel comfortable and that they're important as well ... Like a homely nice space where you come in, where it's welcoming, where you can open up. [Interview 22, Crisis]

With the stigma surrounding sexual violence, disclosures can be difficult. Users of all the service types will require a high level of trust to disclose. It was suggested that when people "feel more cared for ... they are more willing to engage". A welcoming environment can also help people to relax, which was especially important at the start of a therapeutic relationship.

Increasing the support offer for family and whānau

Service users are not limited to the 'primary client'. The Ministry's contracts specify that agencies should also work with family, whānau or other members of a support network where appropriate. The contracts include this in recognition of the ripple effect. Whole families and whānau can be harmed when a single member is directly affected by sexual violence. Working with family and whānau is also unpinned by the understanding that people are more likely to heal with the support of their family and whānau, especially if they have been taught how to provide support.

Agencies were strongly in favour of supporting family and whānau. One participant referred to it as "a critical part of our work". Family and whānau support was seen to be valuable for several reasons. Firstly, it was explained that someone's family and whānau may wish to have a greater understanding of what their loved one is going through. Greater understanding will help them to support the person most directly affected.

Secondly, family and whānau may need emotional support themselves, as "they are quite often upset and sometimes traumatised". This type of support was less the norm because agencies did not think their contracts fully provided for this. Thirdly, a few participants felt that work with family and whānau can prevent further sexual violence, or at least the harm associated with sexual violence, which can be transmitted across generations. The importance and benefits of working with family and whānau were well-illustrated by this participant:

We work with people who maybe the survivor is not accessing the service and so how do they respond to that person they love? How do they show care? How can they support them to get the support they need? But also, can we recognise the additional impact and trauma that they have just by being part of the work ... [and] often the dysfunction occurs in that family system. We need to work with that family system because we are going to leave, so we can feel really good about what we did over three months but if we haven't done something differently

in that family system then we have continued the intergenerational problem of sexual violence destroying families [Interview 4, crisis].

Prior to the Budget-19 investment, however, support for family and whānau was referred to by some agencies as a luxury that they often struggled to afford, as this participant highlighted:

We're able to have the capacity that we have because of that funding and potentially we would have to prioritise our work if we didn't have that funding ... then it may be that we weren't able to continue that support with the wider whānau because there just wouldn't be capacity to do it. [Interview 6, Crisis]

With the additional funding, agencies said they would be extending existing support for family and whānau. Some agencies said they were also likely to be launching new initiatives. For example, one participant said that it is “a space that would be good to explore”. Another stated they “have lots of thoughts” on possible ways to involve family and whānau to a greater extent.

It seems, therefore, that by increasing work with family and whānau, the Budget-19 investment will improve the wellbeing and experience of victim-survivors. It will do so by helping build a strong support network for them. In the longer term, this may reduce their reliance on sexual violence services. Extending support to include family and whānau may also help to provide a more culturally responsive service for some people.

Family and whānau support requires specialist skills

Expanding support for family and whānau is not without its challenges. As described above, there are multiple ways to work with family and whānau and each requires that staff have relevant expertise. Staff may be required to provide psychological support, deliver education, navigate complex relationships, work with multiple age groups at the same time and, potentially, work alongside both victim-survivors and perpetrators.

Recruiting or developing staff to work effectively with family and whānau was a challenge for many agencies. One agency highlighted why it was a challenge for them. They suggested that counsellors and peer support workers may be more accustomed to working in a one-on-one setting. Therefore, facilitating group therapy or large group sessions may require new skills:

It's a different way of working, being able to have large, big meetings or the availability of everybody altogether, and a range of counsellors altogether for one whānau. It's a different way. It's not as clean cut. [Interview 2, Crisis]

Working with children requires specialist knowledge and skills, which do not necessarily exist within services specified for adults. Some agencies reported being “restrained by the contract”. For example, some agencies reported that they felt unable to hire a child therapist to work with younger family and whānau because their contract with the Ministry was to work primarily with adults.

Not only does family and whānau support require additional capacity and capability, but also appropriate real estate. Having access to spaces that can accommodate groups of people, including a comfortable waiting room, was important. This was barrier for many

agencies, who felt they needed to acquire more appropriate premises before being able to expand their work with family and whānau. That said, agencies were optimistic about progressing this work in the future. For example, one participant said that “it’s going to be huge once we find a bigger place”. Another said:

We’re working more towards working with whānau. One of the difficulties is actual space, but while we’re working out in the community a lot of the team are actually involving whānau and things like that, but physically here we can have so many but then we are a bit tight. [Interview 13, Crisis]

Due to the potential costs associated with recruitment and training of staff, and securing and furnishing real estate, increasing work with family and whānau may require a greater financial investment for some agencies. There was some uncertainty from a small number of agencies over how far the additional funding would stretch in terms of initiatives for family and/or whānau, and what they will be able to provide:

I’m not sure whether there’s going to be enough budget provision to enable that [whānau engagement] to happen ... It’s certainly one of the areas that there’s probably a need, but whether we’ve got the capacity to do that financially yet, I’m not sure. That will be a discussion that we’d have to have. [Interview 29, MSSA]

Agencies stressed the importance of a ‘client-centred approach’ and thus ensuring that work with family and whānau was agreed to or initiated by the ‘primary’ service user. It was noted that not all service users wanted their family and whānau to be involved. Some service users did not want their family and whānau to know about their experience of sexual violence.

Impact on inter-agency relationships

Participants were asked if they expected the Budget-19 funding to impact their relationships with other agencies, which might affect referral pathways and sharing resources, including business systems, information, and good practice. Overall, agencies felt that their relationships with other agencies were already well-established, but the funding was helping to strengthen them.

There is integration at the service level

The three Tauwi HSB agencies have been working together for the last 20 years as part of the 'Trinity Alliance Group'. They meet regularly together with government agencies that fund their work and share resources and practices to provide a, sort of, national service. As mentioned, they share an integrated CMS and are currently developing a shared HR system. The integration of these systems allows for client information to be shared effortlessly if someone moves from one place to another and allows for consistent outcomes and performance monitoring across the agencies. The three agencies also work closely to develop and review treatment programmes to ensure they all are delivering a consistent service across the country.

The MSSA agencies have also been collaborating as a national service. Their integration has been supported by their membership of the national body, MSA, which was established in 2015 and is also funded by the Ministry. MSA has developed national governance frameworks, policies, and protocols; a national qualifications framework for its peer-workers and a national case management system; and *Kia Mārire* – an effectiveness with Māori strategy. These things support inter-agency relations, in addition to regular meetings with other members and the MSA.

The Crisis Service comprises a larger number of agencies than the HSB and MSSA services. Also, whilst a number of Crisis agencies are members of TOAH-NNEST, the Crisis Service does not have a specific national body. Perhaps, unsurprisingly then, the Crisis Service does not seem to have the same level of integration as the HSB and MSSA services, at least, not nationally. However, inter-agency relationships were reported to be strong in several regions. At a local level, some Crisis agencies shared HR functions, offered training to other agencies, and had arrangements to refer people to other Crisis agencies when they were at capacity.

Funding is likely to strengthen relationships

Participants suggested that the impact of Budget-19 on inter-agency relationships would be limited where relationships were already strong, as this participant indicated:

I think if you already work that way you have those relationships still. I think if you put more money into things, if you already have systems in place then of course it's only going to assist that. We already had good networks and relationships in place. [Interview 13, Crisis]

However, participants noted that most relationships can be strengthened in some way. Thus, one way in which the funding has enabled agencies to strengthen their relationships has been by enabling them to practice better, or more frequent, manaakitanga, as this participant suggested:

[The relationships are] functional and we've recognised they could be better and that's why we've identified the top 10 agencies that we need to have strong relationships with but that's when I'm going to do one-on-one come in for morning tea, because we can afford to do it now. We can afford to buy them a sandwich. I couldn't in the past. There's so many of those little things. [Interview 31, MSSA provider]

Some PfO Advisors anticipated that the funding would improve relationships across the sector by reducing competition between agencies. This a view was supported by some agencies. On this basis, the PfO Advisors anticipated a more joined up sexual violence sector in the future. Agencies suggested that some of the main outcomes of better inter-agency relationships include improved client experience through more wraparound support, increased access to training, and increased sharing of knowledge and resources.

More staff and flexible funding are enabling networking

The Budget-19 funding was reported to be strengthening inter-agency relationships already. Participants said that more staff had bought them more time to participate in networks, working groups and steering groups. They had been able to meet and work more easily with other sexual and family violence support agencies, government agencies (including Corrections, Police, and local health services) and other local agencies (including schools and addiction services). As this participant stated:

So, I think that money enables me and other people from my team to actually have the space to network, connect and then actually contribute to different pieces of work. Whereas before, we definitely tried to do all of that stuff, but it was just really taxing. [Interview 4, Crisis]

A few agencies reported using the funding to employ staff specifically dedicated to managing inter-agency relationships or referrals. As these two agencies mentioned:

Due to the increased funding that we have received, we have chosen to appoint roles in different areas called a clinical crisis coordinator and the purpose of that coordinator is to coordinate services amongst our collaborative partners... meaning that they can then attend the interagency meetings, they can attend the local level agreement meetings with Police and medical staff etc. [Interview 17, Crisis]

I know we were able to hire a referral coordinator a few months ago and I believe it was about just [being] in a different financial position so that, being able to increase our workforce in that way, has been certainly helpful. [Interview 24, Crisis]

An MSSA agency had employed someone to work part-time at another agency. This enabled the MSSA agency to operate peer support groups from the other agency's premises, thereby increasing the reach of their service.

The increase in funding, and greater flexibility provided by the FTE contract funding model, also meant many more agencies were able to pay for staff to travel to meetings and participate in networks, as mentioned by this participant:

Whereas there may be once again we'll move up to support with travel and that where they may have to travel down to catch up with meetings and things like that in another area. So that you've got that interagency collaboration. [Interview 15, Crisis]

In particular, a handful of agencies said that the improved ability to travel had helped them to foster relationships with their local iwi, hapū and marae, or will do so in the future. One participant said that collaborating with the local marae was likely to improve access to specialist support for Māori and improve the cultural responsiveness of the support:

[It will make it possible for them to] provide services for clients on a marae if they're comfortable with that. If that's what they're wanting to do. [And it will help them to have] the cultural competency to be able to give the clients exactly what they want. [Interview 15, Crisis]

Stronger relationships provide better referral pathways

Participants reported that fostering relationships with other agencies had educated them on what other types of support might be available for service users. This was leading to increased referrals, as explained by this quotation below:

Thinking too on what you were saying about referral pathways, being able to send relevant staff to something like the [name of service type] conference last year which is an opportunity for us to share the work that we do amongst [type of agency] who tend to be quite a significant source of referrals [Interview 26, HSB]

In this way, better inter-agency relationships were also making it easier to coordinate wraparound support for service users:

... networking is so important because when you're working with clients if you think there's an agency that might be able to help them – if you know someone within that agency and know how that works it just makes it so much easier. We do a lot of going with people to other agencies as well (particularly for the first time they meet them, things like that) and we encourage that if a client is already working with an agency and they want to come and meet with our agency we encourage them to bring a support person with them if they want to. It's about agencies working together and knowing which piece of the pie they're dealing with and continuing to talk knowing that a person is getting the full support they can get. [Interview 18, Crisis]

Some agencies were concerned about the increase in referrals resulting from better inter-agency relationships, because this means greater demand. On the other hand, one agency said that because of their relationships, they have been able to work with other agencies to meet the various needs of their service users. Working together with agencies in different types of services meant they could get support to service users,

while they were on the waitlist for specialist sexual violence support. This participant suggested that some government agencies were supporting this type of arrangement:

The demand is very high, and we try and keep the waitlist to a minimum ... What it has caused us to do is really look at okay for the interim what can we provide or work about and provide interim support until we are geared up to take you ... there was a period where we would just say "no go away" so now we're able to [say] to hang on a minute - this is a cognitive shift as well for all of our staff but it's been promoted by government MSD, Oranga Tamariki, Corrections, Ministry of Health - take a collaborative approach and you may not be able to do anything right now but your client or your whānau may have all these other areas now, with housing, unemployment and health now that can be looked after in the interim. [Interview 27, HSB]

Training and knowledge-sharing are future priorities

Participants expected that improved inter-agency relationships could provide economies of scale. As discussed earlier in the report, most agencies want to invest in staff training. Some were thinking about opportunities to share training. This would make specialist staff training viable and mean they could share the cost of the training. Participants were also interested in accessing training from other agencies, particularly cultural training, to help their staff build knowledge and expertise needed to support ethnic minorities.

One MSSA agency said that in the future they would like to use the funding to do more "outreach work". This involved them providing training and education to community stakeholders on male survivors of sexual violence. In this way, the Budget-19 funding would be used to build on work they had previously started.

Some Crisis agencies wanted to establish a national network for the Crisis Service. They felt that this would support integration and standardisation across Crisis agencies. They were also interested in organising a national hui in the future. Participants thought that the network and the hui would provide opportunities to share good practice and, perhaps, agree on sector-wide standards. Agencies said they would use some of the Budget-19 funding to support these initiatives, but they would need help with coordination. They suggested that the Ministry might offer this help.

Some Crisis agencies also thought that information sharing could be supported by a single CMS. A single CMS would allow them to "create a consistent understanding" and "bigger picture" of sexual violence in Aotearoa New Zealand. Having a single CMS for the Crisis agencies would align them with other sexual violence services that already have this. As previously detailed in the report, the three Taiwi HSB agencies already had a single CMS and the MSSA Service was in the process of rolling-out an improved CMS.

Minimal impact on relationships with *Safe to talk*

Participants were specifically asked whether they expected to see any changes in their relationship with the national helpline, *Safe to talk - kōrero mai ka ora*. Most participants reported that they have no existing relationship with *Safe to talk* and that, because of this, the increase in funding was unlikely to impact in this area. This is evident in the two quotations below:

That's not impacted at all, no. [Interview 2, Crisis]

...in terms of relationship, nothing... As a provider in sexual violence, I think it's not a partnership at all. [Interview 13, Crisis]

Participants' views about *Safe to talk* seem to be influenced by perceptions of the role of the national helpline. Participants who expected the national helpline to provide 'warm referrals' were less positive about *Safe to talk*. A warm referral would involve *Safe to talk* directly transferring a caller through to a specialist sexual violence support agency.

Many agencies that thought the role of *Safe to talk* was to provide warm referrals had been involved in the Ministry's consultation when the national helpline was being set-up. From this consultation, they also expected that *Safe to talk* would foster and maintain a relationship with their agency. However, only a few of the agencies who participated in this baseline survey had ever received a warm referral from the national helpline. Moreover, few said they had any relationship with *Safe to talk*. Their disappointment about this was as illustrated in this quotation:

I have to say you know that's one of the areas of disappointment because when Safe to talk launched there was a lot of fanfare about kind of linking in with providers but actually it's never happened. We're virtually, apart from that initial consultation right at the start which was sort of pretty broad across the community, we've had no engagement with them at all and to my knowledge I'm not aware that any of our clients come directly from Safe to talk. [Interview 28, HSB]

Other agencies did not expect warm referrals or a direct relationship with *Safe to talk*. They thought the role of the national helpline was to complement their service and fill service gaps. Moreover, some participants thought that warm referrals were not always what callers wanted. For example, they noted that some people might not be ready to engage with (or be unable to access) face-to-face support, might want to remain anonymous while receiving support, or require support in addition to face-to-face support, as this participant described:

I think maybe since its inception we might have had one referral from Safe to talk, but I don't necessarily see that they're falling down in their responsibilities or anything like that. I think what has been found is that a large number of people who were calling or using that service, use it because they don't want to be engaged with a local service...The other thing is all those people that are accessing those services or that particular service might already be engaged, and they're using that service as an extra support...they're meeting a different need to what we're meeting. [Interview 3, Crisis]

Agencies that thought of *Safe to talk's* role in this way, spoke more highly of the national helpline, as this participant did:

We know how important they are. We value them. We respect them and we don't want to see them going anywhere. [Interview 27, HSB]

It appears that the role of *Safe to talk* may have changed from initial expectations, based on the preferences of service users. Participants from *Safe to talk* reinforced the view that often callers to the national helpline do not want a warm handover to a local agency. They explained that, despite expecting their role to primarily involve transferring callers through to support agencies, it is not what most people want:

We thought we'd be doing what we call warm transfer, like 'hold the line and I'll phone that organisation now for you and put you through.'
We've found that people are not so much wanting to do that. They'd rather take the number and then, in their own time, engage with that other service. [Interview 36, Safe to talk]

In any case, it seems like many agencies would like more of a relationship with *Safe to talk*. Some participants said they had previously reached out to *Safe to talk* to initiate a relationship but were unsuccessful in doing so. It seems that more can be done to support better perceptions of, and relationships with, the national helpline.

Most agencies refer to *Safe to talk*

Regardless of what they think about *Safe to talk*, it seems that most agencies do refer people to the national helpline. They referred people to *Safe to talk* when they were unavailable to offer support, for example during holidays or while service users were waiting to get an appointment with a face-to-face counsellor. Agencies also promoted *Safe to talk* on their websites and through other resources.

A large proportion of participants mentioned that their agencies were unable to provide services 24/7 or did not have 24/7 crisis lines. They noted that *Safe to talk* played an important role in filling that gap, as demonstrated by this participant:

We've still got their cards and we tell people in afterhours to contact them. We don't operate a 24/7 service. That's not what we're funded to do, but they are, but we have no contact with them. [Interview 14, Crisis]

One participant mentioned that callers were using their agency's own 24/7 crisis line to access types of support that are beyond the scope of the intended purposes of their agency's crisis line (e.g. long-term support through the helpline, people from other regions in the country). In light of this, and recognising the broader scope of support offered by *Safe to talk*, the agency mentioned that they were thinking of reviewing their own crisis helpline.

There is low confidence in *Safe to talk's* expertise

A few agencies expressed low confidence in *Safe to talk's* ability to support people who use the helpline, as said by this participant:

...to be honest with you I haven't heard one positive [piece of] feedback about it yet. People who have tried it don't want to use it again [they] are very resistant because they haven't found it helpful at all. [Interview 8, Crisis]

For MSSA agencies, there was a concern that *Safe to talk* was not well equipped to support male survivors, as this participant expressed:

*None. No confidence even I was trying to be diplomatic, I guess.
[Interview 34, MSSA]*

One MSSA agency said that most of *Safe to talk*'s phone counsellors were women and that this would be a barrier for most men seeking support. A few agencies reported that their service users could not get through to the national helpline when they needed to. One participant felt that *Safe to talk* had no knowledge about their agency and, consequently, felt that *Safe to talk* would therefore be unable to refer people to them:

I've spoken to a couple of the Helpline people on the phones, and I've said to them, because some of them have applied for jobs here. I say, 'What do you know about [agency]?' 'Nothing', and I think, you're working for Safe to talk and you don't know who we are? Incredible. I'm sorry, but I'm very - I'm not happy about that. [Interview 2, Crisis]

It should be noted that there were agencies who felt that *Safe to talk* "effectively" allowed callers to anonymously disclose their experiences and that the national helpline helped to prepare service users to engage with face-to-face services. Some participants reportedly received positive feedback from service users about *Safe to talk*, as demonstrated by the quotation below:

I guess I have heard back from a few clients and they seem quite happy with them. One had screens and screens of texts over a period of about 3 days and that was texting to and from Safe to talk. I don't think I've ever had anyone say to me they were awful, or I didn't like them or anything. [Interview 20, Crisis]

Impact on relationships with the Ministry

Participants were asked about the impact of the Budget-19 funding on their relationship with the Ministry. Most agencies said that they already had a good relationship with the Ministry and the funding had made them feel more supported. However, other things also affected their relationship with the Ministry, including how staff interact with them and the Ministry's ability to provide strategic support to address sector-wide challenges.

Most agencies have a good relationship with the Ministry

Participants were largely positive about their relationship with the Ministry. Some said their relationship with the Ministry was the best it had been, having improved over the last two-to-three years. Praise for the Ministry was sometimes glowing. For example, some said, "it's just bloody awesome" and "we are always best friends". A few agencies said they felt more positive towards the Ministry because of the additional Budget-19 investment, which made them feel valued and supported, as this participant suggested:

This [the funding] has given us a real sense of feeling supported and a real sense of feeling like we are going to be able to make something different happen and maybe, you know, that could be great. [Interview 4, Crisis]

At least one participant thought that the additional funding was bound to have an impact on their relationship with the Ministry, because more money meant more interactions and greater accountability. Other participants felt that the Budget-19 investment would make little difference to their relationship. They referred to other factors that were as important in affecting how they related to the Ministry.

How the Ministry responds in a time of crisis seems to be important. This is because when asked about their relationship with the Ministry, some participants immediately referred to its COVID-19 response. Participants felt that the Ministry's COVID-19 response was successful due to the rapid flow of funding and because their local contract manager kept in regular contact with them. Both made agencies feel supported.

Only a few participants reported having no relationship with the Ministry. This was the case for one participant who said their Head Office managed the relationship with the Ministry. Participants who spoke less positively about the Ministry, associated this with staff having poor local knowledge, teams within the Ministry working in silos, a lack of consultation and collaboration with them, and difficult and non-sensical reporting arrangements. These things will be discussed in more detail below.

Individuals build relationships on behalf of the Ministry

Participants described how their relationship with the Ministry relied heavily on their experiences with individual staff. This is the nature of relationships with organisations, which are mediated through people, as this participant highlighted:

Of course, we don't have a relationship with MSD. We have a relationship with a person in MSD... [and] what we have is very good relationships with the people. [Interview 30, MSSA]

The role of the Ministry's staff in developing relationships, likely explains why agencies felt that high staff turnover was a problem for them. They said that staff turnover was especially high in national office, which made it difficult for agencies to even begin a relationship with the Ministry. Participants described the negative implications when staff moved on without a good handover. For example, it could mean that progress with time-intensive work was lost:

We spent a lot of time with the people who aren't there now, unfortunately, and that's the big issue. I think there's too many new people all the time. ... and they spent a lot of time with us, to understand how we captured data etc. ... It just drives us bananas.
[Interview 12, Crisis]

Participants wanted to have good a relationship with Head Office because this promoted free and open discussion, and increased the likelihood that their agency would be understood. Agencies that had been able to build stronger relationships with staff at Head Office appreciated what staff had been able to do for them; for example, saying things like: "[s/he] has been with us all the way. I couldn't speak more highly of [her/him]". Other agencies offered blanket compliments for Head Office, such as:

The team in MSD Head Office have been fantastic, we wouldn't be here without them, quite frankly. [Interview 33, MSSA]

Most participants reported that their main relationship with the Ministry was through their local contract manager (PfO Advisor). While some staff turnover was reported for PfO Advisors, most agencies felt that their relative stability had helped them to feel connected to the Ministry, despite changes at Head Office.

Most participants spoke highly of their PfO Advisor. Unsurprisingly, then, many participants were apprehensive about the forthcoming changes. These changes involved the Ministry taking full responsibility for contract management. In some localities, this meant appointing new people to take over the PfO role. Concerns about this, prompted some participants to emphasise the qualities of their current PfO Advisor:

I just think that there are some really dedicated, smart, and open and compassionate people working in this space for the Ministry and they should treasure and retain those people. ... I don't know if you guys hear this enough. [Interview 4, Crisis]

Participants suggested that a good contract manager will "champion the cause for survivors". They explained that this meant working closely with the support agencies, who are the trauma-informed experts and, therefore, an important resource.

PfO Advisors, similarly, believed that relationships with the Ministry were strongest at the local level. Relationships were especially strong with agencies that were solely funded by the Ministry. Other agencies were managing relationships with multiple funders, including other Ministries and charities. Given the role of the local contract managers in building relationships, PfO Advisors noted how important it was for Head Office to keep them informed. Poor communication from Head Office reflects badly on them and the Ministry.

Agencies want to be consulted more

The relative stability of PfO Advisors was appreciated by participants because local knowledge is critical to the role and takes time to acquire. Local knowledge includes understanding the local geography, the arrangement of existing services, and inter-agency relationships. Agencies reported that a PfO Advisor with good local knowledge was better able to advocate for them. For example:

I think the one really good thing about our current contract manager is she knows the district. She knows the trends and the needs of the district. She knows all the agencies and she's able to go to Wellington and speak about the district. She's able to indicate our needs. So, I guess with the changes, we hope that the replacement, when we go back to MSD, we will have those same relationships... [But] it took almost 2 years for her to really understand. [Interview 12, Crisis]

Participants felt that it was just as important that staff at Head Office have good local knowledge. Commissioning without this knowledge has the potential to pit agencies against each other or left agencies figuring out how to work together, in spite of their contracts. For example, it was reported how the Ministry had previously arranged contracts that allocated suburbs arbitrarily to two agencies, preventing these agencies from working with their usual communities.

Participants suggested that the Ministry can build its local knowledge through meaningful engagement with agencies, as well as other local actors. Yet, the Ministry did not consult with them enough. It was reported that national office often made decisions without engaging the sector, nor informing the local contract managers. This made agencies feel undervalued and could cause confusion, as this participant highlighted:

There seems to be a disconnect between Wellington and the local office, and then between us as well. Because I might be on a forum and hear things from Wellington, and then I try and talk to the local person and they say 'Oh no, we haven't heard about that' or 'we don't' know about that', or whatever. Or sometimes decisions or thinking in Wellington is made before they actually talk to us, who are doing the doing, and so then that's again where we talk past each other, or we scramble to catch up. My dream would be that we have a tighter relationship and a valued relationship when I can say 'our'. [Interview 2, Crisis]

It was reported that a lack of, or limited, consultation by the Ministry sometimes meant that agencies missed out on contracts for which they have significant expertise. One participant described how this had happened with the Ministry's E Tu Whānau funding. E Tu Whānau is not a sexual violence service and, thus, outside the scope of this evaluation. However, feedback like this highlights that negative experiences with one part of the organisation can affect how the Ministry is perceived overall.

Conversely, some participants said that the Ministry did provide opportunities to voice their opinions. Participants within the MSSA service appreciated being involved in co-designing their current service guidelines. Participants were also pleased to be involved in the current research, which was enabling them to share their knowledge, views, and experiences with the Ministry.

Strategic support can add value to the funding

Much was said about the Ministry's contract reporting, which, in many cases, negatively impacted relationships with agencies. Participants felt that the Ministry's current reporting requirements were overly difficult, time-consuming, and non-sensical. This participant indicated that the reporting requirements were non-sensical because they focused on volumes (i.e. service outputs), even though the new contracting model focused on the number of staff in place (see p.11):

The contract reporting is painful ... It's a 'no volumes' contract that asks in multiple ways what volumes you're putting through. [Interview 9, Crisis]

Agencies use a range of databases, or client management systems, to collect and manage their client data. These databases also produce the contract reporting for the Ministry. Hence, any changes to reporting requirements will involve changes to these databases, which can be expensive when they involve software experts from overseas. It was suggested that the Ministry might support the sector by investing in a tailor-made database for all sexual violence agencies, which they can easily and inexpensively control themselves. Crisis agencies were more likely to suggest this because the HSB and MSSA agencies already have a common database for each of their services.

Some participants felt that the Ministry could add value to the Budget-19 funding by providing more strategic support for the sector. This required "greater strategic alignment", which possibly involved a shared plan between the Ministry and the sector. Other participants simply wanted the Ministry to be more transparent about their "direction and their requirements of the sector". Specifically, some participants wanted to better understand what the Ministry expected them to do with the Budget-19 funding, which they felt had not been explicitly communicated.

Strategic input might be directed towards specific sector-wide challenges. Participants suggested that the Ministry might contribute to a workforce development plan, given the issues with recruitment previously highlighted in the report. Certainly, implementing a workforce development plan requires the support of the Ministry because it would likely need the input of other Ministries, government agencies, professional bodies, and the tertiary sector, to ensure that trauma-informed staff are available for recruitment.

Participants also wanted the Ministry to help them connect to other agencies, so they can function together as a sector. Collaboration takes staff away from their day job, and this is why it often takes a back seat. Additionally, the Ministry might provide low interest loans for "long-term things" like organisational development. Alternatively, the Ministry might think about funding capability-building separately from service delivery within their contracts.

Part 3 – Overarching findings and next steps

Service-specific findings

The evaluation approach recognises the importance of the context surrounding the impact of the Budget-19 funding. Some of the sexual violence services are new, or relatively new. Others, like the Crisis Service, have been established for longer. This is part of the context. The services also have distinct goals and work in different ways. Capturing the unique experiences and priorities of the different service types is, therefore, critical for understanding how the impact of Budget-19; and for understanding what more can be done to strengthen services and the sector.

Crisis Service

Demand was a pressing issue across the different service types, but especially for Crisis agencies, due to the increase in demand from young people. This has been most challenging for agencies without an Oranga Tamariki contract, which offered flexibility.

The Crisis Service has also been stretched by a shortage of long-term provision. Agencies are unable to refer people on and so their workload includes in crisis and in 'post-crisis'. Some agencies were likely to use the Budget-19 funding to develop more and better post-crisis support.

Recruitment was a challenge for all services. The Crisis Service had invested most heavily in expanding the workforce to meet demand. However, agencies across the country were struggling to recruit staff with the right skills to offer trauma-informed support to people affected by sexual violence. This might limit the impact of Budget-19.

Crisis agencies are contracted to provide 24/7 support, 365 days a year, where possible. Even with the Budget-19 uplift in funding, some crisis agencies were struggling to provide 24/7 support because their contracts did not fully recognise the cost. Some agencies were referring people to *Safe to talk* when their support was unavailable.

Some participants wanted the Ministry to take a more active role in integrating and strengthening the Crisis Service. Some wanted the Ministry to invest in a common CMS, which could help Crisis agencies to share data and work together more strategically.

HSB Service

HSB and MSSA services faced particular recruitment challenges. Both these services worked more frequently with men, and needed male workers to be responsive. HSB participants believed that working with people with harmful sexual behaviour was particularly stigmatised, and not a well-known career option, especially for men.

Through Budget-19, HSB agencies received funding to deliver a new CSI service and psycho-social support. These additional support options were enabling HSB agencies to be more responsive to the needs of service users. These additional support options were also providing support to people on their waitlists for HSB clinical interventions.

HSB agencies have used the Budget-19 funding to continue the development of a common CMS, which will enable them to securely share data and to better monitor and improve the service. They also suggested the common CMS can be a valuable resource for national level research and policy development. HSB agencies were also planning to adopt a common HR system.

HSB participants were concerned that *Safe to talk* staff do not have the appropriate skill-set to support people who call about HSB or CSI.

MSSA Service

A defining feature of the MSSA Service is that support is typically provided by male peers, who have their own experience of sexual violence. Because of this, MSSA agencies have unique workforce considerations and priorities. These priorities were being supported by Budget-19 funding, which was being used to support staff wellbeing.

Similar to HSB agencies, some MSSA agencies said that it was difficult to recruit male staff. Working alongside the peer support workers, male social workers, counsellors, and coordinators could provide a more responsive service to their male service users.

Budget-19 funding has, and is being used, to expand the geographical coverage of the MSSA Service and to expand the range of support activities. MSSA participants were concerned about how far the funding could stretch. They hoped the funding would cover the cost of maintaining the expanded service.

Budget-19 funding had been used to further professionalise the service. For example, it was being used for organisational development, including accreditation. Budget-19 had also helped to fund a new CMS for the service. The national body, MSA, was critical to the integration of the service and had been a driving force for these developments.

Some MSSA agencies were not confident about *Safe to talk's* ability to support male survivors. They thought *Safe to talk* had few male staff and staff had limited training, if any, to work with male survivors. They did not think that Budget-19 would lead to improvements in this regard.

Over-arching findings

The previous sections have reported the thematic findings of the baseline survey. The survey involved interviews with 73 people, who were asked about their plans and/or expectations for the Budget-19 investment. This section synthesises the thematic findings, highlighting the main impacts, achieved and planned; factors that seem to be limiting the impacts; and views about what else the Ministry can do to strengthen the capability, capacity and integration of the sexual violence sector.

Timeframe for impacts

The Budget-19 funding is allocated over four years (financial years 2020-23). As this survey was being conducted, midway through F21, most agencies were already reporting impacts. The most immediate impact was on the workforce. Agencies had prioritised the recruitment of staff to increase their capacity. The FTE contracts require that a specific number of FTE are in place, but this was not the driving force for workforce expansion.

Some agencies said they had not yet been able to make planned changes because things like organisational development take years to achieve. Most agencies, at least, felt able to strategize and invest in longer-term activities due the financial security provided by the change from one-year contracts to multi-year contracts. Contracts are now either three or four-years in length.

Impacts, achieved and planned

More and improved access to support

The main impact of Budget-19, thus far, had been on the workforce. The funding had been used by most agencies to fund additional staff, and this was helping to support more people affected by sexual violence. The larger workforce had helped agencies to clear or reduce waitlists; and to reduce caseloads, allowing support workers to spend more time with service users, offering them longer and/or more support sessions.

Agencies had also increased, or had plans to increase, the capacity and geographical reach of their support by acquiring more buildings. Geographical coverage and access to support will also be improved by the use of funding to purchase laptops, mobile phones and travel costs for staff and service users.

Some agencies had received Budget-19 funding to establish new services and types of support, including court support, the CSI service and the psycho-social support component of the HSB service. These increased the capacity of the sector overall. The psycho-social support had been especially valuable for people on a HSB waitlist.

Increased capability is driving-up the quality of support

Increasing the workforce had enabled agencies to increase their capability, by freeing up team leads and managers to focus on strategy and forward planning. Agencies had also purchased additional expertise, such as trauma-informed consultants. This is likely to promote more informed and effective support for people affected by sexual violence.

Having a larger workforce provides greater flexibility, for example, when staff are sick, on annual leave, or attending training. Agencies suggest that this flexibility is critical for staff wellbeing and development. It can avoid burnout and improve retention.

The additional Budget-19 investment, combined with the move to an FTE contracting model for some services, seems to be driving up the quality of support. Smaller caseloads meant that support workers were able to spend more time with service users, to assess needs and provide timely, responsive, wraparound support.

Also associated with the additional and less restrictive funding, some agencies were expanding the range of their activities. MSSA agencies were now offering day trips, walks and new spaces for survivors, where they can play games and watch TV together. Crisis agencies were doing more community engagement and promotional activities. These activities are likely to increase knowledge about sexual violence and how to access support.

Better experiences and outcomes for service users

Cultural responsiveness was being improved. Agencies were training (more) staff on how to work with different ethnic groups; developing written support materials in different languages; and increasing the use of te reo and interpreters. Being more responsive to the cultural needs of service users can support a stronger relationship with the support worker, which, evidence shows, can promote better outcomes.

The Ministry's contracts require agencies to work with family and whānau where appropriate. The additional and less restrictive funding meant that more agencies were able to do this. Agencies were investing in premises and therapies better suited to family and whānau support. They were also working more flexibly to involve family members in other parts of the country. Participants felt that working with family and whānau widens the circle of support for people affected by sexual violence and can prevent inter-generational harm. However, agencies without a Oranga Tamariki contract were worried that staff did not have the skills to work with younger family and whānau.

Strengthened relationships and sector integration

The Budget-19 funding seems to be promoting better relationships with the Ministry because agencies feel more valued and supported.

Most agencies reported having well-established relationships with local agencies already, including with other sexual violence agencies; other types of services, such as police and health; and with iwi and marae. The Budget-19 funding was helping to strengthen these relationships by freeing up staff to network and covering travel costs to attend meetings.

Stronger inter-agency relationships were reported to be improving referral pathways for people affected by sexual violence because agencies had greater knowledge of what supports were available and how to negotiate access to them.

In the future, participants hoped to benefit in other ways from improved inter-agency relations, for example, by sharing staff training and good practice. Inter-agency activities, like this, can increase the capability of individual agencies and the sector.

Factors limiting the impacts of the funding

Workforce skills and training are the main limitations

The main limitation on the funding seems to be the inability of agencies to recruit staff with the appropriate skills and experience. Participants suggested that social work and counselling courses were not producing trauma-informed graduates. This meant that existing staff were being pulled away from the frontline to provide in-house training to new recruits. In-house staff training was also used by agencies to avoid the costs of travel to urban centres, which took people away from the office for longer.

The desire to work more holistically by increasing support for family and whānau was limited by workforce skills, as well as poor cohesion between government agencies. Supporting children within a family requires specific skills, which some agencies did not explicitly recruit for because the Ministry's contracts are focused on adult support.

The contracting model affects when and how funding can be spent

Budget-19 impacts may be limited by the length of the contracts used by the Ministry to allocate the funding. While the move from one- to three-year contracts had given most crisis agencies the confidence to forward-plan, a few reported that they were squirrelling away some of their funding to ensure their agency's survival beyond the next funding round. This risk-averse behaviour may limit short-term impacts.

Specific to the Crisis Service, agencies felt that the additional funding in their contracts did not acknowledge the full cost of providing a 24/7 service. If they used the funding for this, less would be available for other things, such as organisational development.

Agencies covering large rural areas are likely to face additional costs and challenges. The additional investment is being used to fund remote working and/or travel costs to connect people with support. This increases capacity but may limit capability building.

Ever-increasing demand may limit capability-building

Some agencies reported that COVID-19 increased demand, which was already high. It is unclear whether this was primarily due to an increase in harm or help-seeking. In any case, the additional demand may limit the impacts of Budget-19, because if agencies are 'fire-fighting', they are less able to invest in capacity or capability building.

The increase in promotional and community engagement activity is a positive impact of the funding, especially because it is likely to increase access to support. However, high demand presents its own challenges, especially when this demand is from young people. Agencies that do not have contracts to work with young people (with Oranga Tamariki), must decide whether to provide support anyway, or to refer onto agencies that may already have long waitlists, or may not seem appropriately designed for older teens.

Additional support for the sector

Some of the challenges facing the sector cannot be addressed with funding alone. Staff recruitment remains a challenge, which is now more pronounced because more agencies are trying to recruit more staff from a pool that is already too small. The pool can only be enlarged through strategic work with national and regional agencies to ensure that social work and counselling courses are fit for purpose, that enough places are available, and that people are incentivised to enrol and supported to completion.

The development of sector-wide systems also requires strategic support. Some agencies indicated that they wanted the Ministry to invest in a sector-wide database / client management system that can support the safe collection and sharing of data between agencies. This could also be used to meet the Ministry's own reporting requirements.

It was also suggested that the Ministry might promote sector integration by facilitating networking, shared opportunities for training and the sharing of good practice between agencies. The Ministry seems better-placed to integrate national agencies, such as the *Safe to talk* helpline, into the sector. It is unlikely that *Safe to talk* has the capacity to work meaningfully with every specialist sexual violence agency across Aotearoa.

Next Steps

The findings of the baseline survey will inform subsequent evaluation activities. The evaluation aims to understand the impact of the Ministry's Budget-19 investment on services and the sector, in building capacity and capability and promoting integration. As an exploratory evaluation, it also aims to understand how to support people affected by sexual violence. The evaluation will not focus explicitly on identifying 'best practice', but will maximise the value of the information gathering, by capturing effective ways of working from the perspective of agencies and service users.

The baseline findings highlight the impacts of the Budget-19 investment so far, and the likely impacts over the next few years. They also highlight some of the main challenges for services and the sector, and how the funding is addressing them. Thus, the later evaluation activities will be designed to track progress in these areas. Additionally, the baseline findings have identified where funding is not enough, and where other types of input may be needed. These findings will be presented to the Ministry and other government agencies in case they can contribute to the design and delivery of solutions.

Service-specific evaluations will ensure that research activities are aligned to service goals and are cognisant of when services were established and their current stage of development. Some of the later evaluation activities may be conducted by external consultants, who can provide additional capacity and expertise. The Ministry's research team will draw on the baseline findings to guide them. Finally, the Ministry's research team will synthesise all the findings from the service-specific evaluations, to provide over-arching conclusions about what has been achieved with the Budget-19 investment.

Notes

¹ The term 'victim-survivor' is used to refer to those who have experienced sexual violence. This term acknowledges that some who have experienced sexual violence will identify as a victim and others as a survivor; and it is possible to simultaneously feel like both. See: Slade, N. (2020) *Literature review on international best court support models for victim-survivors of sexual violence*. Ministry of Social Development. URL: <https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/literature-reviews/literature-review-on-international-best-court-support-models-for-victim-survivors-of-sexual-violence.pdf>

² Discussion of whānau and family within the report relies on participants' understanding of it. Typically, the term was used to mean immediate and extended family. For Māori, this may include their marae, hapū or iwi. The term can include people who may be family by blood or marriage. For some, it will include neighbours and close friends too.

³ As four of the 11 MSSA agencies are newly established, they were excluded from the baseline survey, however, it is anticipated that they will take part in the later stages of the evaluation.

⁴ Harmful sexual behaviour is a term used to describe an array of sexual behaviours that involve elements of force, coercion and/or power by one person over another for sexual gratification and control. This includes both non-contact behaviour (such as stalking, grooming and child sexual abuse material) and contact behaviour (including non-consensual sexual contact, physical/verbal sexual harassment, and child/adult sexual exploitation).

⁵ The Ministry funds three Tauwiwi agencies and one Kaupapa Māori agency to deliver non-mandated HSB services. Only the Tauwiwi agencies participated in the baseline survey to avoid over-burdening Kaupapa Māori the agencies that were already engaged in the Mātauranga Māori workstream.

⁶ Concerning sexual ideation is a term used by the Ministry to describe people who have harmful sexual behaviour thoughts or fantasies, but who have not yet acted upon them. Concerning sexual ideation involves ideating about sexual activities focused upon force, coercion or other forms of manipulation. It has been identified that individuals who have CSI may engage in counterproductive measures to manage their arousal/thinking and subsequently commit HSB.

⁷ Gale, N. K., Heath, G., Cameron, E., Rashid, S., & Redwood, S. (2013). Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 13(1), 1-8.

⁸ For more information about New Zealand's COVID-19 response see: <https://covid19.govt.nz/alert-system/history-of-the-covid-19-alert-system/#timeline-of-key-events>

⁹ For more information about the COVID-19 grants see: <https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/27-million-ngos-and-community-groups-continue-providing-essential-services>

¹⁰ For more information about the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care see: <https://www.abuseincare.org.nz/>

¹¹ For more information about the *Me Too* movement see: <https://metoomvmt.org/>

¹² Ministry of Women's Affairs. (2009). *Restoring Soul: Effective Interventions for Adult Victim/Survivors of Sexual Violence*. Url: https://women.govt.nz/sites/public_files/restoring-soul-pdf-1.pdf

¹³ The term 'trauma-informed' was used by agencies to emphasise a focus on 'what has happened', rather than 'what is wrong' with people who seek harm. Within this

definition, this involves understanding trauma in all its forms, including individual, family-based, and intergenerational and cultural. For further explanation see Lambie (2019). What has happened to you? Changing how we think about family violence and justice. Url:
https://www.corrections.govt.nz/resources/newsletters_and_brochures/journal/volume_7_issue_1_july_2019/what_has_happened_to_you_changing_how_we_think_about_family_violence_and_justice

¹⁴ For more information about TOAH-NNEST see: <https://toah-nnest.org.nz/>

¹⁵ All MSD-funded MSSA organisations are member organisations of MSA.

¹⁶ Slade, N. (2020) *Literature review on international best court support models for victim-survivors of sexual violence*. Ministry of Social Development. URL:
<https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/literature-reviews/literature-review-on-international-best-court-support-models-for-victim-survivors-of-sexual-violence.pdf>

¹⁷ TOAH-NNEST. (2009). *Tauiwi Responses to Sexual Violence: Mainstream Crisis Support and Recovery Services and Pacific Services*. Report to Ministry of Social Development.