

Improvement Analysis ChildFund New Zealand 2019-20 Report

Progress and challenges over the reporting period (A3)

As described in A2, ChildFund New Zealand has two programmes, the RoadMap and the IMPACT, with different indicators.

The set up of the IMPACT programme was developed as a pilot, as it was among the first programmes to be included in the New Zealand Government's new funding mechanism, which required a long-term plan across partner communities. How a MERL programme plan was developed using a youth survey is explained, which will enable to track the progress. The IMPACT programme ToC is shared in a diagram.

For the Road Map Programme, the first baseline reports from the Thrive surveys mentioned in A2 are yet to be performed. ChildFund New Zealand is working with partners to ensure the data collection process is not burdensome to communities and, to make it more sustainable and viable.

ChildFund New Zealand also tracks the activities that are implemented through the Road Map plans, and some examples of progress are shared.

The panel looks forward to learning how the different monitoring and evaluation plans have been implemented in practice, whether any challenges were encountered and how these were overcome. The MERL programme plan comes across as complex and comprehensive. The panel would like to know how it will be measured and the data collected, beyond the youth survey.

Stakeholders support your advocacy work and value changes achieved(F2)

The response reinforces the need for inclusion of all community members described in F1, and briefly outlines the 4 Ms for change Messaging, Material, Mass swelling of support and Mettle.



It, however, does not provide evidence that shows how stakeholders support ChildFund New Zealand's advocacy work. The panel would like to learn about that in the next report.

Pay scale, gender pay gap and top salaries (G2)

Remunerations are reviewed at least annually as part of the performance assessments carried out by the management. It is stated that the gender pay gap is not measured because the small size of the sample (14 permanent staff) won't produce a meaningful indicator. Salaries are confidential and the ratio between top and bottom salaries is not provided. It is stated that pathways for women to reach leadership positions are enabled.

The panel would encourage to share the ratio between lowest and highest salary as an exercise of transparency while keeping individual salaries confidential. ChildFund New Zealand might find it helpful to see [Terre des Hommes report \(pp. 23\)](#) as an example on how peers of similar size are approaching this question. Moreover, the panel would like to understand how staff salaries in countries where projects are implemented are set.

Complaints handling mechanisms and overview of external complaints (J3)

In J2, avenues available to raise complaints are listed, including the [dedicated page](#) which points to relevant policies the organisation has agreed to abide by.

Training that incorporates Code of Conduct, PSEA, and safeguarding procedures is undertaken by staff and Board members. A table showing complaints by category during the reporting period is provided. The grand total is 16 complaints, much lower than the previous year figure (195). Has any event or change been identified as the cause for the decrease in complaints?

The panel notes that staff and board are regularly trained on the organizational code of conduct, PSEA and safeguarding procedures. What has been the outcome of this training? The panel would like to understand what constitutes 'significant' external complaint and how many categories of complaints there are.



Given the work that ChildFund New Zealand does with vulnerable communities in complex and difficult geographies, the panel recommends to reflect in future reports whether not having received safeguarding complaints might be an indication of underreporting. The panel would like to learn how the safeguarding policies and mechanisms are promoted among people and communities ChildFund New Zealand works for and with, as well as whether it plans to make information more accessible, beyond the policy documents, on how the complaints mechanism works (protection for victims, confidentiality of the process, presumption of innocence, etc.) [SOSCVI latest report \(pp. 30\)](#) might provide some practical examples on what the panel recommendations refer to.

Complaints handling mechanisms and overview of internal complaints (J4)

The Harassment Policy and Bullying Policy was reviewed. The Bullying Policy ([here](#) in pp. 78) outlines informal and formal procedures to report. There were no harassment or bullying complaints.

The panel notes that no harassment and bullying complaints were received during the reporting period. What about other types of complaints? What opportunities do staff have to raise concerns which may not always warrant the formality of a complaints procedure? How are these handled and resolved?