



**Parkland County**  
**Family and Community Services Program Review**  
**Findings Report**

**Prepared By:**

**Moorhouse & Associates Consulting Inc.**

**March, 2015**

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	3
Municipality Interviews .....	4
Interview Data Summary .....	5
Partner Municipality Interview Summary .....	8
Municipal Partner Interview Findings .....	11
Document Reviews .....	19
Appendix .....	30
Key Areas of Inquiry .....	31
FCSS 2012 Annual Report Summary .....	31
County of Rocky View Sample Funding Agreement .....	33
Parkland County FCSS Program Description and Outline....	38

## **Parkland County Family and Community Services Review**

### **Findings report – Final Draft**

#### **Introduction**

Parkland County has participated in the Family and Community Support Services (FCSS) Program, with the Province of Alberta since 2002. The FCSS Act and Conditional Funding Regulation provide for a variety of operating models depending on the structure, needs and capacities of the respective municipalities in the province. The County operates a funding model that involves receiving the annual available funding from the province, adding the municipal matching share (20%) and allocating a portion of the combined funding amount to adjacent municipalities to support their FCSS programs and services. In response, the partner municipalities accept County residents into the FCSS programs and services that they offer throughout the operating year. The County also reserves a portion of their FCSS funding to allocate to county based service agencies and to support some direct program support.

This model has worked satisfactorily for a number of years. Recently the County has undertaken a number of development processes including a comprehensive region wide FCSS Review (2010), developing the Collaborative Action Group (CAG) to improve regional engagement, instituting quantitative reporting processes and conducting a program survey (2013) with a sample of county residents. A recent strategic planning process has resulted in a new Strategic Priorities Plan (2014 – 2018) for the County. As a result of these processes and the current political and administrative climate in the county, it has been determined that a review of the current FCSS Program operating model is required. The review will help to determine if the current practice, in terms of FCSS service provision, is the most effective means of providing programs and services to county residents.

A component of the process is a comprehensive review of existing, relevant data and documentation and interviews with partner municipalities and other municipalities with similar FCSS Programs. This will begin to build the information and resources necessary to provide an accurate analysis of the current practice, identify potential changes or adjustments to the Parkland County FCSS Program as well as build the basis on which to identify potential options and recommendations for moving forward.

The following Findings Report is a summary of the document review and interviews undertaken as part of the overall FCSS Review process.

## Municipality Interviews

In person interviews and follow-up conversations were held with all municipalities that partner with Parkland County in the delivery of FCSS programs and services to county residents. The municipalities included:

- The City of Spruce Grove;
- The Town of Stony Plain;
- The Town of Drayton Valley;
- Leduc County;
- Yellowhead County; and
- The Village of Wabamun.

Interviews (telephone) were also held with municipalities that had some similarities with Parkland County with respect to the operation of FCSS programs and services. These municipalities included:

- County of Rocky View;
- M.D. of Willow Creek;
- Mountain View County;
- County of Grande Prairie; and
- Municipal District of Northern Lights.

The following notes are a summary of the responses, comments and thoughts, in key common areas covered during the interview and discussions. Summary findings, related to the areas under consideration of this review, follow the notes. An outline of the key areas of investigation / discussion is included as attachment 1.0.

## Interview / Discussion Data Summary

Area	Provides Access	Provides Programs	FCSS Board	Acknowledgement	Areas of Focus	Comments
<p>Spruce Grove \$181.0</p> <p>Funding goes into general FCSS budget and a specific program (Parkland Village) budget</p>	<p>Access to all Spruce Grove FCSS Programs and Services</p> <p>View the contract with Parkland County essentially as an access agreement</p>	<p>Parkland Village – Youth Group</p>	<p>No FCSS Board</p>	<p>Budget to Council shows “transfers from other governments” includes provincial and PC dollars</p>		
<p>Stony Plain \$145.0</p> <p>Budget goes into the general FCSS budget</p>	<p>Access to all Stony Plain FCSS programs and services</p> <p>Funding is essentially for access to all FCSS programs and services</p>	<p>Seniors Home Support</p> <p>Muir lake school</p> <p>Programs in PC</p>	<p>Director reports to FCSS Management Board</p> <p>Board members are Council appointees – bylaws have been changed to include up to two County members</p>	<p>Budget detail to the Board and specific Parkland County budget lines to Council</p>		
<p>Drayton Valley \$35.0</p>		<p>Programs to Seba Beach, Tomahawk and Wabamun</p> <p>Seba Beach is outside the service agreement area but is using services</p> <p>Seniors subsidies for facility use</p>	<p>FCSS Program has a Board, no provision for County representatives on the Board. Would be a bylaw change as members are appointed by Council</p>	<p>FCSS budget to Council acknowledges the contribution from Parkland County</p>	<p>Seniors, homelessness, after school care, younger families moving in due to lower housing costs</p>	
<p>Leduc County \$87.0</p>		<p>Programming to Graminia. Programs and services developed for Leduc County provided in Graminia as well if needed.</p>	<p>FCSS Advisory Board made up of Council representatives</p>	<p>Good recognition of Parkland County in budget process and as a Program Partner</p>	<p>Seniors services, family and youth support, prevention and community support</p> <p>Also run Parent Link, FASD Network and</p>	

Area	Provides Access	Provides Programs	FCSS Board	Acknowledgement	Areas of Focus	Comments
		<p>Staff position jointly funded by Leduc County and Parkland County to work in Devon and Graminia</p> <p>If Parkland County residents wanted to attend programs and services in Leduc County that would be ok but do not see the funding as “access” funding</p>			Homelessness	
Village of Wabamun (no Parkland County dollars)	<p>Parkland County residents can access all programs and services offered</p> <p>The Village feels they can be a “program center” for the County</p>		<p>Have an FCSS Board, one Council representative and up to 6 Members at Large from the community</p> <p>Positions are Council appointments</p>	Village has had governance to governance meetings with Parkland County (broad issues)	<p>20 service groups in the Village</p> <p>Strong seniors group (need a snow angle program)</p> <p>Volunteer development</p> <p>Seniors housing</p> <p>Community engagement</p> <p>Babysitting, Family Day, Kids can catch, school/parenting, developing a youth club, youth engagement</p>	
Yellowhead County \$55, 919	Access to Yellowhead County programs and services	<p>Programing to Entwistle and Fallis</p> <p>Job Search</p> <p>Home Support</p>	Has an FCSS Advisory Board appointed by Council. Members have to be County residents	Parkland County funding is identified in the FCSS budget to the Advisory Board and to County Council	Seniors	

Area	Provides Access	Provides Programs	FCSS Board	Acknowledgement	Areas of Focus	Comments
		Entwistle school i.e. "Be Cool"				

## Partner Municipality Interview Summary Notes

### Relationship

- The perception is that the County is increasingly open to engagement as program partners rather than just “funders”\*;
- There are good working relationships County staff;
- Previous dynamics of Parkland County was that they were in more of a funder\* relationship. This has and is changing to more of a program partner relationship. Still need to do some work on building Parkland County credibility with partners, stakeholders and councils;
- Partners are open to and interested in making a presentation to the County Council if it would be useful to do so;
- Communication and program engagement with Parkland County continues to improve;
- Believe the partnership is valuable; and
- Good engagement and support is being provided in terms of program and service development.

*\*note: see funding model chart page 12*

### Collaborative Action Group (CAG)

- CAG has been helpful in developing a consistent way that partners are reporting back to Parkland County and has also been helpful in getting information on programs and services from partner municipalities (information sharing) out to Parkland County residents;
- Information sharing is useful to a degree in informing each other what is being done;
- Discussions at CAG have been useful in sharing information on programs and services;
- Initially thought that CAG might encourage more collaborative programming in the county;
- Through CAG we have gotten to know county staff and building our working relationship;
- CAG is a useful forum for collective work on communications strategies;
- Not really effective for municipalities the value is more to Parkland County;
- Not clear on the relationship between CAG and the Inter-municipal Collaboration Committee;
- Some program work does occur at the CAG meetings. Parkland County wants decision makers there however more focussed on information sharing than decision making. Would be useful to work on identifying the needs of the community and how to meet them;
- Determine what business needs to happen at a particular meeting and then who it is that needs to attend, municipalities to get the “right person” to the table based on the meeting agenda / requirements;
- Aware of CAG but do not participate (Wabamun);
- Some competition within the group as they are also trying to make their case for funding from the County; and
- Need to focus more on program information and options.



## **Program Planning**

- Informal program planning only, do not have a formal process or mechanism to identify program or service needs collectively or develop programs and services;
- If Parkland County has program or service development needs they need to identify those so that we can work together on them, They (the County) are in the best position to identify what county residents need;
- Parkland County needs to be clear on what they want (need) and bring that to the table so we can work on it collectively;
- Parkland County does not micro manage contracts or overly prescribe program details;
- Municipalities are interested in contributing to program and service development and implementation rather than just information sharing;
- Believe that the intent of “this process” was to have Parkland County determine their needs, identify desired program options with partners and provide funding for any additional program and service requirements;
- A “regional” program planning process would create engagement leading up to program development and during implementation; and
- Suggestion for initial regional program planning could be to focus on youth engagement.

## **Communication**

- Average resident do not know about the arrangement between Parkland County and the municipalities and the access it provides, they may believe that the partner municipalities are fully funding the programs and services;
- The “Connector” is a good vehicle for residents to get information. County staff distributes the information to some community halls;
- Need to find ways to inform residents better of the programs and services that are available to them and increase participation by county residents as a result;
- Parkland County has helped to inform other areas in the county of opportunities in the municipality;
- Work could be done on how to get more information to other areas of the county i.e. Duffield and Entwistle;
- There is a need for an overall communication strategy;
- County website not easy to navigate and either does not contain FCSS program information or it is hard to find and have to go to other municipalities web sites to find it; and
- The Green Book is a useful communication tool.

## **Sierra Study**

- Sense that the study had “no traction” as a basis for change;
- Surveys were random, “urban”, surveyed residents who had little understanding of what FCSS was and did;

- Main focus was on reporting processes to Parkland County;
- Not useful to municipality, did help Parkland County identify some demographic information and some resident needs;
- Aware of but have not found it useful;
- Process was uncomfortable, clinical, did not understand FCSS;
- CAG was a useful recommendation and action;
- Took the approach of “proving to them” (Sierra) that you had Parkland County residents attending programs and services as a basis for continued funding; and
- Postal codes not useful as residents can get their mail anywhere including Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Edson, etc.

### **Annual Reporting**

- Tracking Parkland County residents:
  - Hard to track individual residents especially in non-registered programs,
  - Not clear if it is one person to multiple activities or one person to one event,
  - Agreement stipulates no distinction and yet are asking to identify which are county residents;
- Parkland County residents are included in individual program evaluation processes (program feedback by participants). Not sure if the County sees or uses those reports;
- There is a collective need to be clear on definitions and communicate those so information and results are standardized i.e. what is an “encounter”, also define and communicate what data is to be used for so that we can collect better;
- Focus is not on program and service outcomes but rather quantitative measures and indicators;
- Process needs to be cleaned up, standardized and communicated;
- Includes all programs and services that we provide not just those that are reasonably accessible to Parkland County residents so the participation numbers appear lower than they are;
- Identify what is the core decision making information required and how best to get it; and
- Very quantitative, does not measure outcomes or provide information on the experiences and benefits to residents of the programs and services.

### **Administrative and Political Partnership Support**

- Municipalities (councils or Boards) are not questioning supporting attendance of Parkland County residents in FCSS programs and services. There is a good level of comfort from boards and with councils to provide programs and services to residents of the County;
- Good support for inclusion of PC residents as long as funding is there. As costs increase and no new funding is available questions may again be raised as to whether or not “we” are subsidizing county residents to attend FCSS programs and services;
- Very supportive of other people in the county participating in local programs and services; and
- Funding and access arrangements well understood by boards and councils.

### **Implications of reducing or eliminating funding**

- Impact on “in county” programming i.e. Parkland Village;
- Where people live (municipality or county) would become an eligibility factor as it would eliminate the free access for county residents;
- Funding reduction would result in program and service cuts (in the municipality) and/or asking Council for more funding;
- Could not provide services if there was no funding from the County;
- Staff time would be reassigned to programs and services in the municipality only, i.e. no outreach into Parkland County; and
- Would likely still accept county residents but would not go into Parkland County areas with programs and services.

### **Needed Areas of Focus**

- Need a focus on transportation issues so that county residents have greater access to the available programs and services;
- Parkland County and partners need solid information to determine if there are potential improvements to the program and service partnership or if it is best the way it is now;
- Suggest that Parkland County needs a social development plan, rather than municipalities trying to guess what is needed the County could identify what resident needs are and what programs and services might best align with the goals and desired outcomes of the County; and
- Funding levels are an issue within FCSS (i.e. dollars from province) and, as a result, with respect to the dollars from Parkland County to the partner municipalities.

## **Municipal Partner Interview Findings**

### **Relationship**

There is an increasingly positive working relationship at the administrative level between Parkland County and its FCSS Program partners. There currently appears to be little to no political governance relationship between Parkland County and the partner FCSS municipalities to acknowledge the partnership, promote understanding and identify significant common region wide social concerns.

There has been a significant evolution and change in the relationship between Parkland County and the partner municipalities over the past number of years. The operating relationship has changed by intent and through environment changes (i.e. personnel, political factors, program needs) from a pure contractual funder relationship with very little program partnership engagement to contractual funder and program partner with some fee for service relationships. Parkland County appears to be in the middle of a transition in the model of FCSS delivery within the County. Parkland County has not developed or articulate its need and rationale for change and is not necessarily actively directing the change process with the municipal program partners. Therefore, there is some confusion as to roles and

relationships and program and service processes and expectations. The intent (not articulated) appears to be to continue to move toward a model where Parkland County delivers its FCSS Program as a program partner through a variety of means including access contracts, fee for services, joint programming etc., and to develop Parkland County FCSS on a regional (geographic not governance basis). The chart below illustrates the various relationship and allocation models in use by Parkland County.

### Parkland County FCSS Allocation models

Funding types	Direct	Partnership	Funder	Flow Through	Fee for Service
	Programs and services developed, delivered and monitored by Parkland County	Identification of common needs and desired outcomes. Partners bring dollars and resources to plan, implement and monitor programs and services	Dollars provided to existing organizations to assist in undertaking their programming based on their capacity to address community needs. Organizations monitor and report.	Dollars provided to other organizations with similar mandates and under matching regulations (legislation). No direction as to specific areas of need to be addressed or outcomes to be achieved other than those under the legislation	Dollars allocated under contract to agencies to provide specific programs and services and achieve specific outcomes as identified by the funder
<i>Advantages</i>	<p>Direct assessment of needs and community capacity</p> <p>Development and implementation of programs and services .Direct knowledge of results</p> <p>Direct decision making</p>	<p>Collaborative assessments of needs and options</p> <p>All partners bring resources to the table (dollar, human and/or in kind)</p> <p>Potentially lower overhead or shared overheads and ability to leverage dollars</p> <p>Increased program and service catchment areas</p>	<p>No program or service infrastructure required</p> <p>Use of external expertise and experience</p> <p>Builds and supports community capacity</p>	<p>No program or service infrastructure required</p> <p>Organizations under similar mandate, policy and regulatory conditions</p> <p>Potential leveraging of infrastructure, expertise and experience and dollars</p>	<p>Dollars invested are for specific programs and service with specific results and outcomes identified</p> <p>Costs for program results are clear</p> <p>No program development or delivery infrastructure required</p>
<i>Limitations</i>	Highest overhead costs, no leveraging of dollar and resource opportunities	<p>Need for partnership and engagement processes</p> <p>Potential for</p>	Decreased direct knowledge and experience of results and outcomes	Decreased ability to determine needs and plan based on local community demographics and	Harder to monitor and control program and service quality and gain knowledge of

Funding types	Direct	Partnership	Funder	Flow Through	Fee for Service
		longer time requirements for decision making and development  Less direct knowledge of results and outcomes	Contractor relationship rather than program and service partner relationship  Need for audit controls	conditions  Reduced direct knowledge of results and outcomes  Processes required for engagement, reporting, monitoring, etc.	results and outcomes  Requires formalized contract development and monitoring  Contractor role rather than program partnership role
<i>Dollars Allocated</i>	326,500		27,500	478,000	35,000
<i>Percentage</i>	37.8		3.2	55.0	4.0
<i>Total</i>	862,700				

### Collaborative Action Group

The formation of the Collaborative Action Group (CAG) was a useful recommendation coming out of the Sierra Review. CAG has been effective in providing a forum for information sharing although the main beneficiary is seen to be Parkland County.

CAG has helped Parkland County begin to move from funder to program partner. It is a way to let people know what is happening in the County and in the other municipalities. There is beginning to be a lessening sense of priority in the committee due to lack of action and tangible results.

There is a sense that the intent of CAG was to encourage collaborative program planning in the

County, however, this has not happened to the degree that partners were anticipating. The CAG forum appears to be a useful mechanism to accommodate information sharing and program and service planning and development functions, with some changes to the mandate and operation of the Group.

It appears that the right people are not always at the CAG table for the appropriate agenda items. There has been a focus on having “decision makers” at the table which serves well for some items however does not, in all cases, support the program and service need identification and development functions.

The Collaborative Action Group mandate and function appears to be evolving from an administrative / compliance mechanism to facilitating a deeper understanding of the collective needs and resources of the County and partnering municipalities as a whole.

## **Program Planning and Development**

Parkland County is in the process of moving to an increased level of engagement in FCSS program and service development and delivery within the County. This a changed environment for the partnering municipalities. The change by the County is based on ensuring both knowledge of, and practices that, address and support the needs of Parkland County residents in the most effective and efficient manner possible. Parkland County has not articulated the intent and trajectory of the intended change nor the values, principles, goals and strategies that support it.

There is currently not a clear and consistent mechanism to participate, with its program partners, in identifying needs, developing programs and services and capacities within the county region to address the needs. As well there is not currently a region wide approach or “system” of programs and services across the county (a county wide perspective rather than looking at individual areas). Programs and services are offered based primarily on the priorities of the individual partnering municipalities.

Partner municipalities are not clear on Parkland County’s areas of focus, priority and anticipated outcomes for their FCSS programs and services. It is therefore difficult for them to determine what program and service areas to proactively develop.

There would be a benefit to the program partnership if the County were to articulate the intended goals and principles that guide investments of funding into the County FCSS Program and the anticipated benefits for residents of the County. This would help to resolve the:

- Need to align the FCSS strategic work with the County Strategic Plan and report to Council on the successes in contributing to and supporting the county plan;
- Need to clarify the goals and strategies to assist in effectively measuring and communicating results and outcomes; and
- Provision of a basis to assist in developing a process or mechanism for collaborative program and service planning and/or development.

The structure of the program partnership within the County appears to be effective and is viewed positively by the administrations and their respective boards and Councils. There is a high level of willingness to work together with Parkland County on an individual basis and on a county wide basis.

## **Communication**

Communication mechanisms and activities have improved significantly. There does, however, continue to be a need and potential for greater communication concerning FCSS programs and services to county residents. County residents are largely unaware of the Parkland County FCSS Program, its partnership and access opportunities and the fact that the County is providing programs and services for residents through a variety of means and delivery sites. A significant increase in attendance at FCSS Programs and services in the County and in partner municipalities, could be achieved through increasing awareness of the opportunities and of the nature of FCSS programs and services in general. There is existing capacity to accommodate an increased number of county residents in a wide and diverse variety of program and service options.

The county web site does not acknowledge, define or describe the Parkland County FCSS Program or access partnership with the participating municipalities. The site essentially refers county residents to external providers (partner municipalities) and does not acknowledge or build an understanding of the resources and support that the County is investing in programs and services for its residents. This appears to be an unrealized opportunity to build a sense of value, support and appreciation of the work of the County by its residents.

### **Sierra Study**

The study is not widely in use by partner municipalities, i.e. demographic information and priorities have not translated into program and service development and implementation.

The Collaborative Action group is seen as a good outcome of the study process and recommendations.

The survey process and methodology used are felt to have not produced actionable information due to limited survey size, poor knowledge of FCSS by survey participants and generalized results and conclusions.

There is a sense that the project and resulting report was highly focused on reporting, defining obligations of partner municipalities and prescribing funding allocations based on compliance.

### **Reporting**

It is not clear what information is required by Parkland County, what the associated information needs and definitions are and what the resulting information will be used for. Partner municipalities feel they would be better able to provide clear, useful and accurate data if these areas were clarified. It may be helpful if the partner municipalities were engaged as partners in reporting (telling the story of the combined resources) rather reporting as contractors.

The current reporting template and processes are felt to be overly comprehensive and administratively onerous. There are some built in inaccuracies, i.e. use of postal codes and inclusion of programs and services that county residents are highly unlikely to use. There is a sense that collective work on the reporting tools and processes would result in better information for Parkland County administration and council.

Additional analysis of the existing Annual FCSS Reports from partnering municipalities would provide useful information to establish county resident participation benchmarks and set participation level targets. Parkland County and the program partners can then work to develop strategies to increase the level of program and service participation. The current agreements support and accommodate increased levels of participation by County residents. The following chart is a sample of the potential analysis, the source document can be found under attachment 2.0.

### **Parkland County**

### FCSS Reports From Municipalities 2012 - Summary

*Sample for discussion purposes only – figures are not necessarily accurate*

	Total Participants	Parkland Residents	Participation Percentage
Yellowhead County	678	246	36.30
Drayton Valley	4724	347	7.3
Stony Plain	525	80	15.2
Spruce Grove	3698	1080	29.2
<b>Parkland County</b>			
<b>Totals</b>	<b>9625</b>	<b>1753</b>	<b>17.60</b>

Parkland County residents that participate in partner municipality programs and services are included in the current evaluation processes and practices conducted of those programs and services. The resulting data is used to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the respective program or services and continuous improvement decisions made accordingly. The evaluations and data are reviewed by the respective administration, boards and / or councils as part of their ongoing evaluation of their programs and services. Increased engagement of Parkland County in reviewing the evaluation results and in the continuous improvement processes undertaken with the respective municipalities would be helpful in creating an increased level of capacity in determining value for money of Parkland County's financial resources.

All programs and services offered by the municipalities, including Parkland County are required to operate within and report to the conditions and requirements identified within the provincial FCSS Act and Regulation. Reporting and review of all FCSS programs and services offered by Parkland County and its partner municipalities is undertaken annually to and by the province under the terms and conditions identified in the Conditional Funding Regulation. All programs and services they undertake, including those with funding from Parkland County must meet the terms and conditions of the FCSS Act and Regulation and undergo review and audit by the provincial government.

The majority of information reporting on programs and services to Parkland County by the partner municipalities is quantitative in nature. It may be useful to establish some parameters for qualitative outcome reporting and begin to move toward collectively identifying a series of common outcome measures to be used by the CAG municipalities in evaluating their joint programming.

### Support for Program Partnership with Parkland County



All partner municipalities reported good support administratively and at the political level for delivering programs and services in partnership (on behalf of) Parkland County. There is some concern with issues of rising costs and lack of additional dollars from the County to cover those costs. This also reflects an issue with the lack of increased resources for FCSS at the provincial level and the historic role of Parkland County as a funder rather than program partner.

Recognition of the partnership with Parkland County in supporting and delivering FCSS programs and services is not consistent between municipalities and in some cases does not identify or reinforce the value of the partnership and combined resources in making the programs and services available to all municipalities involved.

### **Impacts of reducing or Eliminating Funding**

Provision of programs and services outside the boundary (“outreach programs and services”) of the respective partner municipality would not be able to be continued. This would directly affect programs and services currently provided under contract to communities including Graminia, Seba Beach, Tomahawk, Entwistle and Parkland Village and other outreach services such as home support and short term counselling.

Partner municipalities would likely begin adding a fee or a fee surcharge for any County residents attending programs and services in the respective municipality and municipal residents would likely have first priority if programs and services were oversubscribed. Depending on the municipality there may be no access to programs and services provided for Parkland County Residents.

The opportunity for collaborative program development and design would be greatly reduced and would only occur in specific cases where a municipality(s) and Parkland County were each putting dollars into a joint program or service.

There would likely be a reduction in the programs and services available within the partner municipalities due to lower number of participants (i.e. minimum class sizes) and or fewer overall operating dollars resulting in prioritization and reductions in some program types or frequency of offerings.

### **Comparative Municipalities**

#### **County of Rocky View**

The County of Rocky View allocates a portion of their combined FCSS funding to three municipalities within the County.

The Town of Cochrane receives funding to support County residents attending Cochrane FCSS programs and services. Cochrane reports approximately 20% of program and service participants are county residents.

The Town of Irricana funding from the County is allocated specifically toward a Women’s Conference and a youth center operated by the Irricana Boys and Girls Club.

The Town of Chestermere receives funding from the County to support county residents attending Chestermere FCSS programs and services. Chestermere reports approximately 30% of program and service participants are County residents.

*Note: agreement attached under Appendix 3.0*

### **MD of Willow Creek**

The MD of Willow Creek allocates a portion of their combined FCSS funding to five municipalities within the County. The allocations provide funding for access to FCSS programs and services in the five municipalities by MD residents.

### **Mountain View County**

The County funds organizations providing programs and services within the county and grant transfers to urban centers in the county. The grant transfers are under a funding agreement (sample agreement available). Reporting includes what programs and services were offered, how many urban and rural residents participated and are now requesting some outcome information (sample reporting form available).

### **Grande Prairie County**

The County provides program funding to two municipalities within the county to provide specific programs (i.e. Sexsmith youth programs). The contract is for a set amount of dollars and does not have number or outcome reporting requirements. The agreement does provide for access to the programs funded by county residents.

### **Municipal District of Northern Lights**

The MD allocates FCSS funding to three municipalities to provide for access to programs and services by MD residents. Some funding is allocated to partnership programs i.e. family day activities. There is an informal funding agreement and the MD requests reporting on the number of MD residents attending.

## **Document Reviews**

### **Parkland County Vision, Mission, Strategic Plan**

#### **Document Highlights**

- Parkland County has been incorporated since 1969, currently 30,000 rural residents;
- Forward thinking rural community, committed to leading Alberta's resurgence of rural living;
- Legacy of agricultural and environmental stewardship;
- Investing in an exciting, quality and promising future;
- Peaceful setting, home to a variety of amenities;
- Demonstrating leadership in re-defined rural living;
- Purposefully and deliberately continuing to plan for, and make investments in, our future;

- Six goal areas; agriculture, community, economy, environment, governance and infrastructure;
- Focus on people; and
- Four principles; diversifying our economy, protecting our natural environment and rural values, collaborating within and outside our community, leading the way in modern rural living.

### **Vision**

The land is the tie that binds us. As innovative and responsible land stewards, we are progressive enablers of economic prosperity. We respect the distinctiveness of rural and urban populations. We are at our core, a reflection of strong rural values.

### **Mission**

Parkland County will be the rural community of choice for its progressive and strategic governance efforts to create one of the most competitive business environments in Alberta, and enhance the lives of our residents in pursuit of quality of life.

### **Values**

The stated and articulated values include, leadership, responsibility, progressive, cooperation and community.

### **Operating Principles**

- Primary accountability is to deliver excellent core services;
- Provide services that reflect community's needs;
- Committed to engaging residents;
- Community four year commitments – promote and advance health and wellness opportunities, elevate sense of community, enhance recreation and culture opportunities and experiences, create a viable and resilient community by empowering residents;
- 20 year goals; safe, inclusive, healthy community; community pride;
- Economy goal area references employment for local residents; and
- Governance, quality of relationships and collaboration; meaningful ways for residents and stakeholders to affect positive change.

### **Findings**

- The Plan is comprehensive and well-articulated describing the strategic priorities of the County;
- Not clear in the document what the FCSS contribution to achieving the principles and goals is in the Strategic Plan;
- Parkland county values, strategies and expectations from its FCSS Program and resources are not described. Residents do not have the opportunity to understand or acknowledge FCSS programs and services as part of the benefit of living in the County. There is a need to develop and communicate to Council, departments, residents, municipal partners etc.;
- FCSS can and does contribute to the goal areas including economy, environment, infrastructure (social) and governance;

- It would be helpful both internally and externally to develop an “alignment” and integration document that described how Parkland County FCSS contributes to achieving the strategic priorities of the county for use within the county administration and as a foundational piece for working with the partner municipalities;
- The Plan identifies a focus on quality of life, and strong rural values. FCSS makes a significant contribution in creating and sustaining both areas of focus;
- A principle and value based decision matrix that reflects the values, principles and goals in the County Strategic Plan, and that enables decision making between social choices would be helpful for Parkland County administration and Council and the FCSS municipal program partners;
- The Plan does not talk about the CAG agreement / process in achievements, could be referred to as an example under the intergovernmental excellence area;
- FCSS can add to and sustain the quality of life area of effort as the plan continues;
- The economy section is an ideal place to identify the significant relationship between community health and municipal prosperity. A great deal of information is available that describes the return on social investment and the relationship between on social health and prosperous communities;
- The Environment section could be used to reference the community building value of environmental stewardship; and
- There is a need to begin conversation on social infrastructure.

## **Agreements with Partner municipalities**

### **Document Summary**

- Provides access for Parkland residents to partner municipality FCSS programs and services without distinction between county and non-county participants;
- Provides an acknowledgement of partner municipality’s administration to deliver FCSS programs and services to county residents;
- Provides for the equitable sharing of operational costs;
- Specifies that all programs and services must conform to the Alberta FCSS Act and Conditional Funding Regulation;
- Partner municipalities are to forward the required annual provincial reporting to Parkland County and complete and submit additional reporting based on formats developed by the Collaborative Action Group (CAG);
- Partner municipalities are to provide administration as required by the province;

- Municipal FCSS boards are not to exclude Parkland residents and are to inform Parkland residents of opportunity to participate on their boards;
- Ensure that Parkland is recognized prominently in advertising and promotions;
- Parkland County may develop agreements with other providers for provision of programs and services;
- References Collaboration Action Committee Terms of Reference; and
- Includes the funding allocation formula.

## **Findings**

- Five out of six program partner municipalities have FCSS advisory or management Boards (includes Wabamun). Only one municipality currently has a provision for Parkland County residents to sit on their board. Two others indicated that if Parkland County desired they could undertake to revise their board bylaw provisions to accommodate Parkland County residents sitting on the respective boards;
- Accountability requirements are deferred to the CAG Agreement. There are layers of accountability in the FCSS “system”. Each FCSS Program is accountable to its board and/or council. Each municipality is accountable to the provincial government in relation to the FCSS Act and Conditional Funding Regulation. Parkland County has inserted another level of reporting and accountability from the partner municipalities to Parkland County to determine the number of county residents attending municipal partner programs and services and to satisfy the County’s requirements to report to the provincial government;
- The Agreements are access agreements. Specific programs and services are identified and offered under additional fee for service contracts. There is no “cap” on access by Parkland County residents; and
- The Agreements do not include any provision for or requirement for collaborative program planning activities or processes.

## **Collaborative Action Group Terms of Reference (CAG)**

### **Document Summary**

- The CAG’s purpose is to encourage ongoing collaboration between Parkland County and all participating municipalities in order to identify and meet current and emerging social needs of Parkland County residents;
- Responsible for managing the relationship between the County and partnering FCSS Programs, to make informed decisions re programming needs / reporting on program stats (to Parkland on a quarterly basis);
- Provides an opportunity to share local area knowledge, discuss ways to raise community awareness of FCSS programs available to county residents, recommend where and how partnership programs can be facilitated;
- Provides a forum to help increase understanding of current issues (common) facing the county and partnering municipalities;
- CAG provides an opportunity to collectively plan new collaborative initiatives;

- Parkland County is the lead party in the Agreement;
- Looking to create a more sustainable relationship to better serve Parkland residents;
- Partner municipalities are “brokers” and manage the relationships and funding between Parkland County and service delivery agents;
- Suggests an annual regional program planning cycle and process;
- Identifies “baseline” funding principle and practice;
- Identifies a requirement to undertake an annual evaluation of FCSS services by residents and service providers within each participating municipality; and
- A six month notice is required to modify CAG agreement.

### **Findings**

- A direction of “Better serving Parkland residents” is not identified as a purpose and therefore does not help in focusing the activity of the group;
- The “Broker” designation of partner municipalities adds some clarity to roles and responsibilities. Is it clear to community agencies that they are working for the County in this capacity or do they think they are working for the respective municipality? This definition makes a difference in the perception of the County as an active participant to its residents in identification and resolution of social issues and opportunities;
- There is a need to differentiate the roles, responsibilities and “business” that CAG is undertaking in the CAG forum as opposed to ongoing work that takes place between and/or as a result of CAG meetings; and
- A model option or addition is to use CAG as vehicle to deal with “regional” issues, programs and services. Each municipality (Parkland included) deals with local issues, specific to their demographics and populations, independently and then come together to share and to work on more common issues and opportunities that impact more than one municipality, ie housing and homelessness or youth engagement.

### **CAG minutes**

#### **Document Summary**

- Minutes from February 27, 2014; May 14, 2014 and October 7, 2014 reviewed;
- Options to increase community awareness of FCSS are on each agenda;
- Discussion of the survey undertaken by Parkland County;
- Discussions concerning the FCSS Outcomes data bank;
- Round table sharing at each meeting; and
- Variety of other items including specialized transportation, Director’s Network update, Agreement extensions, Parkland County internal FCSS Review discussed.

### **Findings**

- The meeting format (agendas) and actions are not consistent with Terms of Reference (at least in this sample). This is not intended as a criticism but rather may point to a need to adjust either the agenda content and structure or the Terms of Reference;

- The group appears to allocate the majority of meeting time to information sharing and understanding what is occurring in the various participating municipalities;
- There does not appear to be a strong mandate for, or practice of, issue/opportunity identification and program/service planning and evaluation;
- Comments from the municipality interviews are that the annual planning process identified in the Terms of Reference has not yet occurred; and
- An appropriate key task for the CAG may be developing and monitoring a county wide strategy on increasing FCSS awareness and subsequent participation by county residents.

## **Annual Reporting Documents**

### **Document Hi-light Summary**

Each partner municipality is required to provide Parkland County with an Annual Program Report. The Report includes the following fields of information:

- Number of individual services provided by the municipality;
- Issues and trends related to FCSS identified in each municipal area;
- Number or percentage of Parkland County residents attending programs and services;
- Volunteer hours to FCSS Programs and services and to community based not for profit organizations;
- Community initiatives participated in;
- Partnership projects undertaken;
- Participation in regional or provincial projects; and
- A significant FCSS “story” (qualitative data) from the reporting year.

### **Findings**

- Municipalities indicate they do not have a clear sense of the definitions for some of the data areas and how the numbers will be used. Clarification of these points would increase the accuracy and reliability of the data;
- There is no sense of a “value added” to the municipalities in providing this information to Parkland County;
- An annual summary of the key data elements\* over time, combined with a summary of the reported issues and trends has the potential to provide useful information for program planning and development. The annual summary data would be a significant element of determining and reporting the percentage of county residents attending specific program areas in each municipality, the effectiveness of communication and awareness building strategies and by linking that information to the program evaluation reports, a measure of program and services effectiveness could be determined. Combining the data collected with the respective municipality’s FCSS Program operation cost and county contributions could also provide a measure of program contribution percentage against the program participation percentage. The following chart is an example for discussion purposes only;

*Note: \* The CAG group would need to determine what the key data elements are for Parkland County and for the Participating municipalities as well as the most effective means of collecting, analysing and reporting on the resulting information.*

## **Parkland County**

### **FCSS**

#### **Municipal Partner Funding and Participation Comparison**

*Example for Discussion Purposes Only –  
figures are not necessarily accurate*

	<b>Municipality Budget (80 / 20)</b>	<b>Agreement Contribution</b>	<b>Budget %</b>	<b>Participation %</b>
Spruce Grove	483.6	181	37.43	29.2
Stony Plain*	437.7	145.7	33.29	15.2

\* includes municipal over contribution amount

- The Program Report currently does not include program outcome data other than the narrative stories collected from each municipality; and
- Accuracy, utility and ease of implementation would be improved if work was undertaken to clarify what information is required and by who, confirm definitions for the resulting data elements, work together on data collection sources, methodologies and reporting and investigate potential information “loops” that would provide valuable processed data back to the partner municipalities.

## **Parkland County Web Site**

### **Document Summary**

- The web site home page does not provide information on, or a quick link to, Parkland County FCSS programs and services; and
- FCSS referral information can be accessed by going to Departments, then Community and Protection, then Parks and Recreation, then FCSS. At that point you are referred to other municipalities for further information. If you do an internet search on Parkland County FCSS the search engine takes you into the last page noted above and refers you to other municipalities for information on actual program and service availability.

## **Findings**



- The Parkland County FCSS Program is not identified on the website. Council, administration, residents and others are not aware from the site that Parkland County has an FCSS Program or that the County provides (through various means) those programs and services to and for its residents. The site is not useful as an information site for the Parkland County FCSS Program or its programs and services and essentially sends residents to other places (perception rather than fact) for these programs and services;
- It does not appear that the potential of the site to communicate that the County, places value on and invests resources in, a positive quality of life and community well-being through FCSS programs and services, is being effectively utilized. One of the results is that the county administration and Council are not receiving the “credit” for holding this value for their citizens and for taking actions and investing resources to achieve a higher quality of life for Parkland County;
- Parkland County residents are referred to other municipalities for FCSS programs and services. The residents would not realize that these services are available from and funded by their municipality ( i.e. must go somewhere else to get these programs and services);
- The site has been described as being hard to navigate and hard to find FCSS content; and
- Not clear how FCSS programs and services link to the rest of the site i.e. appears to be an “add on” rather than an integral part of the site with respect to the perception that, “this is important to our residents and we are taking action ....” feel of the other sections.

## **Report to Parkland County, Family and Community Support Services Review Final Report – Sierra Systems**

### **Document Summary:**

The review intended to:

- Provide Parkland County with a clearer understanding of the existing and future needs of its residents;
- Provide partner municipalities with the opportunity to examine the services they provide in a broader regional context; and
- Ensure Parkland County gains the information they need to make certain that funding allocated to partner municipalities is targeted to areas with the greatest need.

The study activities included:

- Collection of stakeholder input on preventative social needs in the community;
- Analysis/description of the current delivery model of the Parkland County FCSS;
- Prioritization of preventive social needs by the Advisory Committee;
- Development of funding principles based on articulated priorities for preventive social service needs of the county; and
- Identification of administrative efficiencies for a new Parkland County FCSS Agreement.

Study findings (summary)

- From community and agency perspectives, services are being adequately delivered and the majority of needs (not defined) are being met;
- Some collaboration between municipal FCSS Programs does exist;
- FCSS partners need to exhibit behaviours that reflect the contractual nature of the relationships;
- Parkland County and the partnering municipalities need to work toward and enhancement of the management of services provided and evidence based decision making relating to funding and provision of FCSS services;
- Collaboration is required to identify and meet current and emerging needs of Parkland county residents and continued funding by the County should be based on this collaboration;
- Participating municipalities need to provide detailed feedback to the County regarding program participation (by county residents) and the use of county funds;
- Parkland County and municipal partners need to remain up to date on current and emerging community needs, including current Parkland County demographics, in order to better provide services tailored to the needs of residents;
- Identifies a need to transition from the current agreements and practices to more routine business practices; and
- That the goal for the partner municipalities is to ensure that the desired FCSS services are available to County residents and that the value received for the County funds expended can be confirmed.

#### Priorities identified by area (2010):

##### Parkland County

- Transportation (51%);
- Access to affordable housing (41%); and
- Rising living costs/relatively fixed incomes (26%).

##### Spruce Grove

- Access to affordable housing (43%);
- Transportation (26%); and
- Youth at risk (22%).

##### Stony Plain

- Affordable housing (45%);
- Transportation (35%); and
- Employment opportunities (18%).

##### Organizations

- Sustainable funding (77%); and
- Retaining quality volunteers (43%).

#### Recommended Advisory Committee

- Collaborate with partner FCSS Programs to provide a continuum of services to county residents;

- Seek more outreach program delivery to take FCSS programs out to more rural county locations to increase access; and
- Share information on issues outside the FCSS mandate and inform others (agencies) about identified issues that may be outside the mandate.

#### Public input sessions

- Addressing family dynamics and violence;
- Effective tracking methods;
- Services that reflect current needs; and
- Continue to assess community needs.

#### Awareness of FCSS

- 73% are familiar with the programs and services provided by FCSS.

#### Unmet needs

- No significant unmet needs identified that could be addressed within the FCSS mandate;
- FCSS could act as a broker to bring the community together to discuss emerging social issues i.e. lack of transportation and affordable housing.

#### Sierra Report Conclusions

- Agreement is seen as a success by all parties;
- There is little information in the Agreement on what services are needed, what services are being utilized and what value for money is being achieved;
- Accountability mechanisms are weak or missing;
- Ongoing collaboration is needed to identify and meet current and emerging needs;
- Participating municipalities need to be able to provide detailed information to the County regarding program participation and the use of Parkland County funds;
- A process needs to be in place to assess current and emerging resident needs including assessment of demographics and targeted community feedback in order for all participating municipalities to tailor services to the need of Parkland residents; and
- Establish a Parkland County FCSS Collaborative Action Group.

#### Findings

Although demographic factors and area priorities are identified in the report<sup>1</sup> there is not a defined or formal mechanism in place to undertake program and service planning or development. To “bring forward” the priorities for use identified in the report, at this time, verification and updating would be needed to ensure the needs and trends identified were still accurate and relevant.

The content, tone and approach of the Study and Report serves to keep Parkland County in the role of funder, rather than program partner. Examples include:

---

<sup>1</sup> Sierra Final Report, 2010, pp 21

- Each member of the CAG will be held accountable to participate in all CAG activities and to provide the information requested by Parkland County;
- Ongoing participation will be required to secure ongoing funding;
- The participating municipalities will need to provide detailed feedback to the County regarding program participation and distribution of Parkland County dollars; and
- Sierra report suggests some form of least cost accounting for programs and services which continues the primary role of the County as “funder” and the surrounding municipalities in the role of “agency”. It is a challenge to enforce these requirements and participate as a program partner.

The Report also refers to collecting FCSS program outcome information and suggests that the CAG work toward developing per unit costs or, “the amount of funding required to provide a designated service to one participant”. A great deal of outcome measurement work has been done by a collective of provincial trainers working for FCSS Programs in the province which are able to provide resources and training to municipalities. Measuring program and service outcomes will provide more meaningful information for decision making and continuous improvement processes than developing a per unit cost approach. The per/ unit costing methodology with respect to FCSS has proven to be onerous and has not served to provide the level of information anticipated for administrative and political leadership purposes.

The community ranked issues<sup>2</sup> provide a data source for the CAG to discuss and analyse community interests and needs and may be useful for program development when updated and used in concert with current demographic and community resource information.

The information on “Accessing Programs and Services”<sup>3</sup> is seen not to be valid by the program partners due to the low sample sizes. The section reports that 7% to 11% of County residents accessed FCSS programs and services. Considerations include that the level of understanding of FCSS programs and services in the county is seen to be low (Less than 30% rated their knowledge of FCSS as excellent or good) and the Report does not identify comparative rates with other FCSS Programs in the province to determine if the percentages reported are consistent with, higher or lower than other areas of the province.

The report does not consider or address impact of the administrative and political /culture change in the County that is influencing the current evolution of FCSS moving from a funder model to a program partner model. This evolution is influenced by a desire to move toward a “needs based” funding allocation (program and service development and delivery) model.

The accountability, monitoring, reporting, evaluation section of the Report has inconsistencies with provincial reporting timelines.

The Report does not consider strategies to increase municipality’s motivation to participate in the partnership and undertake the roles specified in the CAG Terms of Reference other than funding. There would be value to the partnership in determining the value added components for the partners as a collective and mutually beneficial basis for collaboration (i.e. insufficient registration to run programs

---

<sup>2</sup> Sierra Final Report, 2010, pp 13, 14

<sup>3</sup> Sierra Final Report, 2010, pp14

unless county residents are included or extending number and/or duration of programs and services by leveraging collective resources).

## **Appendix**

- 1.0 Key Areas of Inquiry
- 2.0 FCSS 2012 Annual Report Summary
- 3.0 County of Rocky View Sample Funding Agreement
- 4.0 Parkland County FCSS Program Description and Outline – Example

## **Parkland County FCSS Review**

### **Municipal Partners – Areas of Inquiry**

1. Description of FCSS Program, operations and governance
2. Areas of focus for programs and services
3. Relationship with Parkland County (how does it work)
4. Learnings/applicability of Sierra Review (what has helped, what has been implemented)
5. Tracking of Parkland County residents participation and outcomes
6. Budget presentation and approvals of combined budget
7. Effect of Parkland County funding on FCSS budget, implications of changes
8. Acknowledgement of Parkland County partnership
9. Parkland County representation in/on FCSS program and service decision making
10. Effectiveness of Collaborative Action group (CAG)
11. Planning for needs of Parkland County residents and opportunities to influence
12. Reporting back to Parkland County
13. Ideas, suggestions, alternatives
14. Level of administration and political comfort in providing access to FCSS program and services by County residents
15. Is there an FCSS Board and if so is there provision for Parkland County residents to be on the Board
16. Collect promotional materials

	<b>Total Participants</b>	<b>Parkland Residents</b>	<b>Percentage Parkland</b>
<b>Yellowhead County</b>			
Children and Youth	212	76	35.8
Families	58	31	53.4
Adults	302	122	40.4
Seniors	50	12	24.0
Community Development	56	5	8.9
Drop in Programs			
Total / Average %	678	246	36.3
<b>Drayton Valley</b>			
Children and Youth	120	18	15.0
Families	994	99	10.0
Adults	207	14	6.8
Seniors	903	16	1.8
Community Development	2500	200	8.0
Drop in Programs			
Total / Average %	4724	347	7.3
<b>Stony Plain</b>			
Children and Youth	0	0	
Families			
Adults	140	11	7.9
Seniors	385	69	17.9
Community Development	0	0	
Drop in Programs			
Total / Average %	525	80	15.2
<b>Spruce Grove</b>			
Children and Youth	2381	755	31.7
Families	188	72	38.3
Adults	148	24	16.2



Seniors	651	179	27.5
Community Development	330	50	15.2
Drop in Programs			
Total / Average %	3698	1080	29.2

<b>Parkland County</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>9625</b>	<b>1753</b>	<b>18.21</b>
------------------------	---------------	-------------	-------------	--------------



**Rocky View County  
Family and Community Support Services  
Funding Memorandum of Understanding**

This Memorandum of Understanding made this 9th day of April 2014 BETWEEN:

Rocky View County,  
a municipal corporation in the Province of Alberta,  
hereinafter referred to as “**the County**”

and

\_\_\_\_\_, in the town of \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ in the  
Province of Alberta, hereinafter  
referred to as “**the Agency**”

The County may provide grant funding for the establishment, administration, and operation of community preventive social support services;

The Agency wishes to provide certain services referred to as “**the Programs**” as outlined in the funding applications attached as Appendix A to this Memorandum of Understanding. These Programs operate within the guidelines set in the Alberta Family and Community Support Services Act and Regulation;

The Agency’s funding application has been approved according to the terms stated in a letter, attached as Appendix B, from the County to the Agency dated the 11th day of December 2013.

This is a statement of the Terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between the County and the Agency related to Funding.

**THE AGENCY AGREES:**

- 1.1 To provide services subject to the terms of this Memorandum of Understanding.

**THE AGENCY ALSO AGREES:**

- 2.1 To submit to the County Family and Community Support Services Department (FCSS) upon request a revised budget with the total sum and recommendations approved by the County FCSS.
- 2.2 To keep proper accounting records with respect to income and expenditures and to submit to FCSS one (1) ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT, signed by two (2) officers or members of the Agency with signing authority, for the year ended December 31, 2014, together with one (1) ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT, prepared according to the guidelines in Appendix C, by February 28, 2015.
- 2.3 To meet upon request with a representative of FCSS, for one (1) MIDYEAR PROGRESS MEETING on or before July 31, 2014.

- 2.4 To provide written progress reports in a format and on a time schedule acceptable to FCSS.
- 2.5 That failure to comply with any of the reporting requirements of 2.1 through 2.4 may result in funding advances being withheld until outstanding reports are received.
- 2.6 That all funds shall be used to offset the Program's operating budget for 2014.
- 2.7 To make alterations to the budget, or between major categories only with the prior written consent of FCSS.
- 2.8 To immediately give notice to FCSS if the Agency discontinues or intends to discontinue the Programs and return any unexpended County funds within 10 business days of the discontinuation.
- 2.9 To make available and allow access for review and audit during reasonable hours to a representative of FCSS all financial books, records, and operating procedures.
- 2.10 To have fee schedules, hours of service and eligibility guidelines, where applicable, that are mutually agreeable to the Agency and FCSS submitted annually to FCSS.
- 2.11 To provide to FCSS Program statistics and supplementary data on request, as necessary for effective monitoring of the relationship between needs and services, and for cost sharing with other levels of government.
- 2.12 To allow representatives of FCSS to observe the program or service during reasonable hours, excepting any Program activity for which it is mutually agreed with FCSS that such observation would compromise client confidentiality.
- 2.13 To give notice to FCSS of all matters of significance with respect to the Agency, including, but not limited to, changes in programming, budget, purpose, or Program staff and to forward a list of board members after each Annual General Meeting.
- 2.14 To provide FCSS with satisfactory evidence that the Agency is covered by liability insurance throughout the period for which funds are granted. The amount of coverage of such insurance shall be satisfactory to FCSS.
- 2.15 To indemnify and save harmless the County from and against all claims, losses, demands, actions, payments, suits, recoveries, judgements, or settlements of any kind brought against or recovered from the County in any manner directly or indirectly caused, occasioned, or contributed to in whole or in part, by reason of any act, omission, fault, or negligence whether active or passive of the Agency or of anyone acting under its direction or control or on its behalf in connection with or incidental to carrying out the Programs. Such indemnification shall survive the termination of this Memorandum of Understanding.
- 2.16 The County is not liable for any deficits incurred by the Agency
- 2.17 A year-end County FCSS funded surplus will be returned to the County by January 31, 2015.
- 2.18 The Program provided pursuant to this Memorandum of Understanding shall be performed in a proper professional manner in accordance with generally accepted professional standards.
- 2.19 All work done pursuant to this Memorandum of Understanding shall be done in accordance with all applicable provisions of federal and provincial statutes and their related regulations and codes, and with all municipal bylaws, which do or can affect the FCSS program.

- 2.20 The Agency represents that it is fully experienced and properly qualified to carry out the Program provided herein, and that it is properly licensed, equipped, organized, and financed to perform the Program. The Agency shall act as an independent contractor and not as the agent of the County in performing this Memorandum of Understanding, maintaining complete control over its employees, volunteers, and all of its subcontractors. Nothing in this Memorandum of Understanding or any subcontract awarded by the Agency shall create any contractual relationship between any subcontractor and the County. The Agency shall perform all work in accordance with its own methods subject to compliance with this Memorandum of Understanding.
- 2.21 The Agency shall recognize the County as a source of funding on materials used in providing the Program including newsletters and promotional material and such recognition shall be in a form acceptable to FCSS.
- 2.22 The Agency shall immediately return to the County all program materials and capital items purchased with County funds upon dissolution of the program unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the County.

The County agrees:

- 3.1 To advise the Agency of any matters which materially affect this Memorandum of Understanding.
- 3.2 To provide funds to the Agency pursuant to this Memorandum of Understanding up to the approved sum for the period specified in this Memorandum of Understanding, provided that the terms and conditions have been met by the Agency. The payment schedule will be according to the terms stated in a letter, attached as Appendix B, from the County to the Agency dated the 11th day of December 2013.

THE COUNTY AND THE AGENCY MUTUALLY AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

- 4.1 The Agency has the right to terminate this Memorandum of Understanding upon giving thirty (30) days' notice in writing to FCSS.
- 4.2 The County shall have the right to terminate this Memorandum of Understanding under any of the following circumstances:
- i) by giving thirty (30) days' notice in writing to the Agency in the event of significant changes in the County's financial situation;
  - ii) by giving thirty (30) days' notice in writing to the Agency in the event the Agency fails to perform the duties and obligations which it has undertaken in this Memorandum of Understanding, including the attached Application for Funding;
  - iii) by giving immediate notice in writing to the Agency
    - a) in the event the Agency discontinues or is about to discontinue its Program;
    - b) in the event the Agency is dissolved, amalgamated, or merged with another society or becomes bankrupt;
    - c) in the event the Provincial Family and Community Support Services Department determines this Program is not eligible for funding under the Alberta Family and Community Support Services Act and Regulation.

d) in the event that FCSS believes in their opinion the Agency is contravening the intentions or directive in respect to the Program, or if there is sufficient reason to believe that the Agency's operation in not being conducted in an appropriate ethical and/or legal manner.

- 4.3 That the Program year shall be from January 1, 2014 (or the specified commencement date) to December 31, 2014.
- 4.4 This Memorandum of Understanding embodies the entire Memorandum of Understanding between the Agency and the County. The parties shall not be bound by or liable for any statement, representation, promise, inducement, or Understanding of any kind or nature not stated in this Memorandum of Understanding. No additional changes, amendments, or modifications of any of the terms or conditions of the Memorandum of Understanding shall be valid unless reduced to writing and signed by both parties.
- 4.5 Both the Agency and the County agree that with the signing of this Memorandum of Understanding all previous Memorandum of Understandings as between them regarding FCSS Programs are at an end and of no further force or effect.

The County designates the FCSS Coordinator or designate as its representative for purposes of administering this Memorandum of Understanding.

Name of Agency:

Name of Project: FCSS Programs – Residents of WRV

Approved by County Council on December 10, 2013 for funding in the amount of \_\_\_\_\_for the period ending December 31, 2014.

Signature of Agency Representative      Per: \_\_\_\_\_

Print Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Rocky View County FCSS      Per: \_\_\_\_\_

## County of Parkland FCSS Program Description and Outline

*(example for discussion purposes only)*

### Parkland County FCSS (alignment with Parkland County Strategic Plan)

#### Mission

The mandate of FCSS is to provide locally-driven, preventative, social initiatives to enhance the well-being of individuals, families and the community.

#### Values / Principles

Local people can influence things that affect them

Communities can be innovative and creative

Citizen participation, self-help and volunteerism are encouraged

Human growth and potential are enhanced

#### Goals

FCSS connects communities through the programs, services and information we can provide. Even more importantly, we're a spark in every community, encouraging people and partners to come together to figure out their needs. When one person feels safe and healthy, they contribute to a stronger family. When families are strong, they're a bigger part of their community. And when communities are healthy, they're motivated to give - of their time, of their compassion - to support individuals.

This is how Parkland County builds our community, a real community not just of streets and houses but of people who care about their community and help and support each.

### Program Description

Parkland County FCSS is a Partnership between the City of Spruce Grove, Town of Stony Plain, Town of Drayton Valley, Leduc County, Yellowhead County and Village of Wabamun.

As part of Community and Protection Services, Parkland County Family and Community Support Services (FCSS) provides programs for seniors, youth, adults and families. Many programs are delivered through

partnerships with local businesses and other community based agencies. FCSS thanks all its partners and sponsors for their generous support.

Our programs enable people of all ages to improve their quality of life and their ability to prevent and / or deal with crisis situations should they arise. Our Information and Referral Specialists connects people with programs and services.

### **Delivery Sites**

Parkland County FCSS programs and service are delivered by, and available to, residents though:

- City of Spruce Grove
- Town of Stony Plain
- Village of Wabamun
- Town of Graminia
- Entwistle
- Tomahawk
- Summer Village of Seba Beach
- Parkland Village

### **Programs Available to Parkland County Residents**

Note: not all programs operate at all times of the year

#### **Spruce Grove locations - contact**

##### **Adults & Seniors**

- Being an Executor, Attorney or Agent
- Estate Planning & Wills
- Dementia and Alzheimer's Information session
- Personal Directives and Power of Attorney
- Pre-Retirement Financial Planning
- Home Support Program
- Healthy Eating Starts Here

- De-Clutter Your Life
- Problem Gambling
- Building a Strong Marriage
- Expressive Arts Workshop
- Creating Healthy Relationships
- Mindful Living
- Frauds and Scams
- Applied Suicide Intervention Skills Training

### **Families**

- Mom's Morning Out
- Moving to the Music
- Toddler Time
- Positive Discipline
- Parenting After Separation
- Roots of Empathy

### **Children and Youth**

- Parkland Village Youth Group
- Conflict Resolution
- Summer in the City
- Travelling Playground
- Leaders in Training
- Boys Break
- Girls Group
- Heroes and H2

### **Information & Referral**

- Basic I & R
- Supported I & R
- Green Book



## **Counselling**

- Individual & Families Counselling
- Addiction & Mental Health (FCSS provides office space)
- Probation Counselling (FCSS provides office space)

## **Stony Plain Locations – contact**

### **Personal Development**

- Basic Facilitation Skills Training Workshop
- The Gifts of Imperfection, Problem Gambling
- Expressive Arts Workshop, Building a Strong Marriage
- Mindful Living
- Creating Healthy Relationships

### **Parenting Programs**

- Parenting After Separation

### **Older Adults (Seniors)**

- Christmas Without Credit
- Dementia and Alzheimer's Information Session
- A Happy Heart – Personal Directives and Power of Attorney
- Pre-Retirement Financial Planning
- Healthy Eating Starts Here
- De- Clutter Your Life / Food and Finance
- Utilities Consumer Advocate: empowering Albertans
- Being an Executor, Attorney or Agent
- Estate Planning and Wills
- Spring Readiness
- Understanding Adult Guardianship
- Vacation on a Budget
- Volunteering After 60

- Frauds and Scams
- Breaking Taboos – Talking About Suicide and Mental Illness with Seniors
- Seniors Week Block Party
- Community Volunteer Income Tax Program

### **Bereavement Education and Support**

- Caring Friends / Exploration Through Grief

### **Youth**

- Dealing with Conflict
- Youth Art Studio
- Clean Scene Peer Club
- Cultural Connections
- Red Cross Babysitting Course
- We're Listening

### **Volunteer Programs**

- Stony Plain Volunteer Centre

### **Ongoing Programs**

- Adopt a Driveway / Home Support Program
- Forms Assistant and Information Program
- Mediation Services / Counselling Services
- Information and Referral

### **Parkland Village location – contact**

Youth Center and youth programs

### **Graminia locations – contact**

-Family and Community Support (one to one session - short term preventative and skill-based and referrals)

-Positive Discipline in Everyday Parenting workshop series

- Classroom workshops (various topics such as bullying, communication, respect, emotions, leadership, etc.)
- Playschool workshops
- Community workshops and groups (examples include Home Alone program to boost young people's confidence to stay home alone, girls' and boy's self-esteem workshops and youth leadership/mentorship sessions)
- Support groups (topics include grief and loss, social skills and social-emotional support)
- Seniors Services (referrals, subsidy for housekeeping services, program connecting young people and seniors)
- Counselling referral and subsidy

#### **Village of Wabamun locations – contact**

Babysitting training

Family day activities

Kids can catch festival (Feb 14) – Cabellas sponsorship

School is interested in offering parenting courses

Community volunteer is interested in developing a youth group

Capturing community data

Interested in youth engagement

Tot sport – 5 year olds and parent

Use the Village hall

Strong seniors group – provide support, seniors services as needed

#### **Entwistle and West Parkland County locations – contact**

The FCSS program provides a number of youth services focused on providing quality programs throughout Yellowhead County which are based on recreation, social, education and health.

Five programs provide direct programming throughout the County for youth. They are:

- Children's Programs: Facilitates and/or provides activities for children 6-12 years old in cooperation with community groups and schools throughout the County. – offered in Yellowhead and Parkland (western) Counties.

- Youth Programs: Facilitates programs and/or provides activities that are of a preventative and educational nature for Youth aged 13-18 years old in cooperation with community groups and schools throughout the county. Available primarily in the East end of Yellowhead County and West end of Parkland, particularly Entwistle school and Seba Beach. Have made a program available to Tomahawk.
- Summer Programs: Provides summer activities and camps for children and youth aged 6-18 years old in communities throughout the County. – offered in Yellowhead and Parkland (western) Counties.

These programs rely on strong partnerships with many groups and organizations. Some of the program partners are:

- Area schools
- Yellowhead County Recreation Board
- Alberta Health Services Authorities
- Edmonton and Area Child and Family Services - Early Intervention Program
- Lobstick Community Learning Society
- Student Health Services - Addictions and Mental Health

Programs provided by FCSS youth services are intended to assist youth in making informed and healthy decisions which will benefit them throughout their lives. The program allows them to realize their potential and maximize their possibilities while providing a safe environment within which to do so. The program seeks, through these means, to reduce the influence of drugs and alcohol as well as other negative impacts that youth may be faced with.

Some of the programs being offered are:

- Boys Getaway Weekend
- Girls Getaway Weekend
- Leadership training – primarily through schools.
- It's Cool to Know Your Way in a Relationship retreat (including Entwistle and Tomohawk schools)
- BEE Aware – Drug Prevention program
- Babysitters Safety
- Home Alone Safely
- Ages and Stages
- Roots of Empathy

- Various day camps

Art attack afterschool program

Little Chefs afterschool program

### **Family Outreach**

Provides information and referrals on services available to families, supports that are available to them, individual family programming, emergency counseling and ongoing provision of workshops and speakers to improve and support family relationships.

Workshops include:

- Active Parenting Now in 3
- Parenting
- Conflict Resolution
- Boundaries
- Nobody's Perfect
- Advocating for Your Child

### **Community Outreach**

Provides assistance to individuals in accessing government programs such as:

Canada Pension Plan:

- Retirement Pension
- Disability Pension
- Death Benefits
- Survivor's Pension / Children's Benefits

### **Old Age Security:**

- Guaranteed Income supplement
- Allowance for the Survivor
- Seniors Financial Assistance
- Special Needs Assistance

Supportive counseling

Volunteer Income Tax program

Seniors Groups supports, such as board development

### **Home Support**

Provides light housekeeping services to residents of Yellowhead County as far west as Marlboro (Range Road 210). The County also has an agreement with Parkland County to provide Home Support as far east as Fallis. Home Support is available to anyone who has a health or mobility problem that prevents them from completing housekeeping tasks, regardless of their age.

### **Tomahawk and Seba Beach locations - contact**

A.L.I.V.E. 55: is a prevention program for those 55 years old and up. It reduces isolation by providing information sessions and preventative exercise programs.

PARENTING AFTER SEPARATION: is a mandatory program for all separated or divorcing parents with children. The program focuses on giving parents the necessary tools for creating a positive relationship with each other and with the children once the separation has occurred.

FOCUS ON COMMUNICATION IN SEPARATION (FOCIS): is a free 6 hour workshop offered by Family Justice Services and is about communicating while parenting apart. Some topics include: Impact of Conflict on Children, Listening, Speaking Skills, etc.

VOLUNTEER INCOME TAX PROGRAM: a tax preparation service which is available free of charge to individuals in the community who qualify for assistance.

MAKING FINANCIAL CENTS PROGRAM: a series of 8 free financial workshops facilitated by local professionals. The topics include: Budgeting Basics, Smart Shopping, Vehicle & Home Insurance, Financial Planning, Financing Your Vehicle, Financing Post-Secondary Education, Wills & Estate Planning and Credit Bureau and Protecting Yourself against Identity Theft.

BOARD DEVELOPMENT and LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT: helps provide local volunteer groups and agencies with training opportunities which will increase effectiveness of services offered in our community.

CLEAN COMMUNITY CAMPAIGN: encouraging community pride and increasing interest in creating a greener and cleaner community with four programs.

“Operation Clean Sweep” is a community wide cleanup program – join us today!

“Adopt-A-Block” invites businesses and organizations to adopt a part of town and keep it clean on a regular basis.

“The Litter Bug” visits schools and the public & teaches about litter & recycling.

“Graffiti Removal” free graffiti removal kits are given to various businesses and organizations to help stop the spread of vandalism.

HOST YOUR OWN BLOCK PARTY: it’s a great way to get to know your neighbors. FCSS can help guide you in hosting a Block Party & help pay for some of your supplies.

INTERGENERATIONAL PROGRAMMING: providing opportunities for seniors and youth to connect and to assist each other in understanding the lifestyles, contributions, and experiences that each generation has faced. We encourage seniors and youth to become actively involved in the community and to share each other's experiences.

HOMELESSNESS AND POVERTY REDUCTION – outreach for people who are homeless or at risk of being homeless as well as coordination of resources.

SPECIAL EVENTS: opportunities for children, youth, families and seniors to come together to enjoy community minded, cultural activities while having access to information about local resources and organizations. These events include: Seniors' Week, Canada Day, Halloween Haunted House, Volunteer Appreciation Week etc.

**Moon Lake location – contact**

- Rhyme Times