

## Proposed Models for Partners in Recovery & Consideration of Advantages & Disadvantages of Each

Proposed models:	Contracting	Co-location	Secondment	Flexible	Mixed / hybrid
<b>Lead Org</b>	Lead org contracts to CMOs. Holds some funds for general coordination/ strategy.	Lead org = fund holder.  Governance role.	Lead org = fund holder.  Providing line management & support.	ML led but consortia managed.	Lead org = fund holder  Mix of approaches depending on consortia preferences, area needs & services
<b>Support Facilitators (SFs)</b>	CMOs employ SFs directly, and lead org reimburses salaries.	Lead org directly employs SF's who are co-located in CMOs – based on identified need/services	SF's employed by lead org in a team and seconded out to CMOs. More integrated model than co-location.	Are not embedded in a particular location – they float according to demand. 'Silent office'.	Mixed model as above

### Good practice criteria for consortia development:

Clear staged processes, transparency, consistency, mutual benefit, shared responsibilities, shared objectives, adequate time for negotiations, collaborative.

### Integrating Behavioural Health and Primary Care Services

Strosahl (1998) has proposed a basic distinction that is useful. Namely, collaborative care involves behavioral health working *with* primary care; integrated care involves behavioral health working *within* and as a part of primary care. As cited in: Collins et al (2010). Evolving Models of Behavioral Health Integration in Primary Care

<http://www.milbank.org/reports/10430EvolvingCare/10430EvolvingCare.html>

### SUB-CONTRACTING MODEL:

- Lead org contracts to CMOs. Holds some funds for general coordination/ strategy.
- SFs employed directly by experienced MH providers working with partners
- SFs float and move to where the need is or where consumers have been identified as eligible for PRI
- Flexible funding

### Advantages:

Relationships, collaboration

- Collaborative model: builds relationships, respect, trust,
- Shows commitment to resolve differences by both parties – essential goodwill from the start
- Opportunity for reworking of partnership relationships and development of systems of work and practice which promote joint work at the different service points which will support future initiatives aimed at bridging service gaps ....

Support Facilitators (SF)

- Embed roles - Allows true integration of SFs into the community sector and learn from existing relationships, systems, etc.
- Supports SF skill development by learning from and share knowledge from other NGO based SFs (communities of practice)
- Working with what exists in the community in terms of workforce and avoiding draining NGO workforce – NGOs can use current staff or backfill as required

### Service provision & systems

- System capacity building
- Sustainable outcomes: view to long term collaboration and sustainability irrespective of ongoing funding
- Gives service providers the role of service provision and management of support staff
- Allows lead role to focus on governance, coordination, population mapping etc.
- Values diversity of experience in of NGOs, worker skills and sector understanding
- NGO connectedness to community and understanding and experience of working with consumers.
- Allows for flexible and responsive approaches in service provision
- More likely to align with individualised and person-centred funding
- Focus on what is best for the consumer / target group rather than the \$s
- Improve on facilitated access to range of other services
- Support the aim of MLs to build equal working relationships with community based sector to develop communication pathways and improve the coordination of services to address service gaps
- Improves accountability for lead organisation, i.e. sharing decision making and participatory governance.

### Disadvantages

- Lead challenges to management of SFs and contractors
- Increased risk for lead organisation if not in total control and without good working relationships with contractors
- Challenges to uniformity of approaches and SFs – but Lead can set up ‘coordination structures to ensure SFs work as a team and share knowledge and information.
- DOHA concern that SFs propping up other projects within CMO

### MODEL: CO-LOCATION of SF

- Lead org = fund holder. Governance role
- Lead org directly employs SF's who are co-located in CMOs
- Location of SF based on identified need/services
- SF reports to and is accountable to lead organisation

### Advantages:

- Lead has complete control over project and governance over SFs
- Reduced risks for lead and \$s in one place – easier to manage and monitor costs
- Easier to maintain accountability and performance management from Lead perspective
- Cost savings for lead: resource sharing, use of office space, training /on the job learning
- SFs have defined PIR role – not connected to other program roles of CMO
- Stronger team of SFs – shared culture and connectedness through lead
- SF has some ability to move between ML and CMO sectors and gain access to new ideas, share information
- Opportunities for informal and formal communication with agreed governance and decision making structures
- Fewer agreements to manage.
- Less need for time spent on collaboration, negotiation processes between orgs
- 

### Disadvantages:

#### Relationships & communication

- Co-location does not ensure integration
- Bad start to cross sector relationship building and collaborative processes
- Suggests distrust of the professional practice of NGO's and ability to manage
- Less collaborative model: less likely to build relationships, respect, trust between lead and CMOs
- Less supportive of sustainable outcomes, i.e. ongoing collaboration, development of equal relationships
- Reduces opportunities to maximise existing inter-sector and cross sector relationships
- Denies existing service providers full role of service provision and management of support staff

- which they are accustomed to doing in other successful cross sector partnerships, e.g. HASI
- Expectation of CMOs to provide expertise without recompense / equitable relationship

#### Service provision & systems

- Much broader role for Lead means less transparency & accountability & shared decision making opportunities and processes
- Loss of opportunity to develop systems of work and practice to support future initiatives aimed at bridging service gaps
- Less opportunity to work together developing systems for joint management of risk, quality assurance, evaluation and outcome measurement
- Does not allow for or value diversity of experience of NGOs, worker skills, sector understanding and connectedness to community and existing consumer relationships and skills in working with consumers with complex needs and persistent MI
- Less understanding and connectedness to target group
- Reduces opportunities for flexible and responsive approaches in service provision so necessary for target group

#### SFs

- No control of SF role by CMO
- SFs not truly integrated into community sector
- Doesn't provide true integration of SFs into CMO sector - cursory approach
- SF boundaries blurred
- SFs less understanding of the community sector services, programs, philosophy, practices
- SFs bring different attitude, personality, skillset to role, e.g. community and negotiation skills, professional judgement, consumer understanding
- Less opportunity for SF skill development, imbued knowledge

### SECONDMENT MODEL

- Lead org = fund holder. Governance role.
- Lead org directly employs SF's who are seconded /co-located out to CMOs – based on identified need/services

#### Difference between Co-location and Secondment model?

- More integrated model than co-location but depends entirely on consortia agreement on contracts and ongoing collaboration & shared decision making of consortium and with service providers throughout
- SF employed by lead but managed by each CMO – joint recruitment process
- Fully integrated in CMOs but 1 team of SFs
- Admin and capacity \$s for each SF

### FLEXIBLE MODEL

- ML led but consortia managed.
- SFs not embedded in a particular location – they float according to demand.
- Time spent in CMO to draw on organisational knowledge, sector programs, philosophies, etc
- Silent / virtual office for SFs and PIR coordination

Where does the SF staff come from (variable arrangements)? Can place strain on workforce.

#### Advantages:

##### Governance

- Lead has overarching control over project and governance over SFs
- Reduced risks for Lead and \$s in one place – easier to manage and monitor costs
- Easier to maintain accountability and performance management from Lead perspective

- Less complicated contracts to manage

SFs

- Improves integration of SF into the community sector and learn from existing relationships, systems, etc.
- SFs have defined PIR role – not connected to other program roles of CMO or distracted with competing priorities of CMO
- Stronger team of SFs – shared culture and connectedness through lead
- Ongoing opportunities for sharing information across the region
- Professional development through shared learning /on the job training
- SF support for each other - mentoring
- SF has opportunity to move between ML and CMO sectors and gain access to new ideas, share information and understanding
- Opportunities for informal and formal communication with agreed governance and decision making structures

Relationships, collaboration

- Better ongoing collaboration when consortia managed - builds relationships, respect, trust,
- Shows commitment to resolve differences by both parties – essential goodwill from the start
- Opportunity for reworking of partnership relationships and development of systems of work and practice which promote joint work at the different service points which will support future initiatives aimed at bridging service gaps ....

Service provision & systems

- System capacity building
- Sustainable outcomes: view to long term collaboration and sustainability irrespective of ongoing funding
- Values diversity of experience in of NGOs, worker skills and sector understanding
- NGO connectedness to community and understanding and experience of working with consumers.
- Allows for flexible and responsive approaches in service provision
- More likely to align with individualised and person-centred funding
- Focus on what is best for the consumer / target group rather than the \$s
- Improve on facilitated access to range of other services
- Support the aim of MLs to build equal working relationships with community based sector to develop communication pathways and improve the coordination of services to address service gaps
- Improves accountability for lead organisation, i.e. sharing decision making and participatory governance.

**Disadvantages:**

- Dependent on Lead org to maintain agreement to ongoing collaboration and shared decision-making and

**MIXED MODEL**

- Lead org = fund holder
- Mix of approaches depending on consortia preferences, area needs & services

**Advantages & disadvantages:**

Similar advantages and disadvantages to Co-location model but:

- Increased risk for CMOs and staffing arrangements
- HR nightmare for CMOs managing different staffing contracts and varied salaries