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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction
This study was completed as a thesis project for the University of Victoria’s Masters in Community Development Program. The City of Nanaimo commissioned this study to assess the feasibility of creating a collaborative environment in Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector (the Sector); to identify the conditions, decisions and actions required to support such an environment; and, to learn about organizational frameworks for structuring a new collaborative environment. The City, in its role as facilitator and community builder, hopes the study can be used by the Culture and Heritage sector and other relevant sectors to address equally challenging and important community issues.

Literature Review
The study's literature review examined scholarly research on collaboration theory, environmental conditions for optimum collaboration, current organizational models for collaboration, and collaboration practices and tools. Regardless of model or approach, trust, leadership, and governance practices based on shared interests were identified by most of the authors as key to collaboration success. The academic community identified knowledge sharing and relationship building as secondary key actions for creating a trusting collaborative environment.

Methods and Methodology
The study's methodology, a fusion of Asset-based Community Development and a community based needs assessment, was designed to gain knowledge of the Sector's collaboration assets, attitudes and behaviours, generate understanding and insight into collaboration success, and identify key actions to help the Sector shift into an improved collaborative environment. The study analyzed qualitative information gathered through primary research, which included an Asset-based survey and data review that complemented and built upon the findings from the literature review. The research, analysis, findings, and recommendations were developed using an interpretive and constructionist framework that acknowledges the ways people come to perceive their own world and experiences (Gurbrium & Holstein, 2000). The study was designed to provide evidence-based advice to the City of Nanaimo on steps it can take to support the Sector on its path to a new environment.

Survey Results and Key Findings
The study's primary research used an asset-based survey to gather responses from a representative sample of Nanaimo Culture and Heritage organizations that have previously applied for City funding. Based on the survey data analysis and findings, Sector organizations were found to be interested and excited to learn more about collaboration and cooperation and wanting to engage in a community-based model and practice. Specific to the client, another important finding is that the Sector is looking to the City of Nanaimo for greater leadership and a long-term commitment to ensure the Sector is sustainable and a respected and celebrated contributor to Nanaimo's cultural vitality. To complement the study an introduction of Promising Practices used in three jurisdictions, Kelowna, Calgary, and the United States was included to provide guidance and ideas and to help inform the City of Nanaimo’s future Culture and Heritage policy, organizational model, funding, and programming.
Discussion and Analysis

The study’s survey data analysis suggests that while Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector’s current attitudes toward collaboration provide a good starting platform to create the Sector's new, trust-based collaborative environment, its collaborative behaviors are concentrated at operational and tactical levels and are not sufficient at the governance or management levels to build necessary relationships and capacity. The Sector also appears to have limited understanding of collaboration theory, methods, and practices for collaborating at multiple organizational levels.

The study examined three collaborative model Options, Networks, Communities of Practice, and Constellations that could be used by the City and the Sector to create a new trust-based collaboration model.

Options to Consider and Recommendations

The study, based on its collective analysis, findings and discussions provides the following three options for the City to consider:

1. **Maintain the Status Quo** – The report proposes that the City's internal Culture and Heritage Department continue its current mandate and working methods using the current 2014-2010 Cultural Plan for a Creative Nanaimo (Cultural Plan) as the guide.

2. **Create and Sustain the Constellation Model** – The report proposes creating a Constellation Model for collaboration and a support network platform to enable the Sector players, of which the City is one, to self-govern, manage, and coordinate program and service delivery using the current Cultural Plan as the guide.

3. **Create an Independent Body** – The report proposes creating a City Council-appointed, independent body to govern, manage, and coordinate the Culture and Heritage program and service delivery in Nanaimo using the current Cultural Plan as the guide.

The following recommendations are based on a review of academic literature; analysis of survey findings on the attitudes, behaviors and practices of Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage organizations; the City’s preferred role; and, on an assessment of available collaboration models.

1. **Preferred Model** - That the City of Nanaimo advance The Constellation Model as the preferred model for its work with the community in creating a collaborative environment and sustainable service delivery model for Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector and the organizations in it.

2. **Resource Requirements** - That, if the City is unable to commit the necessary resources and support for the Constellation Model, that it take no further action in implementing a collaboration model for Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector.

3. **Arts Policy** - That regardless of option selected, the City in consultation with the community and using the current Cultural Plan, develop and approve an Arts Policy to further direct and guide the City's role in Culture and Heritage.

4. **Supporting Successful Cities** - That regardless of the option selected, the City work with the Culture and Heritage sector and representatives of other sectors to highlight to City Council and the community generally the value and benefits of Culture and Heritage in creating a successful city (Nanaimo and District Chamber of Commerce, 2012).

5. **Further Investigation** - That assuming the City embraces the recommended option, the City further investigates working examples of the Constellation Model and further research Community Innovation Labs.

[iii]
Conclusion

The study concludes that, based on assumptions that the City of Nanaimo and Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector will accept and implement the above recommendations and that all players will participate with goodwill and use their combined best-efforts, creating a trust-based, collaborative environment in Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector is indeed feasible and should be immediately and creatively pursued.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Nanaimo commissioned this feasibility study to explore approaches to create a more collaborative environment within Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector (the Sector), which comprises approximately 1000 organizations, groups, individuals and businesses with common yet distinct and diverse needs and goals. The City is keen to understand the desired attitudes, behaviours, and knowledge that are required to create and sustain a collaborative environment, the approaches, and actions that it could take to enable and support such an environment, and the governance framework that the Sector could consider to structure the new environment (Whitford, Lee, Yung & Jung, 2010, p. 323). This need and desire for creating new capacity for collaboration and partnerships in the Sector was a theme heard throughout the community and stakeholder process used to develop the 2014-2020 Cultural Plan for a Creative Nanaimo (Cultural Plan). Sector members are aware that ‘going-it-alone’ and not sharing resources could potentially place members and the Sector itself at risk in terms of groups disappearing, decreased opportunities for residents to participate in a variety of events, and decreased base level funding for individual groups (Survey Participants, 2014, q. 17).

The lack of collaboration is a long-term problem that is not unique to the Culture and Heritage sector or to the City of Nanaimo. For example, the City's Parks and Recreation Department has been evaluating models and strategies that it could use to create a more collaborative environment with its facility users. The Regional District of Kootenay Boundary has invited the Trail and District Arts Council to develop new approaches to working together and sharing resources differently in order to continue receiving the same levels of funding (BC Touring Council, 2014). Through professional conversation in 2014, the Corporation of Delta indicated it was seeking assistance and ideas on how to bring Delta's Culture and Heritage sector together and how it could change or adapt its approach to create a more supportive and cohesive environment (Ken Kuntz, personal communication, 2014).

As such, in addition to its use by the City of Nanaimo and Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector, this report may be an instructive resource for other City departments and other jurisdictions as they too foster and enable improved collaborative environments. This feasibility study was also completed as a capstone project for the University of Victoria’s Masters in Community Development program.

1.1 Study Problem and Objectives

1.1.1 Defining the Problem

Nanaimo's current cultural and heritage paradigm may be unsustainable if groups within the Culture and Heritage sector continue competing for finite resources and audiences and fail to work collaboratively (Survey Participants, 2014, q. 17). For this study, paradigm refers to how Culture and Heritage organizations interact with one another and the community and the organizations' inability to partner and collaborate within the sector to promote programs and services, raise and leverage funds, and diversify audiences (Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, 1997, webpage). MacIndoe and Sullivan (2014), define non-profit sustainability as how an "organization will be able to fulfill its commitments to its clients, its patrons and the community in which it operates (p. 2)." Indeed, shifting to a more sustainable paradigm is important to Nanaimo based on concerns raised by the Sector itself throughout the Cultural Plan input sessions (City of Nanaimo, 2014, p. 88).
Further, in 2015, the Culture and Heritage Department experienced increased numbers of organizations applying for first time and/or increased base level funding from the City of Nanaimo, and some groups offering reduced programs or seasonal offerings (Brennan, 2015a; City of Nanaimo, 2015a).

Feedback and discussions throughout the 2013-2014 cultural planning process also suggested that the lack of collaboration appears to be systemic, based on a history of individual groups acting in isolation for their own benefit, often to the detriment of other Culture and Heritage organizations (City of Nanaimo, 2014b, p. 88). One reason cited anecdotally as a root cause of the ongoing intra-sector fighting is Nanaimo's 1974 amalgamation, where municipal boundaries were extended to include a number of stand-alone communities that had their own flourishing non-profits.

Feedback also outlined how new organizations increase pressure on already stretched funding programs, decrease the community's leadership capacity by populating redundant but required boards, increase volunteer fatigue by using a limited pool of individuals for multiple roles and decrease the groups' abilities to generate ticket-sale revenues by diluting audiences (City of Nanaimo, 2014b, p. 88; Survey Participants, 2014, q. 17 & 22).

As explained to Sector representatives at a Culture and Heritage sector grant review session in January, 2015, local and provincial government agencies view the Sector as competitive and splintered, leaving it vulnerable to environmental impacts such as economic downturn, funding program reduction (i.e. Casino Funding), and competition from emerging groups both within the Sector and in other sectors (Melinda Mollineaux, personal communication, 2015).

Instead of joining forces with others to deliver programs and services, new organizations and societies continue to form on a regular basis, stressing the Sector's reliance on local government funding and increasing its vulnerability to competing funding interests. As evidenced through City Council discussions, conflicting and competing interests from other sectors also impede the Culture and Heritage sector's ability to grow and positively impact the community's economic, social and cultural health (City of Nanaimo, 2015a). In discussions with each other and with the City’s Culture and Heritage Department, Culture and Heritage groups often anecdotally compare themselves to organizations in other sectors and their perceptions of how much "the sport groups" receive from the City in the form of funding and infrastructure support.

Based on survey responses and Council discussions regarding arts and culture funding and Council’s perceived failure of ‘25 Victoria Road’ as a small theatre, the Culture and Heritage sector's ongoing inability to collaborate directly affects its credibility with local politicians, residents, and some City Departments, making it challenging to secure project and funding approval for large-scale initiatives and ongoing operations (City of Nanaimo, 2014a; City of Nanaimo, 2014c; Survey Participants, 2014, q. 17).

The Sector's continuing viability is further compounded by the increasing volume and size of funding requests its members make to the City and the uneven political and community response the requests generate (City of Nanaimo, 2014a).
1.1.2 Study Objectives

The study’s principal objective as approved by the client, the City, was to determine the feasibility of improving the collaborative environment in Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector by assessing the effort required to shift the sector into a new environment. Its three secondary objectives, also client-approved were to:

- Understand the sector’s existing collaborative environment and identify a desired future state environment that could further Nanaimo’s commitment to support a healthy and prosperous community that recognizes the importance of creativity and cultural vitality for quality of life and place as outlined in the Cultural Plan (City of Nanaimo, 2014b);
- Identify tools and approaches that could be used to leverage the knowledge and assets of Nanaimo’s culture and heritage organizations and to promote learning, planning and delivering services effectively together in a collaborative environment; and
- Identify and recommend a collaboration model and strategies that the City of Nanaimo could use to help build capacity in Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector (Vernis, Iglesias, Sanz & Saz-Carranze, 2006, p. 11; Wenger, n.d.).

It was hoped that the study can offer a contemporary contribution to the academic and professional literature on the benefits of using Culture and Heritage as an anchor for community development.

1.2 Research Questions

The research questions were designed to achieve the study’s objectives by developing a comprehensive understanding of Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector’s collaborative environment from three perspectives: current reality; desired future state; and the capacity and resources required to shift the sector from the former to the later, often referred to as a community needs assessment.

The primary research question asked: “What attitudes, behaviours and knowledge shape the current environment of Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector?” The secondary research question asked: “How could the City of Nanaimo use collaboration to affect change in the environment and foster and support the Sector in building capacity as it shifts into the desired collaborative environment?” (Uhl-Bien, Marion & McKelvey, 2007, p. 307). The answers interpreted separately and together, informed the study’s findings and recommendations.

1.3 Client and Study Rationale/Importance

1.3.1 The Client

The City of Nanaimo is the study’s client and is represented by its General Manager of Corporate Services who reports to the City Manager. As a senior corporate leader, the General Manager is responsible for a number of civic departments: Planning and Development; Finance; Human Resources; Legislative and Information Technology; and Strategic Relations (Appendix B).

1.3.2 Study Rationale/Importance

Community engagement and developing new ways for the community to work together and with the City is a high priority for City Council and the organization as outlined in the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan (City of Nanaimo, 2012).
Further, the City endorsed the Nanaimo and District Chamber of Commerce's *Successful Cities: Rethinking Nanaimo* action plan that highlights culture as a key pillar of a successful city (Chamber of Commerce, 2012). Securing Council approval for the 2014 - 2020 *Cultural Plan for a Creative Nanaimo* and early implementation wins, including increased operating and events funding, created an opportunity to leverage the positive energy into a more structured collaborative environment.

Responding to overwhelming community interest and support for its *Cultural Plan*, the City adopted Cultural Vitality as one of its four pillars of sustainability in its 2012-2015 *Strategic Plan*, and in late 2013 created a stand-alone Culture and Heritage Department (City of Nanaimo, 2012, p. 6). Prior to creating the new Department, the City's Culture Services division existed within the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department and its Heritage Planner was located in the Current Planning Department.

To further advance Culture and Heritage sector initiatives and to foster a sense of collegiality, a Cultural Managers' Working Group was appointed in 2014 to work alongside City staff (Appendix A). The study has become increasingly important given the 2014 municipal election and the anticipated priorities of the new City Council. Based on early City Council deliberations, it appears the changed political landscape may result in a lessening of support for Culture and Heritage initiatives. This makes it increasingly important that the Sector create strong intra-sector and inter-sector connections and collaboration to demonstrate to the community and politicians its value and contributions to Nanaimo's vitality and to ensure its continued viability and sustainability (City of Nanaimo, 2015a).

1.4 Background

The City of Nanaimo, home to more than 87,000 residents, is central Vancouver Island's largest city, a 90-minute, 111 kilometre drive north from Victoria or a 20-minute flight or 90-minute ferry ride from Vancouver (City of Nanaimo, 2010; Distance Chart, n.d. –See Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Map of Central Vancouver Island. From Tourism Vancouver Island Website. 2014.Retrieved from http://www.vancouverisland.travel/regions/cenral-island/](http://www.vancouverisland.travel/regions/cenral-island/)
As part of a 2012-13 Cultural-Mapping Project, a self-identified mapping exercise that formed part of the data collection for the 2014-2020 Cultural Plan for a Creative Nanaimo, more than 1000 private businesses and not-for profit organizations, groups, and individuals identified themselves as part of the Culture and Heritage sector (City of Nanaimo, 2014b). For this study, a purposeful sample of groups that have applied for City of Nanaimo Cultural funding in the past four years was selected as the target population for the primary research (Fiscal 2011-2014).

According to the City of Nanaimo’s Cultural Plan “culture celebrates our diverse values; and helps create a community that is welcoming, inclusive, compassionate, caring and supportive of all our citizens” (City of Nanaimo, 2014b, p. 35). The Cultural Plan is designed to make Nanaimo a healthy and prosperous community that recognizes the importance of creativity and cultural vitality for quality of life and place. Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector is a vibrant part of the city’s economy and quality of life, generating a total economic impact estimated at $154 million (Kunin & Associates, 2013, p. 2).

The Sector includes both professional and volunteer non-profit organizations, many of which rely on City of Nanaimo funding to leverage funding from other levels of government and corporate sponsors. For example, according to a 2015 Council Report, of the $231,826 Cultural Operating funding and $30,330 Festival and Events funding the City provided to eligible groups, these amounts represented nine percent of groups’ overall operating budgets and five percent of the groups’ overall events budget, underscoring the importance City grants play in leveraging additional funding (Brennan, 2015b). These figures do not included line item cultural investment directed by the City to the Port Theatre Society, Nanaimo and District Museum Society, and Nanaimo Art Gallery Society.

1.5 Report Organization

This report includes a literature review, an analysis of a field survey, an exploration of Promising Practices, and a set of findings and recommendations that are designed to assist the City of Nanaimo in understanding how it can best contribute to helping create a more collaborative environment for Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector.

The literature review section examines relevant, scholarly published materials on collaboration in general, collaborative environments, collaboration models, and factors required for a collaborative environment. The literature review helped identify the approaches and tools; especially those that foster shared learning and understanding that the City of Nanaimo might consider adopting to help Culture and Heritage sector organizations' shift their attitudes and behaviours and become stronger collaborators. The study's conceptual framework recognizes the City as just one entity in the Culture and Heritage sector.

The methodology section outlines the study's approach to the research and analysis of data and literature. Using a community based needs assessment and an Asset-based Community Development (ABCD) methodology; research participants were asked to identify individual and organizational strengths while providing insight into Sector needs. Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) argue that traditional needs based studies “focus on a community's needs, deficiencies and problems”, where Mathie and Cunningham (2003), suggest that ABCD “draws attention to social assets: the particular talents of individuals, as well as the social capital inherent in the relationships that fuel local associations and informal networks” (p. 1; p. 474).
An Asset-based survey of a representative sample of Culture and Heritage sector organizations was used to gather primary research, with data analyzed using an interpretive and constructionist framework, with interpretation based on understanding, meanings, and actions recognizing that responses reflect the respondents' own worldviews and understandings (Lincoln & Guba, 2013, pp. 45 & 88).

Given her dual role as principal researcher and City staff, the author critically reflected throughout the analysis on her personal associations and relationships in the Sector, personal bias and personal values (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 127).

The findings and discussion sections explore the current state of the Sector's collaborative environment, the desired future state, and interventions that the City, and the Sector players themselves, can take to make the essential shifts required to create a new collaborative environment. This section also includes a Promising Practices section that introduces selected collaborative models used in other Canadian jurisdictions. The intention of the jurisdictional scan is to broaden awareness, stimulate thinking and to illustrate that alternate models are working successfully in other local governments.

The recommendations and conclusions section propose specific actions, including a potential new operational model, for the City of Nanaimo to consider and implement as it decides best. The recommendations focus on approaches and tools that mobilize existing assets and build on others to create a collaborative community climate grounded in theories of inter-organizational networks, Communities of Practice and Constellation Models. The report concludes that there is sufficient potential to create a new collaborative environment for Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector and that realizing that potential requires bold, creative and committed action by the City and all Sector participants.
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review is broken into three distinct yet complementary sections. Section one focuses on collaboration principles, section two focuses on knowledge, behaviours and attitudes required for collaboration, and section three focuses on tools and approaches the City of Nanaimo can use to assist in creating a collaborative environment in the Culture and Heritage sector. While there appears to be little direct literature related to creating collaborative environments in the cultural sector, Gajda and Kaliba (2007), suggest that models used for collaboration in other sectors, such as education, provide relevant learning opportunities (p. 27). A fourth section introduces a proposed Concept Model that ties the study's literature review, research findings, and propose action plan into an possible system-change intervention.

2.1 Collaboration Principles and Sustainability

The City of Nanaimo has adopted collaboration as a qualifying requirement for groups seeking its funding assistance. The literature indicates that collaboration is becoming a mandated solution by funders as a method for encouraging or requiring non-profit organizations to share resources and potentially, become more sustainable (Cropper, 1996, p. 81; MacIndoe & Sullivan, 2014, p. 2; Vernis, Iglesias, Sanz & Saz-Carranza, 2006, p. 23). Applicants, too, increasingly view collaboration as a necessity for strengthening nonprofits as illustrated by the Arts NSW 2014 Region and Sector Report highlighting collaboration and networking as a strategic priority/opportunity for arts groups and organizations in each of its jurisdictions (ArtsNSW, 2014).

The literature presents a number of definitions for collaboration. In general, working together was the common theme throughout the definitions. For example, MacIndoe and Sullivan (2014) endorsed Guo and Acar’s 2005 definition that collaboration is “what occurs when different nonprofit organizations work together to address problems through joint effort, resources, and decision-making and shared ownership of the final product or service (p. 3).” Others define collaboration more simply as organizations working together as opposed to individuals working together (Chrislip, 2002, p. 42; Huxham & Vangen, 2000a, p. 1159; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b, p. 772). While the above definitions fit the environment the City hopes to assist in creating, it is also important to recognize that Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector is a complex system, and the City is just one entity or ‘actor’ in that system and in other sectors too. In this context, a more applicable definition to use is cross-sector collaboration, which is the “linking or sharing of information, resources, activities and capabilities… in two or more sectors to achieve jointly an outcome…”(Agranoff, R. 2008, p. 321; Bryson, Crosby & Middleton, 2006, p. 44; Gray, 1996, p. 58).

Sustainability is another frequently used term and funding criteria in the culture sector (Himmelman, 1996, p. 36; Huxham, 1996, p. 2; MacIndoe & Sullivan, 2014, p. 2). The City of Nanaimo, with culture vitality as one of its four pillars, defines sustainability as “an organization’s ability to meet its mandate in the long-term, with collaboration an important evaluation criteria”, a definition that is supported throughout the literature (City of Nanaimo, 2012, p. 10; MacIndoe & Sullivan, 2014, p. 3; Vernis et al., 2006, p. 71). The City’s definition aligns with other governments, such as Massachusetts, where MacIndoe & Sullivan (2014), suggest that non-profits look at inter-organization strategies that lead to improved performance and bottom-line performance (p. 2; Himmelman, 1996, p. 24).
While supporting collaboration as a tool for creating community, Winkler (2006) and Reddy and Jansen (2007), suggest that creating a collaborative environment requires successive and multiple touches to create a shared identity and sense of community (p. 128; p. 258). Further, a number of authors suggest that whether through formal or informal agreements, behaviours and expectations ranging from how new members are added to the group, to agenda setting, to codes of conduct, and similar 'rules of engagement' need to be stated and must reflect the ultimate culture of the group (Cropper, 1996, p. 96; Vangen & Huxham, 2003, p. 22; Winkler, 2006, p. 128).

This report reflects an ABCD methodology and uses collaboration as a way to bring identified complementary skills, knowledge, and abilities to the table in ways that enable groups to work together, share and mentor, and leverage opportunities to create social innovation (Huddart, 2010, p. 222; Vangen & Huxham, 2003; Wheatley, 2006, p. 104). The literature identifies collective action and inter-organizational networks, specifically Communities of Practice, as foundational structures for creating collaborative environments (Born, 2008, p. 58; Johnson, 2001, p. 46; Li et al., 2009, p. 6193; Provan & Kenis, 2007, p. 231). Wenger (n.d.) defines Communities of Practice as “groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (p. 1). According to the literature, collaboration builds on the social assets and identified strengths of participating organizations to create competitive advantage and social innovation by promoting new ways of working together and by building legitimacy for the collaborative partners (Born, 2008, p. 77; Bryson, et al., p. 51; Johnson, 2001, p. 49; Mathie & Cunningham, 2003, p. 476; Vernis et al., 2006, p. 75).

2.1.2 Barriers to Collaboration

While conceptually collaboration appears to be one way for Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage organizations to share resources and expenses, volunteers and audiences, and leverage funding and projects, practically there are a number of collaboration challenges and barriers to be addressed before successful inter-organizational collaboration is realized. According to the literature, the two key barriers, mistrust of other nonprofits and outside organizations, and long-term, intra-sector conflict, must be overcome for collaboration to be successful (Huxham & Vangen, 2000b, p. 773; Lank, 2006, p. 23; Sink, 1996, p. 102; Winkler, 2006). The literature also highlights that one of collaboration’s greatest strengths is setting the community’s shared norms, patterns, and beliefs, which may assist in overcoming some of the long-held mistrust and reducing intra-sector conflict (Agranoff, R., 2008, p. 326; Li, Grimshaw, Nielsen, Judd, Coyte & Graham, 2009, p. 5).

Offering insight into Nanaimo’s history of organizational conflict, Agranoff (2008), outlines “agency power to block agendas or agreements, collective aversion of risky or controversial problems, process breakdowns, shortfalls or withholding of important program resources, failure to meet critical time lines, barriers presented by policy design limits, unwillingness of political decision makers to make policy accommodations, and technical gaps in finding solutions” as barriers to collaboration (p. 345; Bryson et al., 2006, p. 50; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b, p. 773). Numerous sources cited lack of trust between organizations as one of the key barriers to collaboration in both Networks and Communities of Practice (Bryson et al., 2006, p. 46; Goldstein & Butler, 2010, p. 240; Vangen & Huxham, 2003, p. 12; Ulbrich, Troitzsch, van den Anker, Plüss, & Huber, 2009, p. 160; Vernis et al., 2006, p. 34:).
Numerous authors noted that knowledge and/or worker exchange between organizations is one way to build inter-organization trust and capacity (Lank, 2006, p. 8; Vernis et al., 2006, p. 142).
The literature cautions governments against using legislation or mandating collaborative behaviour as a way to assist in creating nonprofit sustainability, even when it might not be an effective solution (Elson, 2007, p. 52). Bryson et al. (2006), suggest that more times than not, groups will not collaborate if they are achieving individual success and, that governments that expect collaboration without knowing if it will work, or what it will achieve, can put the groups in a no-win situation (p. 45).

MacIndoe and Sullivan (2014), suggest that financially vulnerable organizations are less likely to participate in collaboration, contradicting one of the fundamental rationales that local governments use to promote collaboration (p. 8; Vernis et al., 2006, p. 55). Additional barriers that can critically impact a nonprofit organization’s interest and/or ability to collaborate, as outlined by MacIndoe & Sullivan (2014) included lack of organizational capacity, size, experience, and board leadership (p. 8). Several sources concurred, including Vernis et al. (2006), who identified competition for resources and users, time constraints, lack of resources, self-serving purposes, fear-of-change, and prior negative interactions as behaviours and attitudes restricting non-profit collaboration (pp. 69-70; Sink, 1996, pp. 101-102; Vangen & Huxham, 2003, p. 17).

2.2 Knowledge, Behaviours and Attitudes

The literature underscores the importance of organizations wanting to act collaboratively sharing knowledge about collaboration, having common behaviours that support collaboration, and developing attitudes that balance the needs and outcomes of the collaborative with the needs and outcomes of individual organizations. From the earliest to the most-recent literature reviewed, and regardless of environmental factors or model selected, trust, leadership, and governance practices are three key tenets for collaboration in Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector (Chrislip, 2002, p. 30; Hernández, 2009, p. 92; Himmelman, 1996, p. 34; Kitchenham, A., 2008, p. 143; Lank, 2006, pp. 8-9; Putnam, 2000 p. 137; Ulbrich et al., 2009, p. 160). Honesty and integrity, openness, professionalism, mutual respect, and agreed-upon norms or a code-of-conduct are also identified as key collaboration elements (Miller & Cohen-Katz, 2010, p. 338; Shadi & Afsarmanesh, 2011, p. 264). As a direct response to the identified collaboration barriers, Gajda and Kaliba (2007), outline “(a) shared purpose, (b) cycle of inquiry, (c) dialogue, (d) decision making, (e) action, and (f) evaluation” as key components necessary for collaboration (p. 29; Bryson et al., 2006, p. 46; Vernis, et al., 2006, p. 43).

Knowledge sharing is deemed to be an important trait in creating an environment that supports the behaviours that the literature identifies as important factors in fulsome collaboration. As supported by others, Shadi and Afsarmanesh (2011, p. 265), indicate that “good communication, shared decision-making, creativity, fairness, flexibility, shared interests or purpose, knowledge sharing, joy in working together, visible leadership, readiness, open and honest participation, willingness to commit resources and capabilities, development of social skills, and transparency in provision of information” are behaviours shared by partners in successful collaborative networks (Johnson & Gonzalez, 2013, p. 2317; Vernis et al., 2006, pp. 82-83).

While individual behaviours appear to factor strongly in the success of collaboration, the literature highlights incentives and rewards, shared value systems, and governance structures as key collective behaviours (Agranoff, 2008, p. 334; Reddy & Jansen, 2007, p. 258; Shadi & Afsarmanesh, 2011, pp. 268-269; Vernis et al., 2006, p. 87). Vorakultripat and Rezgui (2009), claim participatory governance and shared decision-making is integral to creating a collaborative culture and while Winkler’s 2006 statement supports the concept that most decisions should be made jointly as part of any collaborative
approach taken, he proposes that some decision-making authority could be delegated depending on the governance framework (p. 162; p. 127).

Additionally, Vernis et al. (2006), recognize increased exposure and communication, knowledge sharing and mutual areas of benefit as critical behaviors for cross-sector collaboration (p. 38; Ulbrich et al., 2009, p. 150) and for collaborations to continue long-term. Vernis et al. (2006), argue there needs to be continued reason and benefit for collaboration and the ability and tools to deal with conflicts among the participants (p. 34; Gray, 1996, p. 65). Vernis et al. (2006), also postulate that the complexity of the times, accountability and sustainability expectations, and technology-based collaboration tools create a positive environment for potential collaboration success (pp. 70-71; Chrislip, 2002, pp. 248-249).

When reviewed as a collective, the above knowledge, behaviours, and attitudes appear to offer the necessary ingredients to mitigate both organizational and individual barriers to collaboration, setting the stage for mutually advantageous relationships.

2.3 Tools and Approaches

While the literature outlines numerous tools and approaches available to the City of Nanaimo and the Culture and Heritage sector, a critical success factor for collaboration is providing opportunities for trust-building, shared experiences, knowledge development, and Sector participation in selecting a collaboration framework model.

Vernis et al. (2006), argue that with the change in the Sector's collaboration attitude, City government action in creating collaboration-focused teams, and providing training in and opportunity for collaboration could stimulate consolidation of nonprofit service providers and enhancement in the collaborative environment (pp. 85-86; Florida, 2002, p. 318). As part of any collaboration training curriculum, the literature highlights the need to reinforce nonprofit boards and governance structures, to assist nonprofits with transparent practices, and to develop the competencies of the nonprofit’s staff and volunteers (MacIndoe, & Sullivan, 2014, p. 8; Vernis, et al., 2006, p. 87). MacIndoe and Sullivan (2014) also argue that nonprofit organizations' leadership capacities and revenue sources are important considerations when creating a collaborative environment.

Based on Innes and Booher’s (1999) findings, Bryson et al., (2006), identify that collaboration can result in three levels of change: first-order change is described as quick-wins such as strategies or “creation of capital”; second-order change is described as “new partnerships”; and third-order change is described as long-term such as “new collaborations” or “adaptation of services” (p. 5; Mullett & McCaig, 2008, p. 206). Recognizing that levels of change relate to levels of trust, Vangen and Huxham’s (2003) “trust-building loop” (Figure 2) and “small-wins” approach offers a decision-making lens for selecting tools and approaches for building trust and momentum and underpin the need for a lead organization to create trust-building opportunities and quick wins (p. 25).
Goldstein and Butler (2010), identify the importance of expanding beyond old collaborative tools (joint-meetings, open houses, town halls) to new approaches that promote trust through sharing and interacting (pp. 9 & 24). Other literature supports this approach and recommends activities that bring groups together to promote positive interaction, identify shared purpose and identity, further each group’s mandate, and provide capacity building opportunities as important collaboration building exercises (Miller & Cohen-Katz, 2010, p. 338; Putnam, 2000, p. 136; Ulbrich et al., 2009, p. 150; Vorakulpipat & Rezgui, 2009, p. 162).

Appreciative Inquiry is identified as another helpful tool in fostering collaboration. Born (2008), describes Appreciative Inquiry as “story hearing” where organizations try to learn about the best of each other (p. 147). It was also suggested that Appreciative Inquiry exercises can challenge pre-existing or perceived power rankings of the participants by using role-reversal, which could assist in changing long-held perceptions within the Culture and Heritage sector (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003, p. 479).

Vorakulpipat & Rezgui (2009), point out the importance of strong social relationships in building collaborative cultures, which can be challenging to achieve in exclusively virtual environments (p. 162; Agranoff, 2008, p. 334; Putnam, 2000, p. 176). Creating both online and face-to-face opportunities for individuals to learn with and from one another, achieve small-wins, make decisions, problem-solve, and celebrate are important network-building approaches (Jones, Hesterly & Borgatti, 1997, p. 929; Vorakulpipat & Rezgui, 2009, p. 162). Supported by Goldstein and Butler (2010), Samborski (Strengthening Nanaimo’s Creative Sector: The Creative Nanaimo Network paper, 2014) identifies a network-based capacity building exercise that incorporates a variety of activities to build and create collaborative opportunities and learning (Appendix D) (p. 240).

The literature counsels that creating opportunity for groups wanting to collaborate to participate in developing a governance framework for working together on a spectrum of projects and issues (from creating a collaborative environment to lobbying for additional funding) is a critical element in creating a collaborative culture (Himmelman, 1996, p. 24; Winkler, 2006, p. 128).
2.3.1 Networks

While the literature identifies a number of potential frameworks, this study focuses on Networks, Communities of Practice, and Constellation Models. Provan and Kenis (2007) define networks as a framework for multi-organizational governance (p. 229); however, the authors recognize a need for a governance structure (formal or informal) to ensure “collective and mutually supportive action” (p. 231).

This study presents three, formal network governance models. On one end of the spectrum is a participatory model, where the network is governed by all its participating organizations (Provan & Kenis, 2007, p. 233). On the opposite end of the spectrum, the network is brokered by a third-party, or Network Administrative Organization (NAO) (Bryson et al. p. 49). The in-between, third model sees one of the network’s organizations take the lead on the majority of governance tasks (Provan & Kenis, 2007, p. 233). The literature highlights that one challenge with inter-organizational networks is that the structure is loose, not tight and hierarchy is non-existent and identifies that for a Network to be successful, there is need for a network coordinator or lead organization (Morgan, 2005, p. 9; Provan & Kenis, 2007, p. 233; Winkler, 2006, pp. 120 & 124).

Three leadership opportunities, referred to as “leadership media” by Huxham and Vangen (2006), represent how network leadership can be generated: by an appointed leader (by the participants); agenda setting (the structure); and communication (processes) (Uhl-Bien, et al., 2006, p. 659; Winkler, 2006, p. 120). Having a lead organization carry out network administrative functions can also be seen as basic form of governance structure and can serve as an initial or interim framework, allowing participants to create the collaborative model as they build trust and network identity and eliminate collaboration barriers (Provan & Kenis, 2007, p. 235; Winkler, 2006, p. 127).

Vangen and Huxham (2003), outline the importance of shared aims and common purpose as key components to developing a network and building trust (p. 18; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b, p. 779). Building on this, Winkler (2006) suggests two approaches to align goals: the first is to get “agreement on aims”; the second is to find a balance between the common and competitive outcomes of the groups through “joint-action” (pp. 120-121). Relating this idea within the Nanaimo context, Gajda and Kaliba (2007, p. 29) argue that the goal of the Sector might be to move forward with creating and leveraging partnering relationships through collaborative opportunities with supporting joint-action outcomes to follow (Winkler, 2006, p. 126).

2.3.2 Communities of Practice

Wenger (n.d.) defines Communities of Practice as “groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (p. 1). As depicted in Figure 3, Wenger (1998) further describes Communities of Practice as “the embodiment of interpersonal collaboration,” “existing within, between and outside organizations” and that form out of necessity. Wicks, using his simpler definition, describe Communities of Practice as a group of similar-type professionals (Gajda & Kaliba, 2007, p. 27; Johnson, 2001, p. 48). Johnson (2001) suggests that Communities of Practice originated in adult-learning environments and is founded in constructivism, which places the learning and success in the hands of the learners, or participants (p. 47).
In Communities of Practice, similar to the Network experience, trust plays a key role in predetermining success of the community, with the need for shared goals and an identified leader, coach or mentor to assist with group and learning facilitation (p. 50; Snyder et al., 2003, p. 21). Communities of supportive individuals are one of the attractive models to support collaboration. The literature advocates that a strong learning community fosters interactions and relationships based on mutual respect and trust (Li et al., 2009, p. 3; Snyder, Wenger & De Sousa Briggs, 2003, p. 18).

Snyder et al. (2003), indicate that collaborative success in a Communities of Practice is tied to having three levels of leadership: a Community of Practice coordinator; support for each identified initiative; and an over-arching “executive sponsor” (p. 20; Li et al., 2003, p. 6; Vangen & Huxham, 2003, p. 15). Similar to a participatory Network led by an identified organization, a community coordinator manages the administrative function of the Community of Practice (p. 47; Goldstein & Butler, 2010, p. 240). The support team is a group of individuals who carry out the initiatives and actions of the Communities of Practice. The executive sponsor, drawn from within community participants, lends credibility to the Community of Practice, increasing its likelihood for success (Bryson et al., 2006, p. 47; Snyder et al., 2003, p. 21; Vernis et al., 2006, p. 75).

When using Communities of Practice as the collaboration model, Snyder et al. (2003), suggest the following steps when creating a governance framework or leadership structure: attract and educate a sponsor board; identify shared focus and priorities; establish roles and responsibilities of leadership levels; and provide training for both leadership and community members (p. 20).

Communities of Practice, when used in conjunction with Asset-Based Community Development practices, can connect organizations and leverage assets, thereby generating “social capital” and building capacity (Li et al., p. 7; Montreal Urban Ecology Centre, 2014, p. 2; Snyder et al., 2003, p. 20). Communities of Practice members, similar to Network members, identify opportunities, define problems and seek innovative solutions (Huddart, 2010, p. 223; Snyder et al., 2003, p. 20). Through relationships and engagement, members of a Community of Practice share assets and experience, professional development and mentorship opportunities, and engage in collaboration (Snyder et al., 2003, p. 20).
2.3.3 Constellation Model

There was limited literature on and limited examples of the Constellation Model; however, there was little differentiation in the authors’ definitions and implementation strategies. Ziegler (2009) defines the Constellation Model as a collaborative framework that is consistent with systems thinking, where “opportunities drive action” (p. 1). The Constellation Model’s framework is grounded in complexity theory where groupings or “constellations” of partners come together in “loose coupling”, balancing each organization’s self-interests and strengths with a shared magnetic attractor, or vision (Hernández, 2009, p. 93; Surman, 2006, p. 13; Surman & Surman, 2008, p. 26). Surman (2006) also describes the Constellation Model as action-based work teams that result from a “balance between strong base of roles, responsibilities, vision, strategy and planning” (p. 3; United Way of Calgary, 2011).

Depicted in Figure 4, a Constellation Model forms when actors come together in response to a “magnetic attractor” or shared opportunity and create a steering committee or stewardship group and develop: assumptions (guiding principles); a vision (identify the end-change being sought); and a plan (framework) to achieve the change (Surman, 2006, p. 5). According to available literature, most specifically the Centre for Social Innovation (n.d.), the Constellation Model is a “complexity-inspired framework designed to hold collaborations within dynamic systems…. And supports multi-organization partnerships and network” (Pithon, 2009, p. 825; StepUp BC, n.d., p. 3; Surman, 2006, p. 1).

![Figure 4. Constellation Model. Retrieved from Ontario Smart Growth Network. (n.d.).](image)

Critical to the success of the Constellation, the partners must agree on a third-party secretariat or coordination function and that leadership be shared on a project basis (Surman, 2006, p. 6; Surman & Surman, 2008, p. 26). Outlined by StepUp BC (n.d.), having a strong magnetic attractor or raison d’être is a key success factor for the Constellation Model (p. 18). Focusing on the magnetic attractor, each team works on different aspects of the project, program or initiative.

It appears from the literature that the Constellation Model is less formal than other models, with constellations being permeable and members able to participate in more than one constellation (or collaboration).
Once work is completed, the constellation dies and actor energies can then be harnessed in another initiative (Surman, 2006, p. 7; United Way of Calgary, 2011).

As with other models, the Constellation Model has positive attributes and challenges. A Constellation Model attribute, as presented in the literature, is the division of labour, enabling constellation members to focus on the vision or goal, the stewardship group to invest energy in governance and the secretariat to concentrate on coordinating day-to-day activities (StepUp BC, n.d., p. 18; Surman & Surman, 2008, p. 25). While a Constellation Model proponent, Ziegler (2009), identifies its challenges as including: collaborative capacity; power; managing the virtual organization, and dealing with change (p. 1). These challenges are similar to those faced by other models.

2.3.4 Model Comparison

Asset-Based Collaboration, as presented by Mathie and Cunningham (2003), regardless of specific model, whether Networks, Communities of Practice or Constellation, as selected by the participants, can have a beneficial impact on Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector’s collaborative environment (Surman, 2006, pp. 6-7). Regardless of model choice, the literature advises that starting informally and moving towards a more formal model as success grows is a preferred method of building inter-sector trust and cooperation and negating conflict (Hanleybrown, Kania & Kramer, 2012, p. 8 & 39). Huddart (2010) argues “aligning efforts to address complex problems across sectors stimulates innovation, increases productivity, and confers competitive advantage” (p. 225). Vernis et al. (2006) suggest that by creating a social network, public and nonprofit collaborations can ensure continuity (p. 65). The literature references cooperative and other more formal agreements ways of providing long-term direction for collaborations (Vernis et al. 2006, p. 62; Winkler, 2006, p. 121).

There is no unanimous endorsement in the literature for any of the three models examined. Vernis et al. (2006) advocate for Networks as one of the “most flexible collaboration forms on account of its low formalization”, while Gajda and Kaliba (2007) consider a Community of Practice the strongest form of collaboration and Networking the weakest (p. 77; p. 32). Goldstein and Butler (2010) offer a hybrid approach, arguing that combining a Network approach with Communities of Practice “nurture and distributes expertise, sustains collaborative practice at multiple scales, and amplifies the potential for change (p. 32; p. 239). While literature is limited on the Constellation Model, the working examples provided by the Centre for Social Innovation, the Ontario Nonprofit Network, the United Way of Calgary and StepUp BC illustrate how an organizing body can champion the collaborative change through a legitimate coordinating role (Surman & Surman, 2008).

Given that there is no consensus on a preferred model, Bolman & Deal (2008) argue that Communities of Practice are better able to move projects forward, share culture, and increase mentorship than formal structures (p. 220). As a working example of a complex and diverse community applying Communities of Practice, the Montreal Urban Ecology Centre’s 2014 draft Active Neighbourhoods Canada - Community of Practice guideline (Appendix E), suggests that a neighbourhood Community of Practice could “provide a forum for increasing our capacity to engage citizens in transforming their neighbourhoods and to share this knowledge widely… and “contribute to changing the culture of planning to become a more collaborative process between professionals and community members”. Noting the similarities between Networks and Communities of Practice, Agranoff (2008) presents the potential for a Community of Practice to develop as part of Network collaboration and that with Network partner support, could “expand the crossing of boundaries, encourage learning, support community development and foster belonging” (p. 333; Bolman and Deal, 2008; Goldstein & Butler, 2010, p. 239; Li et al., 2009, p. 7).
Wheatley & Frieze (2006) suggest a natural systems change progression occurs when Networks mature to Communities of Practice and become systems of influence. Wheatley (2006) explains that when a Network transitions into a Community of Practice the organizations commit to being available to one another and to expanding the community’s knowledge (p. 177). Wheatley and Frieze (2006) argue “In spite of current ads and slogans, the world doesn't change one person at a time. It changes as networks of relationships form among people who discover they share a common cause and vision of what's possible” (p. 1).

2.4 Conceptual Framework

Based on the literature, fostering a more collaborative future environment for Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector requires building and strengthening inter-sector trust and cooperation by increasing participants’ collaborative knowledge and using that knowledge to help participants shift their attitudes and behaviours (Vernis et al., 2006, pp. 69-70).

As demonstrated by the literature, regardless of the collaborative model selected by Sector participants, a balance between participatory practices and consistent and capable leadership will be integral to long-term success (Bryson et al., 2006, pp. 42&43). Landry further notes that any organization (e.g.: The City of Nanaimo) wanting to improve inter-sector collaboration must focus its energies on increasing Sector knowledge and capacity and making programmatic changes that promote interaction and shared experiences to change organizational attitudes and thereby shift organizational behaviours (Landry, 2011, p. 29).

Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector’s operating environment is influenced by a complex system comprising not only of the Culture and Heritage groups and the City, but other actors (those directly operating within the Nanaimo Culture and Heritage system such as Vancouver Island University, Snuneymuxw First Nation, for-profit Culture and Heritage organizations), and stakeholders (those not directly operating within the Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector such as the private sector, other levels of government, other community-benefit organizations). This expanded group of actors and stakeholders can influence collaboration success and must be considered when designing and implementing a new collaborative environment for the Sector.

The following concept model (Figure 5) illustrates how the literature findings and collaboration-based tools and approaches can be combined into an integrated, knowledge-based change strategy to build inter-sector awareness and trust as a first-step towards a new collaborative environment for Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector. The model reflects the literature’s findings that trust building, as part of an early implementation phase, may also be an outcome of a more collaborative environment. The model will help the Sector understand how an increase in knowledge that spawns changes in attitudes and behaviors may result in an improved collaborative environment within the sector (Landry, 2011, pp. 8-9; Vorakulpipat & Rezgui, 2009, p. 162). The concept model also illustrates how, with the application of knowledge-based collaboration tools and approaches, Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector and its participants, can shift from the current environment into an improved collaborative environment. The responses to the study’s primary and secondary research questions, (“What knowledge, attitudes and behaviors shape the current environment of the Culture and Heritage sector and what knowledge, attitudes and behaviours are required to create a collaborative environment?”) will be invaluable in identifying the most appropriate tools and approaches to be used in helping Sector participants learn about collaboration theory and practices.
Figure 5. Strengthening Nanaimo’s Creative Sector: Creating a Collaborative Environment. Samborski Conceptual Framework. 2014.
3.0 METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

3.1 Methodology

The study, tailored to reflect the Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector's diversity, approached a community based needs assessment from an ABCD methodology that was designed to: gain knowledge of the Sector's collaboration assets, attitudes and behaviours; generate understanding and insight into collaboration success; identify key actions to help the Sector shift into an improved collaborative environment; and, to provide advice to the City of Nanaimo on steps it can take to support the Sector on its path to a new environment. The project analyzed qualitative information gathered through primary research and completed a literature review examining collaborative knowledge, attitudes and behaviours, and applicable tools and approaches, and available models that could help create a collaborative environment for the Sector. As previously indicated, Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) argue that traditional needs based studies “focus on a community's needs, deficiencies and problems” (p. 1); where Mathie and Cunningham (2003), suggest that ABCD “draws attention to social assets: the particular talents of individuals, as well as the social capital inherent in the relationships that fuel local associations and informal networks” (p. 474).

An Asset-based Survey acted as a tool to complete a needs assessment, with the results providing the study’s baseline understanding of the Sector's experience in, and readiness for, collaboration activities and assisting in identifying tools and approaches that aligned with the literature and research findings and that would leverage the culture and heritage organizations’ assets and capacities.

The study explored the organizational assets identified by the research sample and measured them against the desired collaborative processes and capacities outlined in the literature review by understanding the following:

- The knowledge and skills assets present among the surveyed Nanaimo cultural organizations.
- The assets that may be missing or needing strengthening for Nanaimo's Cultural and Heritage sector to move into a more collaborative environment.
- The research group’s preferred learning styles and subject areas of learning.
- The current climate of collaboration in Nanaimo's Cultural and Heritage sector.
- The desired climate of collaboration in Nanaimo's Cultural and Heritage sector.
- The inter-relationships between knowledge, attitudes and behavior and how they shape a collaborative environment.
- The appropriate tools and strategies to create a collaborative environment in Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector.

The research, analysis, findings, and recommendations were conducted and developed using an interpretive and constructionist framework that acknowledges the ways people come to perceive their own world and experiences (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000). Based on a constructivist paradigm, the study assumed that the survey respondents' responses reflect not only the role they each play in the organization they represent, but also their own personal world-view and geographic context, experiences and biases (Lincoln & Guba, 2013, pp. 40&47).
Accepting that perceptions are one’s reality, the author agrees with Lincoln & Guba’s (2013) finding that reality (perceptions) is also influenced by culture, values, experiences, and interactions with others and acknowledges that, based on her dual-role as principal researcher and City staff member, that the study’s “analysis and findings were influenced by her Sector experience and relationships (p. 49).

This report also includes a Promising Practice section examining three alternative local government culture and heritage service delivery models that range from incremental improvement to visionary change for the City’s future consideration and further research.

3.2 Project Methods

Applying Community Based Research (CBR) methods, the study used an online, Asset-based Survey (Appendix F) to engage a representative portion of Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector in assessing the current state of Sector collaboration by identifying strengths, barriers impeding forward momentum, and opportunities for future success (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1990; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker & Donohue, 2003, p. 6). While primarily closed-ended, the survey provided open-ended opportunities for participants to share why they felt a certain way. The closed-ended questions ranged from multiple-choice to Likert-scale, with the majority of the questions providing a means for additional comments (Sincero, 2012, webpage).

Receiving ethical approval from the University of Victoria’s Research Ethics Board (Appendix G), the study, through a hard-copy letter, invited 50 Culture and Heritage groups who had previously applied to the City of Nanaimo for cultural operating and/or events funding to participate in the on-line survey. The purposeful sample was drawn from the Culture and Heritage sector and included a variety of large and small professional profit, not-for-profit, and amateur organizations as it was determined these groups were representative of organizations currently working with one another and/or the City in some capacity (Hall, 2013, 20 minutes). The survey was released on May 29, 2014 with respondents having two weeks for completion; however, recognizing summer period delays the submission deadline was extended via email until July 7, 2014. Thirty-seven completed surveys were returned, an effective response rate of 75 percent of those who were invited to participate in the research. Based on survey attempts, it appears that an additional 10 groups started to respond and for unstated reasons did not complete the survey. Only completed surveys were considered in the data analysis.

3.21 Project Data Collection, Sorting and Analyses

Data was collected using a qualitative Asset-based Survey that invited responding organizations to identify their existing assets, clearly articulate strengths and opportunities for growth, and explore what a future state collaborative environment might be (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1990). Comparative analysis was used to sort and analyze the data and a thematic approach was employed to develop the findings (clt, n.d., pp. 3-4; Guest, MacQueen & Namey, 2012, p. 12). Guest et al. (2012) defines thematic analysis as a “move beyond counting explicit words or phrases and focus on identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas within the data, that is, themes” (p. 10). Mason’s question (1996): “What constitutes data or evidence in relation to my research question?” was balanced by allowing the themes to emerge from the research data (p. 65; clt, n.d., p. 3). Both nominal and ordinal frequency distributions were used for quantifying survey results (clt, n.d., p. 5).

Recognizing her dual role, the author critically reflected on, and managed, her personal bias,
assumptions, and beliefs throughout the analysis by testing findings and analysis against the literature, the research, and with the client representative (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 127).

3.3 Project Delimitations and Limitations

3.3.1 Delimitations

Based on the diversity and number of self-identified actors in Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector, the study limited on-line survey participation to groups that had previously applied for City of Nanaimo funding as they provided a contained and identified sample of nonprofit or cooperatives operating effectively within the Culture and Heritage sector and having previous experience with the City. Given that the survey data appeared to provide a broad array of perspectives and sufficient detail and information to generate conclusive analysis, the study did not include focus groups or one-on-one interviews with survey participants.

The study’s literature review did not examine any of the Promising Practices presented in the report, considering them as future study opportunities.

3.3.2 Limitations

A key epistemological consideration throughout the study was the author’s dual-role as principal researcher and City staff member, which was both a strength and limitation. While the author’s professional relationships with respondents may have increased survey participation and project support, the dual-role had the potential to be used to discredit the study’s findings or recommendations. As a member of the City’s Culture and Heritage Department, the author has professional and personal relationships with most of the organizations participating in the survey and works as an advocate and representative of the Sector to other City departments, local politicians and the broader community. Based on her role in developing the City’s Culture Plan, the author had beliefs regarding the need for improvement in the Sector’s collaborative environment, the need for sustained and committed City leadership, and the need to create a more sustainable Sector. The author questioned and tested her beliefs when analyzing the data to ensure the data “spoke for itself” and not for her.

As a community builder and connector in the Sector, the author began the study with an assumption that collaboration processes might provide a framework upon which to build a more sustainable and supportable Sector. To limit any perceived bias for collaboration, the author ensured the literature review equitably examined both collaboration benefits and barriers and ensured that the survey analysis and findings reflect the Sector’s beliefs and assumptions and not hers. The City’s client representative assisted the author by reviewing and testing draft recommendations, creating City buy-in to the study results (Hall, 2005, p. 9).

Thirty-two of 37 respondents named their organization, which may suggest a level of comfort in completing the survey and that the question of perceived power between the researcher and the survey group was appropriately managed. The author took a reflective approach throughout the study, reminding ‘the author’ not to impose personal subjectivity on the data (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2000, p. 579).

Survey timing proved to be limiting. Administering the survey during June and July was a challenge because most nonprofit organizations provide reduced or limited services in the summer, resulting in
delays in both survey returns and analysis completion. The length of time required to complete the survey may have decreased participation by invited participants.

Given previous experience when those not invited to participate in an engagement exercise have responded with suspicion and questions as to why they were not invited, there had been initial concern that a feeling of unease may develop in the Sector. Fortunately, this did not occur in this study. This may be attributed to survey timing, recognizing that many organizations meet less frequently during summer, the author's communication with the Sector prior to the start of the study's research phase, or a lack of general awareness the research was occurring. Participating organizations provided unsolicited, positive feedback regarding the survey and study both to the author and Sector organizations not invited to participate.
4.0 PRIMARY RESEARCH - SURVEY RESULTS/FINDINGS

Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector is integral to the community's sustainability and vitality, as articulated in a series of documents ranging from the City's 2012-2015 Strategic Plan to its 2014-2020 Cultural Plan for a Creative Nanaimo and from the Nanaimo Economic Development Corporation's 2013 Arts and Culture Economic Impact Study to the Nanaimo and District Chamber of Commerce's Successful Cities Strategy. While many in the Sector and in the broader community acknowledge the Sector’s social and economic value to the community, there is a sense that its full potential has yet to be fully realized. Many believe that a key to achieving the Sector's potential will be the ability of the organizations to work better together for community benefit (ArtsNSW, 2014).

To assist in answering this study's primary research question regarding the feasibility of creating a new collaborative environment for Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector and to assess the Sector's collaboration knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours, a four-part, 21-question Asset-Based survey instrument was designed and implemented. The instrument, by gauging respondents' sense of the current reality, the potential future reality and the actions that they believed necessary to achieve and sustain the latter, was also designed to help answer the study's secondary research questions regarding the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours that are required to create an improved collaborative environment for the Sector and the tools and approaches that the City of Nanaimo could use to foster and support the needed shifts.

The survey results (all numbers rounded), presented in both written and graphic formats, and the findings arising from the data analysis provide insight into the Sector's perceptions, realities and state-of-collaboration readiness, and inform the study's recommendations and conclusions.

The findings are presented in five sections. The first four sections will align with the survey instrument and the fifth section provides a thumbnail of three Promising Practices the City of Nanaimo could consider for further research:

- Section A – The Sector’s Profile
- Section B – The Current Collaborative Environment
- Section C – Organizations’ Future Reality
- Section D – City of Nanaimo Roles
- Section E - Promising Practices

4.1 Section A – The Sector's Profile

Section A survey questions were designed to help create a profile of the Culture and Heritage sector organizations based on the organizations' type, age, size, number of volunteers and annual operating budget.

Asked to characterize their organizational type, 94 percent of respondents indicated not-for-profit, three percent indicated for-profit and three percent indicated profit sharing. This make-up is representative of the types of Culture and Heritage organizations that currently interact with the City and one another on a frequent basis. Historically, the City has not typically funded or partnered with individual artists or for-profit organizations. Reflecting Nanaimo’s rich culture and heritage tradition and according to respondents, 47 percent of the organizations have operated for 25 years-or-longer, 15 percent have operated for between 15-24 years, and 38 percent have operated for 14 years-or-less.
This experience spectrum suggests that there is potential for the more-established organizations to mentor, merge with, or act as an umbrella organization to younger and emerging groups.

Board of Director numbers, volunteer numbers and annual operating budgets were used to assist in evaluating organizational size. Based on responses received, 62 percent of organizations operate with 5-10 Board members, 30 percent operate with 11-or-more Board members, while eight percent operate with four-or-less Board members (Figure 6). Responses received suggest that 43 percent of organizations have volunteer complements of 50-or-more individuals, 24 percent have 10-or-less volunteers, 21 percent have between 11-24 volunteers, and 12 percent have between 25-49 volunteers (Figure 7). Based on responses, 40 percent of organizations have annual operating budgets ranging between $25,000-$99,000, 30 percent operate with annual budgets $100,000 or larger, 12 percent operate with budgets ranging between $10,000-$24,000, and 12 percent operate with budgets $10,000 or smaller. Six percent of respondents were unsure of their organization's budget.
Based on responses received to Section A questions, Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector appears to demonstrate long term sustainability and diversity in age, size, budgets, and governance capacity. This spectrum reflects organizational mandates, programmatic focus, and community impact, highlighting the need for any collaborative environment to be flexibly designed to accommodate organizational differences.

4.2 Section B - The Current Collaborative Environment

Section B survey questions were designed to create a baseline understanding of Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector organizations' perspective on the Sector's current collaborative environment and their participation in it. The research questions explored the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours, especially those relating to learning and information sharing, that shape the Sector's current collaborative environment.

With respect to the collaborative and cooperative environment, 19 percent of respondents were very satisfied with the current collaborative environment, 63 percent were generally satisfied with the current collaborative environment, while only 18 percent felt it was unsatisfactory and 10 percent felt unsure of the current environment’s collaborative health.

Survey participants were positive about their organization’s ability to act collaboratively in the current environment with 94 percent of respondents indicating that they had the ability to act collaboratively, with only six percent unsure of their ability to act. The findings in relation to organizations’ readiness to act collaboratively (Figure 8), indicated 42 percent of respondents felt satisfied or very satisfied with their organizational state-of- readiness, 30 percent felt somewhat satisfied, and 18 percent were either not satisfied or very unsatisfied, while 10 percent were unsure.

Survey participants identified the following knowledge, skills and assets their organization currently use to collaborate with others in the Culture and Heritage sector:

- 78 percent of respondents indicated they collaborate on programs and events, external relationships and marketing;
- 63 percent indicated both marketing and external relations;
- 41 percent indicated strategic thinking, planning and evaluation;

Figure 8. Nanaimo Culture and Heritage Organizations' Ability to Act Collaboratively. 2014.
• 31 percent indicated staff and volunteer development;  
• 19 percent indicated governance; and  
• Six percent indicated they don’t collaborate at all.

Survey participants identified the following knowledge, skills, and assets that their organization receives from others in the Sector:  
• 38 percent of respondents identified external relationships;  
• 34 percent indicated marketing;  
• 25 percent indicated programming and fund development;  
• 19 percent indicated strategic thinking, planning and evaluation; and  
• Less than 10 percent indicated governance and staff and volunteer development.

Significantly, 28 percent of respondents indicated their organizations do not currently collaborate with others, yet 94 percent felt their organizations had the ability to act collaboratively.

Respondents, asked to indicate how their organization likes to learn, indicated that 65 percent of the organizations prefer to learn collaboratively on their own schedule and 24 percent independently on their own schedule. Eleven percent of respondents indicated that their organization is not a learning organization. The results suggest that organizations are trying to move towards collaborative learning, providing there is independence in scheduling. Collaboration scored lower when survey participants were asked when they like to learn. Fifty-five percent of respondents indicated their organization prefers learning collaboratively on its own schedule, 25 percent indicated a preference for independent learning, 10 percent indicated the importance of learning collaboratively on other’s schedules, and 10 percent indicated that their organization is not a learning organization.

The results suggest that organizations have a variety of learning styles and preferences and that scheduling convenience is a key determinant of participation. Non-traditional education and learning platforms and approaches may assist in increasing organizational access to education and training opportunities.

Nanaimo Culture and Heritage organizations’ approach to information sharing varies. When asked with whom information is proactively shared, 36 percent of respondents indicated their organization shares with select organizations both internal and external to the Sector, 23 percent identified organizations within the Sector, 16 percent identified all organizations in the community, 16 percent identified all organizations in the Sector and select organizations outside the Sector, and three percent indicated they do not share information at all. Further, respondents share the following information proactively others:

• 52 percent of respondents indicated their organization shares program and event matters;  
• 22 percent share information upon request;  
• 13 percent share information in forms other than those identified in the survey;  
• 10 percent share marketing materials; and  
• Three percent currently share management and operation matters.

Asked how they prefer to receive information from others, 82 percent of the respondents indicated their organization prefers receiving information via email, 58 percent prefer personal contacts, 30 percent prefer Facebook, 27 percent prefer printed materials, 21 percent prefer written correspondence, nine percent prefer Twitter, while nine percent prefer other methods.
Based on responses received to Section B, Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector's current collaborative environment appears to be viewed positively by member organizations, yet there appears to be lower confidence in groups’ ability and readiness to act collaboratively. This suggests that there may be great opportunity to leverage learning, communication, and information sharing to increase Sector collaboration, especially relating to organizational governance and management topics. Preferences for independent learning and modes of sharing information suggest increased opportunities for online collaboration, communication and networking, and for targeted face-to-face sessions tailored to organizations' needs (Figure 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Personal contacts</th>
<th>Written correspondence</th>
<th>Printed materials</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>Other, please specify</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independently, on its own schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboratively, on its own schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's not a learning organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. When Nanaimo Culture and Heritage Organizations Like to Learn (Cross-referenced with the Types of Information They Like to Share), 2014.

4.3 Section C – Organizations’ Future Reality

Section C survey questions were designed to provide Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector organizations with opportunities to identify changes that could be made to strengthen the Sector's ability to collaborate, cooperate, and communicate. The research questions explored opportunities for change within the respondent's organization and within others' organizations. It was hoped that the identified changes would, in turn, help Sector leaders identify and select approaches tools and approaches that could be used to help create a new collaborative environment.

Respondents were asked to select one internal change that their organization could make to improve its ability to collaborate, cooperate and communicate within the Sector. Thirty-nine percent of respondents identified the need to improve its collaboration and cooperation competencies, 20 percent identified a range of changes not listed in the survey, 13 percent identified the need to strengthen leadership in governance systems and competencies, 13 percent identified no need to change, 10 percent identified the need for an internal collaboration charter, and seven percent indicated the need to work differently with others.

When asked to select one external change that their organization would like to see to strengthen the Sector's overall ability to collaborate, 42 percent of respondents identified the need to produce a three-year schedule of major events and community activities, 19 percent identified the need for forums and/or mechanisms for inter-organizational collaboration, 16 percent identified the need to reduce intra-Sector competition for scarce resources (including political support), and 16 percent identified a range of changes not listed in the survey and seven percent indicated that change is not required.

Organizations identified the following when asked to select one action that their organization could take to help others within the Sector and to strengthen the Sector overall:

- 30 percent identified participating fully in collaboration forums and/or mechanisms;
30 percent identified providing leadership in operational areas;
17 percent identified offering wisdom and insight;
13 percent identified selecting a 'buddy' organization and providing mentorship;
Seven percent indicated that their organization could do nothing to help; and
Three percent identified a range of other actions not identified in the survey.

Organizations identified the following when asked to select one action that another organization could take to help their organization and to help strengthen the Sector's overall ability to collaborate:
- 40 percent identified participation in their organization's collaborative undertakings;
- 23 percent identified providing operational leadership;
- 17 percent identified offering its wisdom and insight;
- 10 percent indicated help is not needed;
- Seven percent identified being selected as 'buddy' organization for mentoring; and
- Three percent identified sharing governance and management expertise.

Based on Section C responses, Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector organizations appear open and interested in participating more fully in collaborative opportunities, especially those in operational areas where tactical cooperation can produce quick, tangible results, in sharing self-identified assets with others and in mentoring and being mentored by others. They appear keen to learn more about collaboration theory and practices, especially in governance and management areas where organizational competencies appear less mature than operational competencies.

Among the topics for further exploration are ways a new collaborative environment can increase collaboration and decrease organizational competition for scarce resources. Similarly, conversations regarding volunteer recruitment, training, and sharing may increase the value of the volunteer experience and decrease volunteer fatigue, eliminating the 'not enough time' barrier to collaboration (Vernis et al., 2006, p. 62).

4.4 Section D - City of Nanaimo Roles

Section D survey questions were designed to explore Nanaimo Culture and Heritage organizations’ attitudes and perceptions towards the City of Nanaimo's present and future roles in advancing the Sector and to identify appropriate tools and approaches that may help create a new collaborative environment. The research questions probed the organizations' understanding of the City's work and their sense of the community's support for the Sector.

Survey participants indicated their organization's understanding of the City of Nanaimo’s ability to foster and strengthen the Sector's collaborative environment ranged from 17 percent are very familiar, 40 percent are somewhat familiar, 33 percent are familiar, seven percent are not familiar, and three percent are very unfamiliar.

Asked to describe their organization's confidence in the City’s ability to foster and strengthen the Sector’s collaborative and cooperative environment, the following results were indicated:
- 59 percent of respondents indicated somewhat confident;
- 34 percent indicated confident; and
- Seven percent indicated not confident (Figure 10).
Respondents’ attitude towards Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector's future under the current collaborative environment indicated 49 percent of respondents are optimistic, 34 percent somewhat optimistic, 10 percent not optimistic, and seven percent very optimistic.

Survey participants indicated their organization's confidence in community support for the Sector improving under a new collaborative model with 46 percent of respondents optimistic, 36 percent somewhat very optimistic, 14 percent very optimistic, and only four percent not optimistic. Eighty-seven percent of respondents made specific comments indicating support for a new model developed with Sector participation and one that would strengthen and increase Sector capacity.

Asked to indicate their organization’s ability and readiness to act in a collaborative-based community, 41 percent of respondents indicated very satisfied, 35 percent indicated somewhat satisfied, and 24 percent indicated satisfied (Figure 11).

Survey respondents identified the following actions that the City of Nanaimo could take to help strengthen the Sector’s ability to collaborate:

- 24 percent indicated increasing political support, goodwill and leadership;
- 17 percent indicated increasing financial and operational support;
- 17 percent indicated creating collaboration forums and mechanisms;
- 17 percent indicated fostering and brokering cross-sector collaboration;
- 10 percent indicated targeting financial and operational support for high-impact organizations; and
- Three percent felt the City was doing everything in its power (Figure 12).
Survey respondents identified the following actions that the City of Nanaimo should stop doing to strengthen the Sector’s ability to collaborate:

- 30 percent indicated a range of actions not included in the survey;
- 15 percent indicated the City should stop charging for use of City-owned and/or operated facilities;
- 15 percent indicated the City should stop expecting programs and events to advance both economic and social impact measures;
- 15 percent indicated that rather than stopping anything the City should do more of everything;
- 11 percent indicated the City should stop limiting Cultural Levy funding;
- Eight percent indicated the City should stop offering competitive programs/events; and
- Seven percent felt that the City should stop promoting collaboration as essential for success (Figure 13).

Based on Section D responses, Nanaimo Culture and Heritage organizations appear to recognize that the City of Nanaimo can make a meaningful contribution to strengthening the Sector's collaborative environment and their abilities to work within it.
They appear open to the City's increased leadership and contributions, especially in organizing and delivering forums and learning opportunities that will advance the Sector's collaboration awareness, skills, and abilities, but they appear skeptical of the City's actual commitment, viewing the City's Culture and Heritage Department as a beginning point rather than the desired full, long-term commitment. Despite any hesitancy that may exist, Sector organizations appear optimistic that a new collaborative environment will have significant positive impact on their ability to work together differently, to make measureable social and economic contributions to the community, and to secure broad-based community and political support.

In summary, based on primary research data results/findings, Nanaimo Culture and Heritage organizations appear interested and excited to learn more about collaboration and cooperation, to engage in a community-based model and practice, and are looking for the City of Nanaimo to provide greater leadership and long-term commitment to ensure the Sector is sustainable and a respected and celebrated contributor to Nanaimo's cultural vitality.

4.5 Section E - Promising Practices

To assist the City of Nanaimo and Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector, the study scope was expanded to include an overview of three Promising Practices of organizational design that the City might consider as its role in the Sector evolves. When used in a community development context, Althouse and Tedds (2012) suggest that Promising Practices “is interesting because it gets away from ultimate criteria (i.e. best or smart/dumb) and does not require the practitioner interested in the idea to be bound to its specific” (p. 1). Further, as it relates to this study, in Promising Practices, context and community become more relevant than benchmarking and scientific research (Figure 14).

The following sections provide examples of Promising Practices from three jurisdictions that were considered on the basis of reputation, professional referral and the City of Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage Department’s experience.

The City of Kelowna is a like-sized community to Nanaimo and, based on culture policy and reputation in local government, offers Promising Practices that could provide incremental change for Nanaimo.
The City of Calgary is considered a pioneer in arts and culture delivery by its large-city peers and provides promising practices that model revolutionary change to how the City of Nanaimo could interact with the Culture and Heritage sector. Community Innovation Labs, currently being piloted in the United States, are making their way into Canada via Calgary and Edmonton. Based on anecdotal discussion, this model may provide the City of Nanaimo with the best opportunity for visionary change and leadership.

Comparing municipal Culture and Heritage service delivery is challenging, as there is no standardized program definition or delivery model, with provinces and communities having different blends and mixes of direct delivery versus facilitation (Alliance for Arts + Culture, 2013). Canadian municipal spending on Culture and Heritage varies greatly depending on municipality and is difficult to understand because of differences in both service models and how jurisdictions define and classify programs, services, and support (Brooks-Joiner & Stasiuk, 2004, p. 4).

According to a City of Kelowna study, British Columbia municipal per capita spending on Culture and Heritage programs and services ranges from $28.69 in Burnaby to $6.31 in Port Coquitlam, with the City of Nanaimo spending $21.54 per capita in 2014 (Mormer, 2011, p. 39; City of Nanaimo, 2015b). As previously indicated, it is difficult to ascertain the accuracy of these figures given the variance on how funds are allocated by each municipality.

### 4.5.1 City of Kelowna, British Columbia

Based on long term culture policy and sustained financial commitment, the City of Kelowna (Kelowna) is a Promising Practice example of incremental change (Momer, 2011). Kelowna has identified Culture as one of its four pillars of sustainability (City of Kelowna, n.d.) and, under its City Arts Policy, provides a high-level of sustaining support for Culture and Heritage through a number of initiatives, including significant investments in its Culture district, part of the city's downtown core (Huhtala, 2012, p. 8).

Kelowna, like the City of Nanaimo, has agreements with others, especially community not-for-profits, to manage, program and operate a number of City-owned Culture and Heritage facilities. Unlike Nanaimo where the City has an agreement with a non-profit organization to operate Nanaimo's civic theatre, Kelowna's community theatre facility is a City-owned and operated facility. In 2011, Kelowna's annual expenditure on Culture and Heritage of $18.38 ranked third among BC municipalities (and with the changes to the City of Nanaimo’s organizational structure fell to fourth in 2014 (City of Nanaimo, 2015b; Mormer, 2011,p. 38).

While Nanaimo’s funding per capita is ranked high, Kelowna's ongoing political support for, public policy clarity on, public financial commitment to, and overall community success with Culture qualifies it as a Promising Practice example for the City of Nanaimo's consideration.

### 4.5.2 City of Calgary, Alberta

The City of Calgary (Calgary) is a Promising Practice example of revolutionary change. Recognizing that the Arts (as Calgary refers to its Culture and Heritage sector) "play a significant role in a community's development, including contributions to economic prosperity", Calgary City Council, in 2004, adopted a new Civic Arts Policy (Appendix H) with a core philosophy that "recognizes the intrinsic value of the Arts and the associated need for an environment which values and fosters artistic innovation and growth" (City of Calgary, 2004, p. 1).
To implement its new policy, Calgary established a single, arms-length authority, the Calgary Arts Development Authority (CADA) to create and implement a “long-term strategic plan for the Arts” (City of Calgary, 2004, pp. 2-3).

CADA was designated to receive all the City's funding to external arts organizations for final decisions on distribution and to be the referral body for all Arts-related capital and operational funding inquiries received by City Council (City of Calgary, 2004, p. 5; Kalvista, 2014). Its new Civic Arts Policy committed Calgary to working with other partners “to increase the level of resources available for the arts in the city, and expects an equivalent commitment to sustainability principles from the organizations it supports” (City of Calgary, 2004, p. 5).

Today, CADA acts as a “connector, facilitator, collaborator, champion, supporter, amplifier, investor, catalyst and opportunity-maker”, investing and allocating municipal funding, and leveraging funds to resource the arts sector (CADA, n.d.). It oversees and develops Calgary's cultural focus and commissions studies and cultural planning documents. One of its target key outcomes is fostering collaborative relationships within the city's Art sector (Appendix I outlines a number of CADA’s recent successes). It is responsible for Calgary's Poet Laureate program, awards programs, Breakfast with the Mayor, funding programs, education and networking opportunities, and the one-stop, online cultural shop “Calgary Culture”, a free listings website promoting culture and heritage events in Calgary (CADA, n.d.).

More than 95 percent of CADA's funding appears to be provided by the City of Calgary. According to CADA’s audited financial statements, annual funding has ranged from $5 million in 2010 to $5.4 million in 2014 (Kalvista, 2014 & 2012). Funding amounts appears to fluctuate based on external funding sources and amounts. To compliment CADA's work, The City of Calgary continues to deliver three municipal-based, culture services: a Public Art, Festivals and Events support program, a cultural diversity program that includes consultation, training and resource development, and a liaison, network and outreach program (City of Calgary, n.d.). Calgary’s internal budget for culture is difficult to ascertain, as it is part of sport and culture services, with a net budget of approximately $7 million (City of Calgary, 2015, p. 392).

Calgary’s CADA model parallels the City of Nanaimo's economic development model, where the arm's-length Nanaimo Economic Development Corporation (NEDC) is charged with planning and implementing economic strategies and receives the majority of its funding from the City.

While Calgary per capita funding for CADA appears low at approximately $2.00 per capita, Calgary's political support for, public policy clarity on, public financial commitment to and overall community success with the Arts qualifies it as a Promising Practice example for the City of Nanaimo's consideration.

### 4.5.3 Community Innovation Labs

Community Innovation Labs are a promising practice of visionary change. Community Innovation Labs are a new approach to collaboration that “bring together a diverse, cross-sector group of stakeholders in each location, including city agencies, community organizers, business leaders, artists, cultural organizations, and non-profit service providers, to tackle a specific and urgent local challenge” and are being piloted in three communities in the United States in 2015 by EmcArts Inc. as outlined in Appendix J (Evans, 2015).
EmcArts, a social enterprise for learning and innovations in the arts, launched its New Pathways, a precursor to its Community Innovation Labs, in Calgary and Edmonton in January 2015 (EmcArts, 2015). The Alberta projects, running over three years and engaging up to 20 community organizations each, are aimed at strengthening and advancing organizational innovation and adaptive capacity (CADA, 2015; Edmonton Arts Council, 2014).

Given the emergent, leading-edge nature of Community Innovation Labs as a potential Promising Practice model, the City of Nanaimo and the Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector will be wise to observe and monitor the Calgary and Edmonton projects’ success.
5.0 DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

The gap between Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector's current collaborative environment and a desired future environment, while significant, can be closed through strategic interventions by Sector players, including the City of Nanaimo. These strategic interventions include leveraging organizational assets, adopting new collaboration models, and applying appropriate and available collaboration tools to help Sector actors and stakeholders grow knowledge and understanding, shift attitudes and behaviours, and build trust and supportive relationships.

As shown by the survey findings, the Sector enjoys a strong base of approximately 500 citizen volunteers and a mix of professional and amateur managers and operators with a variety of skills and experience, providing a strong foundation upon which to build (City of Nanaimo, 2014b, pp. 16-17). Based on analysis of the Asset-Based survey responses, findings suggest that Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage organizations currently operate with a low trust-quotient and struggle with collaboration, especially on high-impact governance matters. This is demonstrated in part by growing Sector tensions over, and competition for, limited resources and group fragmentation, providing an opportunity for the City to facilitate a fundamental change in the environment using an incremental approach (Burke, 2011, p. 160; Hickman & Couto, 2010, p. 16).

The study, through its literature review and primary research, explored three essential elements that help shape and are necessary for creating a trust-based collaborative environment: knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors (Vernis, et al., 2006, p. 162). Based on these elements, the study explored tools and approaches the City of Nanaimo could use to affect change in the Culture and Heritage sector's environment and to work with Sector organizations to increase collaboration, both within the Sector and beyond.

The discussion and analysis aligns with the research logic and overlays the literature review on the survey findings in the following sections:

- Current Reality
- Knowledge
- Attitudes
- Behaviours
- The City of Nanaimo
- Collaborative Models.

5.1 Current Reality

Findings from the study's Asset-based Survey, which examined the status of the Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector's current collaboration environment and experiences as perceived by Sector organizations, reveal a gap in how the organizations believe they are currently acting and how they are actually acting, and identify Sector trust-building as a key component in creating a new collaborative environment.

A majority of respondents (78 percent) rated organizational readiness for collaboration as satisfactory to very satisfactory, indicating confidence in the current environment and their abilities to act.
While the majority (79 percent) of respondents indicated that their organizations are collaborating, actual collaboration appears limited to tactical activities rather than transformational-level governance and management collaboration which only 19 percent of respondents identified as an area of opportunity for collaboration even though Provan & Kenis (2007) suggest that governance is fundamental for creating stability in organizations and collaborations and which could result in the biggest positive change to the environment (p. 231; Agranoff, 2008; Reddy & Jansen, 2007, p. 258; Shadi & Afsarmanesh, 2011, pp. 268-69).

Ninety-two percent of respondents indicated their organizations are ready to act in a more collaborative fashion in the current environment, especially operational level collaboration such as staff development and marketing, specifically three-year master event listing. That stated, 62 percent of respondents indicated that, based on the Sector's long history of mistrust and competition, the Sector's culture needs to shift and that strong leadership will be required to realize that shift and for collaboration to increase. As identified in the literature review, trust, leadership, and governance will be key areas for the City to consider when helping the Sector select a collaborative model.

Based on survey data analysis, Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector’s current collaborative environment and actions provide a baseline for a new, trust-based collaborative environment, recognizing that while attitudes are generally good and collaborative behaviors are concentrated at operational or tactical levels, collaboration at organizational governance and management levels is not yet sufficient to build necessary relationships or capacity within the Sector.

5.2 Knowledge

Based on findings arising from analysis of survey data, not only do Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage organizations appear to have a strong desire to collaborate and a belief that collaboration is happening, they have a growing hunger to learn more about collaboration fundamentals and methods for collaborating at multiple organizational levels. For example, survey respondents (87 percent) indicated that their organizations have a desire for increased knowledge about collaboration theory and practices and for increased collaboration leadership from the City of Nanaimo or other backbone organization. This aligns with Winkler (2006), who underscores the importance of organizations having a shared understanding collaboration's definition and its benefits (p. 130).

Sector organizations (60 percent of respondents) appear interested and willing to participate in a variety of networking and educational sessions and forums as ways to create and further develop their collaborative environment, especially opportunities that accommodate their particular organization's schedules and preferred learning styles.

Recognizing Sector organizations' desire for individuality and reliance on volunteers, collaborative models will need to be flexible and easy, reflecting Miller and Cohen-Katz (2009) suggestion that roles, boundaries and rules be clear, but flexible. Reddy and Jansen (2007) argue that numerous touches and interactions are pivotal in creating a relationship-based collaborative environment built on trust and shared norms (p. 258; Li et al., 2009, p. 6; Mathie & Cunningham, 2003, p. 474). Given the described interest and desire, there is an opportunity for Sector organizations to increase their collaboration knowledge base.
5.3 Attitudes

Based on findings arising from survey data analysis, Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector's attitude towards collaboration is positive (78 percent of respondents) and Sector organizations are, at minimum, somewhat optimistic (96 percent of respondents) that improved community support for its work would result from a new collaborative environment. Based on respondents' survey comments, there appears to be a sense of mistrust between Sector organizations and the City of Nanaimo, as revealed through a common theme regarding the perception that the City does not follow through on its support for the Culture and Heritage sector and that Nanaimo City Council political support was, at best, tenuous suggesting that the Sector’s trust of the City as an organization is not at the necessary or desired level for a trust-based collaborative environment. Agranoff (2008) identifies the lack of trust as a barrier to collaboration that can be overcome through demonstrated action. Given the outlined unevenness of respondents’ belief that the City will follow through on its commitments to the Sector in the long term, there is need and opportunity for the Sector's attitudes to shift.

5.4 Behaviors

Based on the findings from survey data analysis, Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector organizations believe there is a collaborative environment and that they are being collaborative with each other.

While they may be collaborating, it was found through the survey results that their experience and efforts is primarily operational and tactical and not at the high-impact managerial and governance levels. By identifying a three-year marketing strategy for events and activities as a collaboration priority, respondents underscored the Sector’s emphasis on operational outcomes which still, according to Shadi and Afsarmanesh (2011), can be instrumental during the early onset of creating a collaborative environment by assisting groups in building trust, leading to future agreement on shared outcomes and goals (p. 265; Huxham & Vangen 2000a, p. 1166).

Survey respondents (79 percent) agreed that their organizations, by strengthening their governance and collaborative competencies and working differently with others, could improve their abilities to collaborate and help others in the Sector. This creates an opportunity for the City of Nanaimo, or another organization, to help the Sector identify, evaluate and select a new collaboration model. In evaluating collaborative models, the literature recognizes that models with specified leadership were more successful than those without (Bryson et al., 2006, p. 49).

The majority of respondents (93 percent) also agreed that communication within the Sector is important and that their organizations are willing and interested, on their terms, in communicating with others. As outlined in the literature review, communication is critical to building a collaborative model and an important area of collaborative leadership that could provide ways, means and opportunities (Winkler, 2006, p. 120).

Given the above, the Sector appears open to the study's conceptual framework that outlines how new Sector collaborative behaviours can be created by building a new knowledge base, shifting attitudes, and using new collaboration tools and approaches to help craft an improved collaborative environment.

5.5 The City of Nanaimo

The City of Nanaimo’s mandate and role in supporting the Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector is not well understood by Sector organizations, a reality that exposes both the City and the Sector to
misperceptions, lack of trust, an under-performing collaborative environment, and an at-risk Sector, which in turn threatens the community's cultural vitality, one of the four pillars of the City's strategic plan. It is a reality that the City can proactively help shift through its own consistent leadership and performance, an intervention that the Sector welcomes and encourages.

Based on analysis of survey data, only 50 percent of respondents indicated their organizations are familiar or very familiar with the City's ability to foster and strengthen the Sector, suggesting a significant need to increase Sector awareness of how, and what, the City does to advance culture and heritage as a key civic priority. The City's investment in assisting the Sector to better understand its work will be a significant contributor towards increasing trust levels between the Sector and the City. Agranoff (2008) identified the lack of trust as a barrier to collaboration, suggesting a key to dispelling the perception that City support does not run deep is the political decision makers’ willingness to make policy accommodation (p. 34). Further, to assist the broader community in understanding the Sector's social and economic impact, the public must believe that politicians value the work of the Culture and Heritage sector (Momé, 2011, p. 6).

The Sector's limited awareness of the City's role notwithstanding, Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage organizations are keen (68 percent of respondents) for the City to play a leadership role in helping foster a new collaborative environment for the Sector, specifically brokering Sector and cross-sector relationships and providing policy and network support. The Sector is also keen for the City to assist its member organizations in developing and implementing a governance framework that balances theirs and the City’s roles and that have ability to flex and grow with the collaboration (Ontario Nonprofit Network, n.d.).

As outlined in the literature, it is important that collaboration be based on a shared understanding of what collaboration means, the available collaborative models, and the purpose participants have in working together (Bryson et al., 2006, p. 46). The shared purpose can be as simple as creating a collaborative environment with resulting projects as complex as creating a sustainable service delivery model for Culture and Heritage in Nanaimo (Gajda & Kaliba, 2007, p. 30).

Using a combination of collaborative-based tools and approaches, the City of Nanaimo has the opportunity to support behavioral changes through skill and knowledge development and, as identified by the Sector and by Vernis et al. (2006), to work with the Sector to implement a collaborative framework based on what each organization does best and has to offer (p. 45). Groups are asking for help from the City to host collaboration forums and cross-sectoral collaboration and partnering opportunities. Vorakulpipat and Rezgui (2009) recognize that informal forums can help facilitate and nurture social networks and as identified by Winkler (2006), relationships help create a sense of community where and shared goals are established and conflicts can be reduced (p. 162; p. 130; Huxham & Vangen, 2000a, p. 1167).

The City can play a facilitative leadership role in helping create the collaborative environment by providing formal and informal forums and sessions to increase sector knowledge, help develop shared definitions, and identify a common purpose (Goldstein & Butler, 2010, p. 241). Approaches for helping groups reach shared definitions and purpose could range from a series of Appreciative Inquiry sessions to Design Jams, which are idea factories (Born, 2008; Design Nerds, n.d.). According to the Design Nerds Website (n.d.), a Design Jam is “a fun, fast, creative brainstorming session intended to create a range of diverse visions that address an issue.”

Sector organizations want the City to host informal collaboration forums and cross-sectoral
collaboration and partnering opportunities, which Vorakulpipat and Rezgui (2009) recognize can help facilitate and nurture social networks and relationships and which Winkler (2006) says create a sense of community where shared goals are established and conflicts can be reduced (p. 162; p. 130; Huxham & Vangen, 2000a, p. 1167).

Once the Sector selects a new collaboration model, the City can then offer a variety of networking and collaboration sessions and provide assistance in developing cross-sector relationships and mentoring programs. Creating an online platform, as identified as part of the Creative Nanaimo Network, would create backbone support for whichever collaborative model chosen (Samborski, 2014). Increasing knowledge through shared experiences and collaboration may not only result in a more sustainable Culture and Heritage sector, it may also act as a system intervention to change damaging behaviours founded in mistrust and competition.

Based on survey comments, the City also has an opportunity to lead-by-example by improving its communication style with the Sector. This includes not only providing information to Sector organizations about the programs and services the City offers, but also committing to respectful conversation with and about the Sector, by all levels of City governance, management and operations. Respectful on-going communication between the Sector and the City is an important component in shaping the public’s perception and confidence in how the City values the Sector and its social and economic contributions to Nanaimo’s overall sustainability and quality of life (Vernis et al., 2006, p. 75).

Based on research findings and the literature analysis, for the City of Nanaimo to successfully perform in a formal facilitative leadership role for the Nanaimo Culture and Heritage sector, continuous City Council endorsement and policy support will be essential, ensuring that any collaborative framework for the Sector is built on a solid foundation and trust between the Sector and the City.

5.51 Collaborative Models

The study examined three collaborative models that could be considered by Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector and the City of Nanaimo when creating a new collaborative environment for the Sector.

Recognizing survey respondents’ comments that their organizations, while seeking leadership, have a strong desire to remain unique and individual when exploring collaborative opportunities, the preferred model selected by the Sector should provide optimum support for the Nanaimo context. The City, as a member of the Sector, has indicated that its starting preference is to limit its role to facilitator/connector. The models introduced below offer different governance structures and operational flexibility.

Networks

Networks provide a framework for groups to work together and are considered a form of multi-organizational governance (Provan & Kenis, 2007, p. 229). While often viewed as informal, Provan & Kenis (2007) argue that some form of formal governance is required (p. 230).

A critical success factor for a Network is leadership, either in the form of one organization being identified a lead organization, a third-party lead organization, or participatory governance where leadership is shared among participants (Provan & Kenis, 2007, p. 233). To be successful, Network participants must commit to a shared purpose and vision and to developing common norms and
behaviour (Winkler, 2006, pp. 121-122).

While Networks appear to provide the greatest flexibility and can help foster Sector legitimacy, a successful Network would most likely require the City to assume the role of lead organization which, at this writing, appears to beyond the City’s scope of interest, given its starting preference for its role to be a facilitator/connector.

**Communities of Practice**

Communities of Practice connect organizations, leverage assets, generate “social capital” and build capacity. The Community of Practice model requires three levels of structure including a sponsor organization, coordinator and support team (Snyder et al., 2003, p. 47). As outlined in the literature review, Communities of Practice use relationships and engagement to assist participants in sharing assets, professional development, and mentorship opportunities – thus creating a collaborative environment (Snyder et al., 2003, p. 20).

Communities of Practice recognize the assets of the individuals and organizations and through asset sharing members advance projects and share culture (Bolman & Deal, 2008, pp. 77 & 220). A collaborative model based on shared learning is consistent with survey findings in which the Culture and Heritage organization identified shared learning opportunities as important and as activities in which they would participate. As a starting point for collaboration, knowledge sessions focused on collaboration and mentorship, built on identified assets could provide the Sector and the City with a flexible governance option.

While the Sector appears ready to participate in a collaboration initiative, the survey results suggests there is no organization with the readiness or capacity to assume key leadership functions, meaning the City would most likely need to assume multiple roles, expanding, at least initially, its preferred role of facilitator/connector.

**Constellation Model**

The Constellation Model recognizes that the actors are part of a larger, complex system and balances each organization’s self-interests and strengths (Surman, 2006, p.13; Surman & Surman, 2008, p.26). The Constellation Model is coordinated by a secretariat function, or body that is not considered one of the partners, but a stakeholder.

In keeping with a relationship-based asset framework, Constellations are formed based on organizational assets, interest, and need by system members (Surman, 2006, pp. 6-7). Building on the assets of the Sector, project groups or constellations could form based on interest and on activities that further the vision of collaboration (Surman, 2006, p. 6). While the Constellation Model has limited academic research, there appear to be a number of working models that currently exist that could make it a possible model for Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector. The Ontario Nonprofits Organization provides a relevant and sizeable example of a working Constellation model.

As outlined in the literature, collaboration participants form the stewardship group with third-party secretariat (or backbone organization) support. The need for players to assume leadership roles on a project-by-project basis, may be a barrier for organizations with limited capacity and/or time, and may be a barrier for groups that are not able to learn (participate) how and when they like to learn
(participate). There are a number of Constellation model components that complement the City’s position with the Sector. The City would most likely need to assume the role of third-party secretariat, which may be within its preferred scope of interest as facilitator and connector.
6.0 OPTIONS TO CONSIDER AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector appears to be at a critical juncture on its path to sustainability. A change in the political landscape resulting from the 2014 Nanaimo municipal election has seen the Sector go from the enthusiastic political and community support and momentum of the 2014-2020 Cultural Plan for a Creative Nanaimo adoption to the apparent political focus on cost cutting of expenses and municipal services (City of Nanaimo, 2015a). How the City and the Sector work together in the future and how that relationship translates into Sector support, funding, and resourcing will determine the role, potential and impact of Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage enterprise (Elson, 2007, p. 52).

The study's literature review and primary research findings clearly identified that the City of Nanaimo, by employing collaboration tools and approaches, could support the Culture and Heritage sector in improving its collaborative environment. Based on the research findings, Sector organizations are confident in their current abilities to work collaboratively with one another and other sectors, recognize that there is room for improvement, and are open to an organization such as the City providing leadership and training that would support trust-building, create new collaborative attitudes, and shift collaboration behaviours.

Based on the study's conceptual framework, the following options and recommendations invite the City to take a leadership role in providing the Sector with collaboration education and training that provides the necessary knowledge to assist in promoting and developing collaborative practices and to help improve the Sector's collaborative environment. The recommendations build on the study's literature review and research finding and encourage the City to affirm its role as a lead-champion for Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector and to provide the long-term political, policy, financial, and operational support necessary to ensure the Sector's sustainability.

6.1 Potential Options

This section identifies three organizational Options available to the City of Nanaimo and the Culture and Heritage sector and approaches and tools that the parties can use to create a collaborative environment grounded in theories of community development and collaborative governance and to leverage and mobilize existing and future assets. Each Option presumes that Nanaimo's current Cultural Plan will remain the over-arching strategic document guiding Culture and Heritage program and service delivery. The section concludes with a recommended Preferred Option.

The three organizational Options can be characterized as status quo, incremental change, and revolutionary change. The first, Maintain Status Quo, continues having the City's internal Culture and Heritage Department implement Culture Plan strategic priorities through formal and ad hoc linkages with Sector organizations to create connections, foster collegiality, and provide programs and services to the community. The second, Create and Sustain the Constellation Model, proposes creating a collaboration model and support network platform that would see the Sector players, of which the City is one, self-govern, manage, and coordinate program and service delivery using the Cultural Plan as the guide. The third, Create an Independent Body, proposes creating an independent Culture and Heritage organization (Calgary’s CADA Model) similar to Nanaimo’s Economic Development Corporation, to provide leadership, funding, and oversight to the Sector, using the Cultural Plan as the guide. Each Option comes with its own strengths and limitations, which are examined below.
7.2 Option One - Maintain Status Quo

This option proposes that the City's internal Culture and Heritage Department continue its current mandate and working methods. The Department would continue its work to advance Cultural Plan strategic directions and priorities within the City structure and through both formal and ad hoc linkages with Sector organizations, creating connections, fostering collegiality, and providing programs and services to the community.

This current model, while enabling slow Sector growth and development, will be challenged to maintain necessary momentum and create sustainable support for the Sector to develop and grow (political and within the community) (Survey Participants, 2014). Change occurs slowly and until the Sector collaborates to become a unified and respected voice in the community, its capacity will remain unpredictable and severely stretched - and perhaps unable - to weather challenges such as change of Councils, change in City strategic priorities or other environmental factors (City of Nanaimo, 2015a; City of Nanaimo, 2014a). A summary of advantages and disadvantages for Option 1 are outlined in Figure 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows for slow growth and development.</td>
<td>Lacks sufficient momentum for significant growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling small successes.</td>
<td>Difficult to achieve sustained support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and Sector have experience with model.</td>
<td>City required to keep the lead role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unpredictable and stretched capacity for Sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires long term political / organizational support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15. Advantages and Disadvantages Option 1 - Maintain Status Quo.

Proposals for City Consideration - Option 1

1. It is proposed that, if the City is unable to commit resources (human and financial) to creating an alternate approach, the Status Quo model be protected.
2. It is proposed that, if the City continues with the Status Quo model, that it work with the Sector to implement its current Cultural Plan and to develop a long-term arts policy (as part of Council's future strategic planning) that recognizes the value of the Culture and Heritage sector from an investment return-on-investment perspective.

7.3 Option Two - Create and Maintain a Constellation Model

This option proposes creating a Constellation Model for collaboration and a support network platform to enable the Sector players, of which the City is one, to self-govern, manage, and coordinate program and service delivery using the current Cultural Plan as the guide. The Constellation Model recognizes the individuality of the participating organizations while inviting them to contribute to and co-create a shared vision, allows organizations to enter-and-exit the collaboration as they are able and interested, works with existing organizational assets, and provides knowledge-sharing opportunities among the organizations (Surman, 2006, p. 13; Surman & Surman, 2008, p.26).

The Constellation Model provides the ability to start-and-end projects, is permeable in that players can come and go, and ensures that the Sector participants themselves develop the vision (identify the magnetic attractor), provide project leadership, and create the supporting work teams (constellations) to
get the work done (Surman, 2006, p. 7). The Constellation Model allows the City to play a secretariat role, which is in keeping with its mandate to facilitate and support the Culture and Heritage sector.

The City and Sector must work together to develop and implement any collaborative framework if it is to be successful. Prior to implementing the Constellation Model, it will be essential for the Sector and the City to understand collaboration and collaborative models. First steps could include exploratory discussions with Sector organizations about the Constellation Model in one-on-ones, coffee-shop conversations, and small/large group configurations, including a potential series of Design Jams, which may provide the best method of creating this shared understanding (Goldstein & Butler, 2010, p. 241). Participants can use Appreciative Inquiry and other imagining or visioning methods to explore the model (Born, 2008, p. 193).

The Ontario Nonprofits Organization and the Calgary United Way are excellent working examples of the Constellation model. StepUp BC has resources the City and Sector can access to further understand the model and apply it to the Nanaimo context (n.d.; StepUp BC).

Once Sector interest is confirmed, the City will need to create an Arts Policy that endorses and supports the collaborative Constellation Model as a preferred strategy of the City's community building work. Working with Sector organizations to develop and present the policy to City Council is an opportunity for Sector players and City representatives to know one another differently, build common language, create trust, and develop new relationships. Creating a shared definition of trust and working together to build trust will be a critical to sustaining the model.

A next step, again with Sector involvement, would be to create and implement a networking platform, allowing organizations to easily exchange information, share collaborating and partnering opportunities, and connect in ways not previously available. Appendix D outlines some of the available tools and approaches that could be considered, including the concept of Community Innovation Labs, a new approach to collaboration that is being piloted in three communities in the United States in 2015 by EmcArts (Evans, 2015). A summary of advantages and disadvantages for Option 2 are outlined in Figure 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector self-governance.</td>
<td>Low accountability - organizations come and go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes assets and individuality of Sector actors.</td>
<td>Requires long term political / organizational support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates shared purpose.</td>
<td>Perception of weakened City support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeable model.</td>
<td>Lack of literature and examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds capacity.</td>
<td>Lack of initial start-up capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates shared learning, knowledge and behaviours.</td>
<td>May require additional City resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City plays secretariat role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 16. Advantages and Disadvantages Option 2 - Create and Maintain the Constellation Model.*

**Proposals for City Consideration - Option 2 - Create and Maintain a Constellation Model**

1. It is proposed that, if the City adopts a Constellation Model, part of the its ongoing commitment to collaboration include:

   i. Investigating in-depth working examples of the Collaboration Model and how the Centre for Social Innovation and/or StepUp BC might assist with implementing model for Nanaimo's
Culture and Heritage sector.

ii. Providing leadership within the Sector - brokering relationships, providing support as needed - to implement the Constellation Model.

iii. Ensuring the Sector knows what the City is doing and can do to help support the Constellation Model and Sector organizations.

iv. Providing opportunities to increase organizations’ and individuals’ skills and knowledge in governance, management, and operational areas.

v. Offering collaborative and cooperative forums and networking sessions.

vi. Creating cross-sectoral links and mentorship opportunities.

vii. Providing system interventions that support collaboration capacity building.

2. It is proposed, that if the City adopts the Constellation Model, that it budget sufficient resources for, but not limited to, the following:

i. Dedicating staffing and senior Corporate support for policy development.

ii. Developing and implementing a networking platform.

iii. Hosting and facilitating exploration and education sessions.

7.4 Option Three - Create an Independent Body

This Option proposes creating a City Council-appointed, Independent Body to govern, manage and coordinate Culture and Heritage program and service delivery in Nanaimo using the Cultural Plan as the guide.

This model could depoliticize the Sector, create new opportunities for enterprise and self-generated funding, and provide an independent voice that is not exclusively accountable to City Council. Its governance could be similar to that of the Nanaimo Economic Development Corporation (NEDC). Under NEDC-type leadership, the City and the economic sector have experienced success and growth. Similar results can be anticipated from an independent body mandated to provide leadership and coordination for Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector. However, based on anecdotal discussions with the client and based on survey respondents’ comments, creating and maintaining trust between the City and the arms-length organization can be challenging, especially at the political level (Survey Participants, 2014).

The Calgary Arts Development Authority (CADA) is an excellent working example of an Independent Body providing leadership, funding and coordination within that city's creative sector. CADA, as detailed in its annual Accountability Reports, has enjoyed growth and success since its 2004 creation by the City of Calgary (CADA, n.d.). If Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector interest is confirmed, the City, the Sector and others will be required to achieve a number of success criteria before implementing the Independent Body Model.

Success Criteria for Independent Body Model:

i. The appropriate political climate to implement and support the Independent Body model.

ii. The appropriate long-term commitments, by the City and others, required to sustain the Independent Body model.

iii. The appropriate sources of initial and continuing financial investments by the City and others.

iv. The role delineation for the Independent Body, the City and Sector organizations.

v. The Independent Body model's ability to foster and grow Sector collaboration.
vi. The Independent Body model's ability to foster and grown cross-sector collaboration.

Once Sector interest is confirmed and the above success criteria have been reached, the City will need to create a policy that endorses the Independent Body model as a preferred strategy of the City's community building work.

Working with the Sector to develop and present the policy to City Council is an opportunity to strengthen Sector and community cohesion. A summary of advantages and disadvantages for Option 3 are outlined in *Figure 16.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arms-length from City influence.</td>
<td>Requires complete political trust in the Sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depoliticizes Sector - less susceptible to political / environmental changes.</td>
<td>Decreases City’s ability to direct implementation activities of its four Sustainability Pillars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector independence.</td>
<td>Increased funding in start-up phase and creates need to continue sustained funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building.</td>
<td>Loss of financial and administrative control by City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased opportunity for social enterprise creation / support.</td>
<td>Potential to create role of ‘insiders’ for any group with representation on Board of Directors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 17. Advantages and Disadvantages Option 2 - Create an Independent Body.*

**Proposals for City Consideration - Option 3 - Create an Independent Body**

It is proposed that, before the City adopts the Independent Body Model as part of its ongoing commitment to Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector that it complete a feasibility study into the benefits/limitations of an Independent Body model for a mid-sized municipality.

**7.5 Preferred Option**

Developing leadership capacity, sharing information, and working together on projects are all behaviors that create a collaborative environment and foster trust building (Shadi & Afsarmanesh, 2011, pp. 268-69). In creating opportunity for multiple touches and ongoing interaction with purpose, the City of Nanaimo can, by applying new collaboration models help the city's Culture and Heritage sector change old perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors and create sustainable organizations that will continue to enrich the city's social and economic fabric.

**Recommendation - Preferred Option - Create and Sustain a Constellation Model**

1. It is recommended that, based on a review of academic literature; analysis of survey findings on the attitudes, behaviors, and practices of Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage organizations; the City’s preference for a facilitator role; and on an assessment of available collaboration models, the City of Nanaimo advance Option 2 - The Constellation Model - as the preferred model for its work with the community in creating a collaborative environment and sustainable service delivery model for Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector and the organizations in it.

2. It is recommended that, if the City is unable to commit the necessary resources and support for the Constellation Model, that it takes no further action in implementing a collaboration model for Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector.

3. It is recommended, that regardless of option selected, the City in consultation with the community and using the current *Cultural Plan,* develop and approve an Arts Policy to further direct and guide the City's role in Culture and Heritage.
Implementation Strategies

1. It is recommended, that regardless of the option selected, the City work with the Culture and Heritage sector and representatives of other sectors to highlight to City Council and the community generally the value and benefits of Culture and Heritage in creating a successful city (Nanaimo and District Chamber of Commerce, 2012).

2. It is recommended, that assuming the City embraces the recommended option, the City further investigate working examples of the Constellation Model to gain a better understanding of what assistance or role the Centre for Social Innovation and/or StepUp BC could play in assisting the City in implementing a Constellation Model.

3. It is recommended the City further research Community Innovation Labs to determine if there are tools or activities used within the pilot communities that could benefit the City and its work with the Culture and Heritage sector.
7.0 CONCLUSION

The City of Nanaimo, Vancouver Island's second largest municipality, has the potential to be a culturally rich and vibrant community. Nanaimo City Council, in 2012, recognized this potential when it adopted Cultural Vitality as one of four strategic pillars in its three-year strategic plan. Council and community support for the city's Culture and Heritage sector was pivotal in Council's adoption of the 2014-2020 A Cultural Plan for a Creative Nanaimo 2014-2020 Developed through extensive community engagement and participation, the Cultural Plan serves as the blueprint that guides both the City's and community organizations' work in providing citizens and visitors with a spectrum of Culture and Heritage experiences.

Building on the momentum arising from the Cultural Plan, the City is now keen to understand the feasibility of creating and sustaining an enhanced, trust-based collaborative environment within Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector. This City-sponsored study, begun in Spring 2014, assessed that feasibility and provides recommendations for the City's and Sector's consideration and actions.

Based on the study's primary research findings, Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector is confident in its current ability to work collaboratively internally and with other sectors, recognizes that there is significant opportunity for improvement, and is open to an organization such as the City to provide collaboration leadership and training that builds trust, increases knowledge, shifts attitudes and behaviours, and increases Sector sustainability. The research indicates that the Sector organizations have a strong desire to work with each and the City to create a trust-based, collaborative environment and that they are ready to be a part of any change and change-mechanism and welcome the City playing an increased leadership and facilitating role.

The study's literature review examined collaboration theory, environmental conditions that support optimum collaboration, currently applied organizational models for collaboration, and promising and emerging collaboration practices and tools.

The study's research and literature findings were over-laid to identify potential collaboration model Options appropriate for use by Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector. Three Options, Maintain Status Quo, Create and Sustain the Constellation Model, and Create an Independent Body, were identified and assessed using criteria including, but not limited to: the ability to foster, promote and support trust; the ability of groups and individuals to flow in-and-out of projects and initiatives; the ability to incorporate and leverage organizational assets; and, the level of leadership and support required by City, based on its preference for a role as facilitator/connector.

The study highlights that the City’s approach to creating a collaborative environment for the Culture and Heritage sector needs to focus on tools and activities that bring groups and individuals together, promote positive interaction, find common-ground, shared-purpose, and group identity, advance each group’s mandate, and provide capacity building opportunities (Miller & Cohen-Katz, 2010, p. 338; Putnam, 2000, p. 136; Ulbrich et al., 2009, p. 150; Vorakulpipat & Rezgui, 2009, p. 162).

The study encourages the following collaboration-based commitments for the City and the Sector based on the primary research findings, the literature review, and collaboration model Option assessment.
The City’s Commitments

- The City and community create and sustain the Constellation Model as the preferred model to be used in creating a trust-based collaborative environment for Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector.
- The City work with and support the Sector in understanding, implementing, and sustaining the Constellation Model and resulting collaboration, not impose it on the Sector.
- The City, as one actor in a complex system, provide the effective and necessary facilitative leadership; education and support required supporting and sustaining trust-based, collaboration environmental change.
- The City engage enthusiastically and fully with the Sector to define trust and in trust building initiatives and shared approaches.
- The City demonstrate Council political support for the Sector and its value as a social and economic driver.
- The City use its current *Culture Plan* to create an Arts Policy to guide and assist in Plan implementation.

The Sector’s Commitments

- The Sector and its organizations enthusiastically and fully engage with the City in its willingness to create a collaborative environment.
- The Sector and its organizations develop the trust, knowledge and competencies, attitudes, and behaviors necessary to be full collaborators with the City, within the Sector and with other sectors.

Shared Commitments

- The City and the Sector foster awareness and support for the Sector, its work and benefits as a social and economic generator contributing to Nanaimo's quality of life and sustainability.

The study concludes that, based on: the primary research and findings; the assumption that the City and the Sector will accept and implement the above recommendations; and that all players will participate with goodwill and use their combined best-efforts, creating a trust-based, collaborative environment in Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector is indeed feasible and should be creatively and immediately pursued. This collaboration will be key to enhancing the Sector's legitimacy, to securing sustainable support for it and to realizing Nanaimo’s potential as a culturally rich and vibrant community. The City, should it be unable to commitment to and provide the resources necessary to sustain the Constellation Model, maintain the Status Quo model to avoid further Sector disappointment and potential failure.
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APPENDIX A
Culture Manager’s Working Group Charter

City of Nanaimo

Culture Managers' Working Group
Charter
Introduction

The City of Nanaimo, in March 2014, approved A Cultural Plan for a Creative Nanaimo. Based on a community-inspired vision, the plan is a blueprint that will see Nanaimo become a healthy and prosperous community that recognizes the importance of creativity and cultural vitality for quality of life and place. As a blueprint, the plan promotes and celebrates cultural vitality, one of the four pillars of the City’s strategic plan.

As part of its cultural vitality leadership, the City created a new Culture and Heritage Department, with responsibility for, in collaboration with others, cultural plan implementation. One of the first implementation steps is building stronger relationships with, and between, cultural organization and business and increasing opportunity to build capacity within organizations.

To assist it advancing the cultural plan implementation and in leveraging the talents and abilities of others, the Culture and Heritage Department has created an adjunct body, the Culture Managers’ Working Group.

Accountability

The Culture Managers' Working Group is accountable to the Culture and Heritage Department.

Responsibility

The Culture Managers' Working Group is responsible for supporting and leveraging the Culture and Heritage Department's initiatives to animate and grow a creative and engaged Nanaimo.

Roles

The Culture Manager's Working Group's provides leadership and action that brings the Plan to life. The Group, and its individual members, under general direction of the Culture and Heritage Department, may perform all or some of the following roles (See Schedule A - Role Activities):

- **Advisor** - providing insight, advice and recommendations on Plan matters including, but not limited to: planning, implementing and evaluating priorities, strategies and activities.

- **Collaborator** - working among its members, among the broader Culture and Heritage sector, and among other sectors to plan, finance and deliver specific initiatives that advance the Plan's vision and align with Plan priorities and strategies.

- **Networker** - working within the Culture and Heritage sector, and within other sectors, to foster and grow relationships, identify and secure new resources and tools and to create and share information.

- **Promoter** - working within the community to foster citizen and organizational awareness of the Culture and Heritage sector and its social and economic benefits, support for, and participation in creative sector activities.
Specific Duties

The Culture Managers' Working Group will perform specific duties as assigned by the Culture and Heritage Department or as mutually agreed annually and documented in a published work plan. All duties and work plans will align with the Cultural Plan, especially Sections 5, 6 and 7.

Members

The Culture Managers' Working Group members are managers of organizations who manage facilities on the City’s behalf, offer a fee-for-service, or receive, at minimum, three-year funding from the City of Nanaimo. The Culture and Heritage Department, when identifying and selecting Group members, will consult with existing Group members. Group members will serve voluntarily and without City compensation at the pleasure of the Department.

Term

The Culture Managers' Working Group will provide its services on an initial three-year term basis, which will be subject to renewal at the discretion of the Culture and Heritage Department.

Evaluation

The Culture Managers' Working Group will plan and evaluate its work and impact annually using a mutually agreed process and measurement criteria. Both the annual work plan and evaluation will be public documents.

Conduct

The Culture Managers' Working Group will conduct its discussions and activities in a trusting, respectful and open manner. Group decisions will be taken using a consensus model. Group disputes and conflicts will be resolved through unbiased and collegial processes. Group members shall conduct themselves, at all times, in a professional and respectful manner.

Meetings

The Culture Managers’ Working Group will meet according to a mutually agreed schedule or at the call of the Culture and Heritage Department. Meetings may be scheduled monthly, quarterly, annually, or on as needed basis. Group meetings are professional and technical work sessions and shall not be open to others, except by Culture and Heritage Department invitation.

Support

The Culture Managers' Working Group will receive policy and program support from the Culture and Heritage Department, including but not limited to: liaison with and advocacy to other City units including Council, Commission and corporate units; and media relations. The Group will receive administrative support from the Department that will be limited to: meeting scheduling and logistical coordination; agenda preparation and circulation; meeting summary preparation and distribution.
Schedule A - Role Activities

Introduction

This schedule identifies, by role, potential activities that the Culture Managers’ Working Group and its members may engage in from time-to-time and as resources permit. The activities may change as progress and circumstances evolve.

All activities undertaken shall align with the Cultural Plan and be for shared benefit, not individual benefit.

Advisor Role

While the Cultural Plan has been adopted, there is significant work to be done in planning the short, mid and long term implementation activities and while some success indicators are contained within it, there is no agreed monitoring and evaluation plan to gauge the sector’s economic and social outcomes. Having the ability to report strategically, over multiple time periods, on the ROI of the combined investments (City, community, corporate, foundations, others) will be paramount to the sector’s continuing success.

The CMWG may assist by:

- Identifying and recommending priority areas or activities
- Providing information and advice on Culture and Heritage issues and initiatives
- Participating in an annual joint-planning process
- Formulating and implementing a Plan evaluation process
- Assessing the status and growth of the Culture and Heritage sectors’ impacts
- Assisting in conflict resolution

Collaborator Role

While the Cultural Plan has been adopted, implementation activities have not begun in a serious way.

The CMWG may assist by:

- Collaborating on implementation activities among its members.
- Coordinating implementation activities among its members and among other sector members
- Identifying and sharing assets
- Developing joint initiatives
- Increasing and sharing resources available to the cultural community
- Leveraging each others’ contacts and Boards of Directors

Networker Role

While the Cultural Plan has been adopted, much work can be done to build and strengthen relationships both within the sector and with other sectors. Cross-sector engagement is key to achieving the Plan’s social and economic potential.

The CMWG may assist by:

- Encouraging and building strong, mutually beneficial relationships among cultural organizations and with other sectors
- Identifying and pursuing ways to raise the profile of Culture and Heritage
• Supporting Culture and Heritage events that add-value to the creative sector and community-at-large
• Working together to access diversified funding
• Leveraging each others’ contacts and Boards of Directors

Promoter Role

While the Cultural Plan has been adopted, much work can be done to foster community, stakeholder and organizational awareness of, and support for, the sector and its social and economic benefits.

The CMWG may assist by

• Being Culture and Heritage ambassadors
• Encouraging increased community involvement in cultural events and initiatives
• Promoting cultural and heritage events and initiatives
• Developing an annual Culture and Heritage activities calendar
• Developing a joint marketing program
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Participant Consent Form
University of Victoria
School of Public Administration
Masters of Community Development

Letter of Information for
Implied Consent

Feasibility Study for Creating a Collaborative Climate in Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage Sector

You are invited to participate in a study entitled Feasibility Study for Creating a Collaborative Climate in Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage Sector that is being conducted by Suzanne Samborski. The research project is being developed for the City of Nanaimo.

Suzanne Samborski is a Graduate Student with the University of Victoria in the department of Public Administration at the University of Victoria and you may contact her if you have further questions by email at ssambors@uvic.ca

As a Graduate student, I am required to conduct research as part of the requirements for a degree in Community Development. It is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Kimberley Speers. You may contact my supervisor at 1-778-351-1960. The City of Nanaimo is represented by Ian Howat, General Manager of Corporate Services and can be contacted at 1-250-754-4251. The study has gone through the University of Victoria’s ethics process under the guidance of the Human Research Ethics Board (1-250-472-4545).

Purpose and Objectives
This project has two purposes. The first is to create an environment that furthers the Nanaimo cultural plan initiatives to make Nanaimo a healthy and prosperous community that recognizes the importance of creativity and cultural vitality for quality of life and place. The second is to identify tools and approaches to leverage the knowledge and assets of the culture groups to promote working, learning, planning and delivering services together effectively creating a collaborative climate in the sector. The primary research question being addressed by the project is what tools and approaches can the City of Nanaimo use to increase collaboration in the Culture and Heritage sector? A secondary question that will be explored is how can the City of Nanaimo build capacity in the Culture and Heritage sector through collaboration?

Importance of this Research
Research of this type is important because creating a collaborative and supportive climate for Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector, increasing the sector's economic impact, and fostering cultural vitality as one of the four core pillars of City of Nanaimo sustainability will all be advanced through this project. Additionally, the project will make a contemporary contribution to the academic and professional literature on the benefits of using Culture and Heritage as an anchor for community development. The project recommendations will focus on tools and approaches that mobilize existing assets and build on others to create a collaborative community climate grounded in theories of community development and Communities of Practice.

Selection of Participants
You are being asked to participate in this study because you are involved in the Culture and Heritage sector in Nanaimo. The research sample will include Culture and Heritage groups who have applied
for City of Nanaimo funding (operating, events and festivals, and line item) in the past four years (fiscal 2011-2014); creating a sample of funding recipients and non-recipients. If a wider audience is needed to get a representative sample, all groups currently listed under Culture and Heritage groups in the Recreation Activity will be invited to participate. The sample is single sector and will contain a variety of large and small professional not-for-profit and community-based cultural organizations.

**What is involved**
If you consent to voluntarily participate in this research, your participation will include an online survey [http://fluidsurveys.com/s/CollaborateInCultureNanaimo/](http://fluidsurveys.com/s/CollaborateInCultureNanaimo/) that may take 15 to 30 minutes to complete. You will be asked to provide your organization’s name to assist in organizing the data and provide further credibility to the research. However, you can choose to complete the survey anonymously.

If you are interested in participating in the survey and/or participating further in the study, please let the candidate know via email at ssambors@uvic.ca.

**Inconvenience**
Participation in this study may cause some inconvenience to you, including the time to complete the online survey.

**Risks**
There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research.

**Benefits**
The potential benefits of your participation in this research include opportunity to provide information that will build capacity in the sector, share knowledge and experience, and create a more sustainable creative sector in Nanaimo through collaboration. Your participation will assist the City of Nanaimo in identifying how to better work with and enable the Culture and Heritage sector in Nanaimo.

**Voluntary Participation**
Your participation in this research must be completely voluntary. If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw at any time without any consequences or any explanation. If you do withdraw from the study your data from the online survey will be impossible to remove from the database. Participants can choose to leave survey responses blank if you prefer not to answer the question. As data will not be correlated by organization name, the candidate is unable to remove specific organizational data.

**Candidate’s Relationship with Participants**
As the City’s Senior Manager of Culture and Heritage, the candidate may have a relationship to potential participants as one of the City’s representative to and for the Culture and Heritage sector. To help prevent this relationship from influencing your decision to participate, the following steps to prevent coercion have been taken:

The study will be voluntary in nature and all information will be confidential. Identities of participants will not be shared with the Client or published in the final report. A list of the organizations who are invited to participate will be included in the final report as an appendix. Assets and opportunities will be based on sectoral and group-type versus individual findings.

Survey responses will not be linked to specific organizations in the report.
The study is focused on improving collaboration in the sector. Typically groups have sensitivity when discussing funds. To further mitigate concerns over perceived power, the survey and focus group questions have been created to not focus specifically on funding but on assets and opportunities. The candidate’s staff role does not have any direct influence on funding decisions and your participation or lack thereof will not influence future funding decisions.

**Anonymity**
In terms of protecting your anonymity the survey is anonymous. There are 45 groups being invited to participate and your organization would be one of 45.

All research materials will be destroyed following project completion in the summer of 2015 and stored securely off-site (not at a City office).

**Confidentiality**
Using a Canadian-based survey company for the online surveys will protect your confidentiality and the confidentiality of the data. All computer files will be password protected by the candidate off-site and all paper will be secured offsite.

**Dissemination of Results**
It is anticipated that the results of this study will be shared with others in the following ways through a project defense, presentation and final report to the City of Nanaimo and the final paper will be available the University of Victoria database.

**Disposal of Data**
Data from this study will be disposed of through erasing electronic date and shredding all paper copies.

**Contacts**
Individuals that may be contacted regarding this study include the candidate and supervisor as outlined at the beginning of the consent form. In addition, you may contact Ian Howat, City of Nanaimo (250) 754-4251 with questions regarding the City’s involvement.

In addition, you may verify the ethical approval of this study, or raise any concerns you might have, by contacting the Human Research Ethics Office at the University of Victoria (250-472-4545 or ethics@uvic.ca).

By completing and submitting the questionnaire, **YOUR FREE AND INFORMED CONSENT IS IMPLIED** and indicates that you understand the above conditions of participation in this study and that you have had the opportunity to have your questions answered by the candidates.

*Please retain a copy of this letter for your reference.*
APPENDIX D
Creative Nanaimo Network

CREATIVE NANAIMO NETWORK: PROGRESS MARKERS

OUTCOME CHALLENGE: The project intends to see the Culture and Heritage Department take a leadership role in creating a collaborative environment within the Creative Sector and connecting the Creative Sector with the Economic/Entrepreneurial Organizations (EOEs), the City of Nanaimo and Vancouver Island University (VIU). Through the support and involvement of Council and City senior leadership, the Culture and Heritage Department initiates policy-level changes that support collaboration, project-based funding and innovative ideas that advance sectoral growth and independence throughout the Network. Recognizing that long-term sustainability in the sector can only be reached by strengthening inter-sectoral relationships, the Culture and Heritage Department energizes the City of Nanaimo’s Internet Technology Department to lead the technological development of the CNN with other boundary partners and provide long-term City infrastructure and staff support. Using existing relationships, the Department is able assist VIU, EOEs and the Creative Sector to develop cross-sectoral mentorship, training, partnerships and research-based projects. Leadership from the Creative Sector provides a framework to expand the Network to include other community benefit sectors such as social and sport, creating opportunities for cross-sectoral collaboration and capacity building.

EXPECT TO SEE [CULTURE AND HERITAGE DEPARTMENT]:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leading and implementing the Creative Nanaimo Network project with Boundary Partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Providing opportunities for cross-sectoral meetings, networking sessions and incubator sessions to promote partnering and collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drafting policy for Council that supports the Creative Nanaimo Network as a way to promote increased self-support and improve quality of life indicators that promote growth and diversification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIKE TO SEE [CULTURE AND HERITAGE DEPARTMENT]:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identifying opportunities for cross-sectoral collaboration and capacity building among the boundary partners (building from data collected by the Creative Sector and VIU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Providing support and resources to boundary partners to develop partnerships, explore social innovation and create organizational capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Playing a lead role in involving other sectors in the Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Playing a lead community development role in the City of Nanaimo and be considered an integral and equal department and function within the City, based on its sectoral and cross-sectoral work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOVE TO SEE [CULTURE AND HERITAGE DEPARTMENT]:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Providing discretionary project funding to support cross-sectoral collaborations that improve capacity or increase resiliency in the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Influencing City Council and Senior Leadership to provide long-term support, commitment and finance to the creative sector through staff, financial and policy initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Linking VIU, the Economic/Entrepreneurs and the Creative Sector to create social enterprise, corporate support and collaborative learning opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OUTCOME CHALLENGE:** The project intends to see the Creative Sector understand what collaboration is, recognize the value of true collaboration and step outside the silo of individual organizations to create a Community of Practice built on sharing information, resources and capacity. The Creative Sector is clearly able to identify its value and worth in a way that is meaningful to its partners, funders and community creating broader support for the sector’s programs and service that results in increased economic and social benefit to the community. The sector is open and accepting of leadership and partnership with those outside the ‘culture and heritage’ sector and recognize those individuals offer skills and expertise the sector may not have. Through a united voice the sector is able to work closer with the City in identifying a clear and action-based mandate for success and is able to leverage its relationships with other partners to lobby City Council and the Province for ongoing support and funding as it relates to creating cultural vitality through the Creative Sector. This project assists the sector in recognizing the need to work with other community benefit sectors to create greater community support, impact and in championing future networking and partnerships.

**EXPECT TO SEE [CREATIVE SECTOR]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creating and agreeing to a shared definition and value of collaboration and partnership (sectoral and cross-sectoral).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promoting social enterprise, social innovation and mentorship as a sustainable way to operate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participating in training and professional development opportunities focused on capacity building, social enterprise and collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communicating cross-sector and community-wide regarding the benefits and impact that the creative sector brings to a community in an accessible and meaningful way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIKE TO SEE [CREATIVE SECTOR]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Encouraging others to provide programs and services an individual organization may have done in the past, freeing up capacity to focus on core activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sharing resources among the sector (volunteers, funding, human resources, governance practices, marketing, training), allowing for many hands to share the work and create opportunity for strategic thinking and planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marketing and promoting other organization’s events and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Implementing monitoring and evaluation methods that provide relevant information that allows government and corporate funders to want to invest in their activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOVE TO SEE [CREATIVE SECTOR]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Partnering with other community benefit sectors to provide programs, services and enterprise that benefit the community at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lobbying higher levels of government for ongoing funding and support in a unified and strategic manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Asking the City for human resource and capacity building support instead of grant funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OUTCOME CHALLENGE:** The project intends to see Economic Organizations/Entrepreneurs (EOEs) identify more closely with the Creative Sector and recognize that their, and the community’s success, is dependent on a balanced sustainability platform that includes cultural vitality. Organizations representing corporate and business interests involved with the project assist in creating the Network, developing mentorship and cross sectoral training opportunities and providing access and connections to the EOE’s membership. EoEs view the sector as a valuable partner and seek opportunities to work with the sector to create project and funding opportunities. Using its political influence, EOE gives the Creative Sector a more powerful voice that influences increased political support for the sector. EOE assist the Creative Sector in understanding that partnership is more than sponsorship and joint training and mentorship programs results in skill development, allowing the Creative Sector to branch into social enterprise, creating employment and economic sustainability.

**EXPECT TO SEE [EOEs]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Investing in the creative sector through shared training, mentoring and corporate partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participating in research projects that identify economic benefits of business partnering with the creative sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Providing funding and human resource support to the Creative Nanaimo Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Influencing local politicians to believe the creative sector and culture vitality is the fourth pillar of sustainability of any community and truly incorporating Culture and Heritage as part of the successful cities mandate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIKE TO SEE [EOEs]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supporting the creative sector in developing social enterprise skills and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mentoring students and established artists, performers and other creative sector workers in small business operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Establishing business plan vetting and financial assistance for social enterprise and collaboration opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOVE TO SEE [EOEs]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Influencing provincial and national bodies to provide long-term, guaranteed funding to collaborative initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sharing resources and capacity with the creative sector (graphic design, copying, printing, and bookkeeping).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Providing leadership in assisting the creative sector and other community benefit organizations to understand and explore Community Contribution Corporations and other operational and governance models as groups morph into alternate self-supporting organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OUTCOME CHALLENGE:** The project intends to see the City of Nanaimo, particularly the IT, Communications and Planning departments and Senior Leadership participate in and support Creative Sector programs and services and participate in the creation of the Network and policy-level changes. The IT department uses its platform and dialogue development skills to create a technology platform that could be used by other municipalities while being recognized for its innovative approach to building community. The Communications department assists the Culture and Heritage department in educating and marketing to the sector to participate in the project and the network and develops an appreciation for the sectors’ ability to connect with hard-to-reach demographics of the community on the City’s behalf. Through Senior Leadership support, the City recognizes the community engagement opportunity to provide a stronger voice to the sector through policy-level changes, ongoing communication support and more strongly linking its economic and social policies and projects to the Creative Sector. City Council creates policy that: supports the development, maintenance and expansion of the network; supports ongoing and stable funding for the Creative Sector which is leveraged into cultural projects and programs that all residents access; and attracts young and emerging Creative Sector leaders and cultural workers who collectively bring life and energy to volunteerism and community groups throughout the community. Creating opportunities for the Creative Sector to connect with City departments early on in projects and processes provides capacity building opportunities for the City and the sector.

**EXPECT TO SEE [CITY OF NANAIMO]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Developing and hosting the Creative Nanaimo Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supporting policies that recognize the value of investing in the creative sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Providing long-term and stable funding to groups that demonstrate resiliency, community benefit, collaborative thinking and acting, innovation and/or economic impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supporting the Culture and Heritage Department in implementing the Creative Nanaimo Network and expanding to other community benefit sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIKE TO SEE [CITY OF NANAIMO]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Providing long-term financial and human resource support to sustaining and expanding the Creative Nanaimo Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Providing marketing and communication support, collateral and development for creative sector groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Including a cultural lens cross-departmentally and throughout all projects from design to implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOVE TO SEE [CITY OF NANAIMO]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Including the creative sector in policy and project design from application of a cultural lens to assisting in the development of design guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Offering City of Nanaimo governance and staff training to individuals and groups in the creative sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Celebrating the achievements and importance of the creative sector to the growth and development of a successful and balanced community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OUTCOME CHALLENGE:** The project intends to see Vancouver Island University (VIU) recognize the value the Creative Sector provides to the VIU by attracting students to the community, providing mentorship and project opportunities to students and employment opportunities to graduates. VIU provides resources and knowledge in the development of the Network and works with Network members to develop curriculum and programs to create a shared learning environment for students and the sector that provide opportunities for their students to gain skills, knowledge and experience in their fields of choice by completing projects, co-ops, research studies and mentorship opportunities for CNN and members of the Creative Sector. Through its public programs and education opportunities, VIU is a conduit between the Creative Sector and the community. Building on its strengthened relationships with the Creative Sector, EOEs and the City, VIU provides vital resources to the Creative Sector through capacity-building opportunities. VIU’s commitment to carrying out research projects supporting the importance of cultural vitality and the dynamic work the CNN is doing in Nanaimo highlights this project as a model for other communities and post-secondary institutions, creating legitimacy the sector can leverage.

**EXPECT TO SEE [VIU]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Providing human resource and funding to the Creative Nanaimo Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creating two mentorship programs from faculty to sector and students to sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participating in research projects that provide data and findings that supports the creative sector as a vital component of a healthy and vibrant community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Opening its doors to the Creative Sector and boundary partners to create partnering and collaborating opportunities with faculty and programs that advance social innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIKE TO SEE [VIU]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expanding its curriculum to include board, staff and volunteer development and capacity building programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Creating program and learning opportunities that involve the community and require participation from the creative sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Increasing its emphasis on attracting and retaining creative sector students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Leveraging its local and provincial government connections to promote policy and funding that supports the creative sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOVE TO SEE [VIU]:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Applying for research grants that further develops the Creative Nanaimo Network and promotes it as a community of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Offering an Culture and heritage or Culture and Heritage specialization degree program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Creating a downtown hub or incubator for social innovation, enterprise and collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Outcome Mapping workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Finalize project terms of reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Provide additional funding to assist in Network infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Develop Network platform/hosting requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Provide administration support for Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Launch the Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Provide meeting spaces and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Marketing and Promotion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Market the Network at Creative Sector meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Host workshops promoting the Network and getting feedback on concept and pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Develop media campaign to build cross-sector Network Buzz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Create Network Newsletter highlighting successes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Host pop-up Network demonstration sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Develop media campaign re., value and success of the Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Develop student-based radio campaign regarding the Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Link the Network to other high-functioning Networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Promote Network as a community-model at conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Provide workshops defining collaboration and partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Host training for working with EOE, the City and VIU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Develop Network platform/hosting requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Host Social Enterprise Development Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Develop/offer advocacy and lobbying training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Develop/Council/Senior staff Network orientation sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Develop/offer ‘building sectoral support’ sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Host faculty workshops on mentorship/cooperative opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Host corporate sponsorship benefit sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Develop community-based curriculum for board/staff development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Host cross-sectoral board/staff development sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Building (Networking, Collaborating &amp; Partnering)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Host monthly face-to-face opps for BP’s to explore opps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Create support program to assist groups/individuals develop cross-sectoral connection-making capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Create baseline of current partnership &amp; collaboration examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Create asset list of sector skills &amp; capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Host EOE/Connectors featuring Creative Sector guests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Create off-site writing &amp; development labs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Provide opportunities for cross-sectoral strategy sessions to further develop relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Administrators provide peer-to-peer training and support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Provide research re.; the economic/business impact of the creative sector to create interest in investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Strategies</td>
<td>Quarter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Identify opportunities for collaborating &amp; partnering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Provide business case for mentorships and corporate sponsorships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12 Develop taxpayer friendly resources outlining 4.16 information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13 Establish corporate Dragons Den breakfast program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14 Link creative sector with existing ‘networks’ in the City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15 Establish EOE/Creative Sector Mentorship Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16 Develop mechanism linking mentoring EOE to non-mentoring EOE to promote participation in mentorship program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17 Share Corporate training opportunities with Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18 Host creative sector-based student recruitment &amp; job fairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19 Make City project funding contingent on collaboration or partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20 Provide opportunities for research &amp; co-op placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.21 Create easy to use performance monitoring and measurement tools for creative sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.22 Formalize agreement between Network &amp; VIU for research &amp; co-op projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.23 Create island-wide Network for idea sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24 Connect IT department with other Cities using similar platforms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25 Create off-site learning incubators for students &amp; faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Policy Development

5.1 Ask Council to direct City to host Network                                     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |
5.2 Create policy to provide long-term creative sector funding                     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |
5.3 Influence EOE to incorporate Network opportunities into their mandates         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |
5.4 Incorporate Network opportunities in VIU mandates & curriculum                 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |
5.5 Ask for Council support to expand Network cross-sector                         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |
5.6 Develop strategy to influence long-term government support for the Creative Sector |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |
5.7 Ask higher levels of government for stable long-term sector funding            |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |

6. Outcome Performance & Monitoring

6.1 Develop monitoring priorities                                                  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |
6.2 Develop Monitoring Worksheets                                                   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |
6.3 Develop Evaluation Plan                                                         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |
6.4 Implement Evaluation Plan (with Boundary Partners)                             |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |         |         |         |        |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Activity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Supplies Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Nanaimo Network Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Spaces and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Costs Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead (12% of Direct Costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Costs Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network platform development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Performance &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/Provincial Grant Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Communities BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nanaimo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Island University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo &amp; District Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts-in-Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL NET PROFIT (LOSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creative Nanaimo Network 24 month budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Activity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Supplies Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Nanaimo Network Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Spaces and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Costs Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead (12% of Direct Costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Costs Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network platform development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Performance &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/Provincial Grant Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Communities BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nanaimo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Island University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo &amp; District Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts-in-Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL NET PROFIT (LOSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
Active Neighbourhoods Canada - Community of Practice

Draft guide (v9) for discussion by partners – As approved as of the May 28, 2014 meeting

A Community of Practice is ...

“The process of social learning that occurs when people have a common interest in some subject or problem, collaborate over an extended period to share ideas, find solutions and build innovations.” (from Jean Love and Etienne Wenger)

This document identifies the key issues the Active Neighbourhoods Canada partners have identified for discussion regarding the creation and functioning of the Community of Practice (CoP). The seven issue areas are identified below.

The document is intended to provide the structure for a facilitated discussion leading to adoption of a Terms of Reference for our CoP. The Terms of Reference will be our CoP’s statement of why it exists, how it will operate, and what it would like to achieve. Once adopted, the document will serve as a Terms of Reference for our Community of Practice until the group decides that it would like to modify the Term of Reference, but it should be reviewed annually at a minimum.

The process to date has been as follows:

1. The first draft of the discussion guide was produced by Elisabeth based on input received at the MUEC staff meeting on October 9, 2013, and an ANC partner workshop with Jacques Chevalier on October 22-24, 2013. ANC project staff provided comments on the draft which were incorporated prior to the document being circulated to the partners.

2. During the January 14, 2014 project conference call the partners received a brief presentation from Elisabeth on the first draft of the discussion guide (v1). There was a preliminary discussion of Key Issue #1, Purpose: Why have an Active Neighbourhoods Canada Community of Practice? Suggestions for changes to the document were offered and it was agreed that further discussion would occur at the face-to-face meeting at the end of January.

3. A revised discussion guide (v2) was circulated by prior to the SAS training (January, 27, 28, 29) and all members were invited to provide comments.

4. The members present at the SAS training met on January 28 to continue the discussion of the purpose, mandate and other issues. The comments arising from this discussion were incorporated in version 3 of the discussion guide.

5. The revised purpose and mandate were discussed at the February 24 meeting and revisions were suggested. The CoP asked Elisabeth to incorporate the changes and circulate them so that members could indicate if the sections are now good enough* to give us the guidance we need to move forward.

6. The CoP approved the Purpose and Mandate statements at the March 24 meeting. Comments on the Structure and Process sections were received and were incorporated for discussion at the April meeting.

7. The CoP approved the Structure section at the April 22 CoP meeting. The Process - Ways of Operating introductory statement and timeline were approved. It was agreed that the Language section would be the focus of the May meeting. Comments can be inserted into this section of the document prior to the meeting.

8. The Language section was approved at the May 28 meeting. It was agreed that the remaining sections would be discussed in the autumn of 2014.

* “the good enough principle” as defined in the SAS handbook on pg. 38 “Make sure that the information and analysis that are part of a discussion are ‘good enough’ to satisfy needs and expectations, without being either superficial or exhausting or exhausting”.

1. Purpose: Why have an Active Neighbourhoods Canada Community of Practice?
The primary objective of the Active Neighbourhoods Canada Community of Practice is to be a valued resource for all members to enhance their success in engaging citizens in planning and implementing active and healthy neighbourhoods. Working together, we will generate support for innovation and experimentation in our individual and collective practices.

The Active Neighbourhoods Canada CoP will:
- Focus on the exploratory rather than the operational aspects of the project
- Provide a distinct space and time for members to collaborate on solving common problems
- Provide time for collective reflection about how we practice
- Help us ground our practice in theory and to contribute to theory from the knowledge gained from our practice

2. Mandate

To provide a forum for increasing our capacity to engage citizens in transforming their neighbourhoods and to share this knowledge widely, in order to:
- Begin to effect change in professional standards and practices in order to promote planning and design for active transportation in Canada
- Contribute to changing the culture of planning to become a more collaborative process between professionals and community members
- Address the major challenge of how to implement plans and maintain community engagement post-plan to implementation and maintenance

The mandate will be attained by:
- Sharing successes and challenges for example in community engagement, communications and “political savvy”
- Testing new tools and evaluation strategies
- Learning about innovative practices from guest speakers or online resources, for example transportation engineers or urban planners
- Working together to answer questions facing all partners, for example, “how participatory should we be?” or “how do we know when an activity or approach adds value?”

New ways to attain the mandate will emerge as the CoP continues to collaborate.

3. Structure

a. Who should be involved?

CoP start up – Oct 2013 - Dec 2014
TCAT: Car, Mikey, Nancy
SC: Celia, Ryan, Roxanne
CEUM: Saleema, Anne, Alexandra, Julie
Evaluation: Diane
Facilitation: Elisabeth

One lead organizational rep (tbd), plus up to 3 other project staff as available.

Jan 2015 – Dec 2015
Add Local Project Partners as available.
Consider inviting other potential partners for some or all meetings: Scientific/Advisory Committees, CLASP, FCM, DSP Montreal and Monterege, Toronto Public Health, Universities (McGill, Toronto, Calgary, Montreal), Quebec en forme, industry groups.

Jan 2016 – project completion
Third phase: Consider inviting new partners to be identified by CoP members.
b. Roles:

Partner representatives (one per Partner):
- Attend all meetings or brief back-up if unavailable
- Liaise with other CoP members at Partner Organisation and Local Projects
- Assist with setting agenda and organizing activities
- Active participation at and between meetings
- Engage and collaborate with other members

Partner members (up to 3)
- Attend as many meetings as possible
- Assist with setting agenda and organizing activities
- Active participation at and between meetings
- Engage and collaborate with other members

Local Project members (# tbd)
- Attend as many meetings as possible
- Active participation at and between meetings
- Engage and collaborate with other members

Organizational representatives (one per Organisation)
- Participate and collaborate with partner reps
- Act as guest speakers?

Facilitator (Elisabeth)
- Meeting preparation and follow-up
- Facilitate meetings
- Generate ideas
- Track and document activities

Evaluation (Diane)
- Ensure evaluation tools are provided and used appropriately

4. Process - ways of operating

The CoP will operate in a dynamic, flexible, useful, and realistic manner which encourages sharing, co-constrcuting, and experimentation. We anticipate that the CoP will build enduring relationships that support our practices which will continue after the ANC project is completed.

Starting in April 2014, each meeting will include a segment presented and facilitated by a Partner Organisation.

The following schedule was set at the March 24 meeting:
April: MUEC – Negotiating Partner Agreements
May: TCAT – Discussing Motivational Diversity in Community Engagement with New Immigrant Populations
June: SC - tbd

a. Timeline

- Training, Drafting documents, meeting preparation

Develop and test: Feb – March 2014
- Discuss and Adopt Terms of Reference
- Agree on first issues and speakers

Launch, maintain, evolve, document, and evaluate: Apr 2014 to Mar 2017
b. Operating Procedures

Language: (spoken and written)

Our CoP includes members with varying degrees of bilingualism. We will need to operate in a manner that allows maximum participation by all members in the language of their choice. This will be an evolving issue as the CoP grows. It is proposed that:

- Documents, posts and emails will be written in the language of choice of the provider, with a written or “jing” summary in the other language where possible.
- Face-to-face meetings operate in both languages with on-site whisper translation provided where necessary and possible.
- Web-based meetings operate in both languages, with on-site whisper translation provided by participants in their regions.
- Presentations can be made in the language of choice of the presenter. Questions and discussion will occur in both languages with whisper translation as required.
- When a member indicates that they are unable to participate in an activity due to language barriers, the CoP will work to reduce this barrier.

Meeting frequency

During the start-up and launch phase (Feb 2014 to Mar 2015) the CoP membership will be limited to the Partners as outlined in the Structure section of this Terms of Reference. During this phase the CoP will meet by conference call 9 times including one face to face meeting in November.

The CoP will grow as local projects are identified by each partner and are invited to join the CoP. Some issues may be more relevant to regional partners while others will be of national significance. The most effective way to continue the CoP as the membership grows and the needs evolve will be determined towards the end of 2014.

In the final phase, the CoP may grow to include other partners. This may require fewer, but longer meetings. The most effective way to continue the CoP as the membership grows and the needs continue to evolve will be determined towards the end of 2015.

Technology needs

- Project management requirements of the CoP will be met by the new MUEC system “Feng Office” starting in June 2014.
- A wordpress site will be used for CoP member collaboration, sharing and reporting starting in May 2014.
- Documents will be stored in googledocs and dropbox until the FengOffice system is operational.
- Meetings will be conducted using gotomeeting (voice only).

Decision making process

A decision making process for CoP should be adopted, for example majority vote, consensus or other.

5. Evaluation of Community of Practice

The CoP will work with Diane Proudfoot to identify appropriate tools for evaluation of the CoP and possible indicators linked to the purpose and mandate of our Community of Practice.

6. Action Research Project

An action research project will be completed on the development, activities and achievements of the CoP. A work plan for the project has been completed. Notes on the actions taken to date and draft research questions have been developed and were presented for comment to the CoP at the May meeting.
An article focusing on the first year of the CoP will be submitted to Plan Canada in September 2014.

7. **Possible Resources**
An on-line resource library was proposed by participants at the partners meeting in October. Resources have been posted on the ANC CoP wordpress site library as of May 2014. The CoP should determine how this space should be managed, for example, guidelines for types of resources, who should post, and how long material should be posted.
APPENDIX F
Research Participant Survey

Introduction
This survey is part of a research study on the feasibility of creating a more collaborative climate in Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector.

The study is being conducted for the City of Nanaimo and forms part of the principal candidate's course work for the University of Victoria's Masters in Community Development program. It has been approved by the University's Ethics Review Panel (Protocol Number 14-088). The study's project report and findings will be presented to the City of Nanaimo and will be part of the public record.

Each organization's survey results are confidential and will only be reviewed by the principal candidate and the academic supervisor at the University of Victoria. Survey findings will be reported on a cumulative basis only and without reference to any individual organization.

For survey purposes, collaboration means two or more organizations sharing assets and working seamlessly together to achieve common goals or a common project and cooperation means two or more organizations working together informally in areas of common interest.

The survey questions are designed to identify the current state of the collaborative climate in Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector and the assets and opportunities that can be leveraged to build the sector's capacity and sustainability.

You and other representatives of selected Nanaimo Culture and Heritage organizations are being asked to share your thinking about:
- The current state of collaboration and cooperation in Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector
- The real and/or perceived barriers encountered during planning for events, applying for funding, marketing events and programs, and building community support.
- The potential solutions for eliminating or reducing the identified barriers.

Thank you for taking time to complete the survey and for sharing your organization's insight and knowledge. Your completed survey is an important part of creating a collaborative climate in Nanaimo's Culture and Heritage sector.
Section A:

This section will help us determine if there are some organizations who are able to be more collaborative than others based on the organization’s age, type, size, number of volunteers and annual operating budget.

Organization Name:

Years Operating:

Organizational Type (non-profit, co-op, etc):

Size of Board:

Number of Volunteers:

Annual Operating Budget:

Section B: Your Organization’s Current Reality

1. Based on your organization’s experience, how do you feel about the current collaborative and cooperative environment among organizations in Nanaimo’s Culture and Heritage sector?
   
   a) Very satisfied
   b) Satisfied
   c) Somewhat satisfied
   d) Not satisfied
   e) Very unsatisfied
   f) I don’t know

2. How do you feel about your organization’s ability to act in the current collaborative environment?

   a) Very satisfied
   b) Satisfied
   c) Somewhat satisfied
   d) Not satisfied
   e) Very unsatisfied

3. How do you feel about your organization’s readiness to act in the current collaborative environment?

   a) Very satisfied
   b) Satisfied
   c) Somewhat satisfied
   d) Not satisfied
   e) Very unsatisfied

4. What knowledge, skills and assets does your organization currently use to collaborate and cooperate with others within the sector?

   a) Governance development
   b) Staff and volunteer development
   c) Strategic thinking, planning and evaluation
   d) Program/event design, development and delivery
e) Marketing, communications and promotions
f) Fund development (including: grant writing, donor development and retention, capital campaigns)
g) Corporate sponsorship
h) External relationships (including political acumen and community connections)
i) Strong volunteer contingent
j) Other (please list)
k) We don't collaborate/cooperate with others in the sector

5. What knowledge, skills and assets does your organization currently rely upon others in the sector for to assist its collaboration and cooperation?

a) Governance development
b) Staff and volunteer development
c) Strategic thinking, planning and evaluation
d) Program/event design, development and delivery
e) Marketing, communications and promotions
f) Fund development (including: grant writing, donor development and retention, capital campaigns)
g) Corporate sponsorship
h) External relationships (including political acumen and community connections)
i) Strong volunteer contingent
j) Other (please list)
k) It doesn't rely on others in the sector

6. How does your organization like to learn?

a) Independently, on its own schedule
b) Independently, on others' schedules
c) Collaboratively, on its own schedule
d) Collaboratively, on others' schedules
e) Other (please list)
f) It's not a learning organization

7. When does your organization like to learn?

a) Independently, on its own schedule
b) Independently, on others' schedules
c) Collaboratively, on its own schedule
d) Collaboratively, on others' schedules
e) Other (please list)
f) It's not a learning organization

8. With whom does your organization proactively share information?

a) All organizations in the sector
b) Selected organizations in the sector
c) All organizations in the community
d) All organizations in the sector and selected organizations in other sectors
e) Selected organizations in the sector and selected organizations in other sectors
f) It doesn't share information

9. What information does your organization proactively share with others?
   a) Governance matters
   b) Management and operations matters (including financial information)
   c) Program/event matters
   d) Marketing and communications matters
   e) External relations matters (including political and community information)
   f) It depends on requests for information that are received
   g) Other ________________

10. What are your organization's preferred methods of receiving and sharing information? (check all that apply)
   a) Personal contacts
   b) Written correspondence
   c) Printed materials
   d) Email
   e) Facebook
   f) Twitter
   g) Other means (please list)

Section C: Your Organization’s Future Reality

11. What is one internal change that your organization could make to improve its ability to collaborate, cooperate, and communicate with the sector?
   a) Create a new mission and align its actions
   b) Strengthen its governance systems and competencies
   c) Foster and strengthen its collaboration/cooperation competencies
   d) Create an internal collaboration/cooperation charter (e.g.: understanding its risk/reward tolerances)
   e) Be more open to working differently and with others
   f) Change is not required, as its fine the way it is
   g) Other __________

12. What is one external change that your organization would like to see to improve the sectors' overall ability to collaborate/cooperate and communicate?
   a) Create forums and/or mechanisms for inter-organizational collaboration/cooperation and communication
   b) Reduce inter-organizational competition for scarce resources, market participation and political support
   c) Provide purposeful, on-going professional development opportunities for sector organizations
   d) Produce a strategic, rolling three-year schedule of major events/festivals and community activities to guide organizational efforts
e) Reduce the number of organizations qualifying for City of Nanaimo support by targeting those with the biggest audiences, the largest volunteer contingents and the widest community impact

f) Change is not required, as the sector is fine the way it is

13. What is one action that your organization can take to help others within the sector and to strengthen the sector overall?

a) Share our governance and management expertise

b) Provide leadership in operational areas including: program/event design/development and delivery; fund development; marketing and communications; external relations

c) Select a 'buddy' organization and provide mentor and operational support

d) Participate fully in collaboration/cooperative forums and/or mechanisms

e) Offer wisdom and insight based on organizational history and perspective

f) Other (please list)

g) It can’t do anything to help others

14. What is one action that another organization can take to help your organization and to help strengthen the sector's overall ability to collaborate/cooperate and communicate?

a) Share its governance and management expertise

b) Provide leadership in operational areas including: program/event design/development and delivery; fund development; marketing and communications; external relations

c) Select our organization as a 'buddy' organization and provide mentor and operational support

d) Participate in our organization’s collaboration/cooperative undertakings

e) Offer our organizations its wisdom and insight based on organizational history and perspective

f) Other (please list)

g) We don't need the help of other organizations

Section D: City of Nanaimo: Current and Future Role

15. How familiar are you about the City of Nanaimo’s ability to foster and strengthen the sector’s collaborative and cooperative environment?

a) Very familiar

b) Familiar

c) Somewhat familiar

d) Not familiar

e) Very unfamiliar

16. How do you feel about the City of Nanaimo's ability to foster and strengthen the sector's collaborative and cooperative environment?

a) Very confident

b) Confident

c) Somewhat confident

d) Not confident

e) Pessimistic
17. How do you feel about the sector’s future under the current collaborative and cooperative environment?
   a) Very optimistic
   b) Optimistic
   c) Somewhat optimistic
   d) Not optimistic
   e) Pessimistic
   Why do you feel that way? (maximum 100 words)

18. How do you feel community support for the sector might improve under a new collaborative and cooperative model?
   a) Very optimistic
   b) Optimistic
   c) Somewhat Optimistic
   d) Not optimistic
   e) Pessimistic
   Why do you feel that way? (maximum 100 words)

19. How do you feel about your organization’s ability and readiness to act in a collaborative-based community?
   a) Very Satisfied
   b) Satisfied
   c) Somewhat satisfied
   d) Not satisfied
   e) Very unsatisfied
   Why do you feel that way? (maximum 100 words)

20. What is one action that the City of Nanaimo can take to help your organization and to help strengthen the sector’s overall ability to collaborate/cooperate and communicate?
   a) Provide political support, goodwill and leadership
   b) Provide increased financial and operational support for our organization
   c) Target financial and operational support to our organization and other high impact organizations
   d) Create forums and mechanisms that enable our organization and others to collaborate/cooperate and communicate
   e) Foster and broker cross-sector collaboration
   f) Measure, evaluate and report on the sector’s economic and social benefits
   g) Other (please list)
   h) The City is doing everything in its powers
   i) The City should have no role in the sector’s future
   k) Other

21. What is one action that the City of Nanaimo should stop doing that would help your organization and strengthen the sectors’ over-all ability to collaborate/cooperate and communicate?
   a) Promoting collaboration/cooperation and communication as essential for success
   b) Limiting funding support to funds raised through the cultural levy

[85]
c) Requiring financial reports and performance results as part of its financial support
d) Developing and delivering programs/events that compete with our organization and other sector organizations
e) Charging for use of City owner and/or operated facilities
f) Expecting that all programs/events will advance both economic and social impact measures
g) Other (please list)
h) Rather than stopping anything the City should do more of everything
i) The sector's future is totally dependent on the City

22. If there was one additional piece of information or response to a question I have not asked, but you think important for the purposes of the study, please provide in the space below

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your responses inform recommendations to the City of Nanaimo to assist in building a more collaborative Culture and Heritage sector.

If you have any questions or would like more information I can be contacted at ssambors@uvic.ca.
BACKGROUND

This policy has been developed to respond to the realities of Calgary and the broader environment in 2004, it is therefore important to be clear about the assumptions and philosophy that underlie the policy itself. The policy should be formally reviewed within 5 years of its adoption.

This policy was completed for The City of Calgary in 2004 with the guidance of the Civic Arts Policy Review Steering Committee. The committee undertook a two-year process of review, research, consultation and writing (see Appendix I for details). This policy replaces the 1996 City of Calgary Civic Arts Policy, which required updating based on a review showing the need for improvements to leadership and communication structures, resourcing and accountability.

The committee concluded that there is an opportunity to recognize the contributions and realize the potential of an arts community that is innovative and entrepreneurial, but in many ways “bursting at the seams.” Calgary is home to many renowned artists and has served as the training ground for many more. These accomplishments have occurred in part due to an endowment of high-quality institutions and facilities and a strong base of private and public sector financial support and volunteers that serve the arts community in a multitude of capacities. This policy is designed to build upon this foundation.

The arts play a significant role in a community’s development, including contributions to economic prosperity. However, despite being a highly valuable outcome, community development is generally not the motivation behind artistic expression. A core philosophy of this policy therefore, is to recognize the intrinsic value of artistic expression and the associated need to create an environment which values and fosters artistic innovation and growth. In such an environment, more artists will be doing more work, and the benefits of this activity will naturally flow to the community as a whole.

To take full advantage of the opportunity to build a more creative and adaptive community, The City of Calgary’s support for the arts requires improved strategic leadership. In the current environment of rapid population growth and increasing
diversity, it is difficult to manage the increased operational and capital infrastructure demands of arts organizations. It is also difficult to create coordinated strategies for the arts as part of a broader agenda to improve the quality of life in Calgary. The city is more likely to meet these challenges through clear structures for planning, leadership and action.

An overriding goal of this policy is to celebrate and build on the best of what we have, while creating the conditions to unlock the potential that clearly exists. It will not happen overnight, but with the continued dedication of the arts community, working in partnership with the private sector, government, and other stakeholders, the vision articulated in this policy is achievable.

**PURPOSE**

**Purpose & Vision**

**Purpose**

To ensure civic leadership and investment in the arts has a clear and measurable impact on the aesthetic, social, economic and cultural quality of life in Calgary.

**Vision**

*That Calgary's*

- Citizens have a multitude of opportunities to engage in creative pursuits as artists, students and audience members.

- Artists thrive in an open and encouraging environment that places high value on their contributions to our community.

- Reputation as an inclusive, innovative and culturally vibrant city is broadly recognized. **Definitions**  
  Arts: Includes all forms of creative expression, including formal and informal arts, as well as art made in for-profit and not-for-profit settings. This definition includes traditional definitions of art such as performing arts, literary arts, visual arts, and the applied arts. The definition is also meant to capture the broad range of arts that impact the everyday lives of Calgarians.  
  Creative/cultural industries: Those activities that have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and utilization of intellectual property.  
  Culture: The collection of distinctive traits, spiritual and material, intellectual and affective, which characterize a society or social group. It is a broader concept

than "arts," comprising modes of life, human rights, value systems, traditions and beliefs.
Public art: Artistic creations or collaborations in any medium whether fixed or freestanding, permanent or temporary, within external or internal settings, intended to be freely accessible to the general public, including works are developed under the City of Calgary’s Public Art Policy wherein 1% of municipal capital budgets is dedicated to public art.

POLICY

Guiding Principles

The following principles are meant to serve together as a guide to practice and decision-making as the policy is implemented.

Ensure That The Arts Play a Leadership Role in the Future of Calgary

City Council recognizes and is committed to support the significant role arts and creativity will play in meeting the challenges of building a healthy, safe, caring, and vibrant Calgary of tomorrow.

Artists Are Welcome in Calgary

A thriving arts scene requires working artists. A key indicator of the success of this policy will be the extent to which artists see our city as a “place to be.” Artists will thrive where there are positive attitudes, energetic peers, a spirit of cooperation, voracious audiences, the resources necessary to do great work, and high profile support.

The Arts Are Accessible and Engage As Many Calgarians as Possible

The arts impact quality of life in a city when significant numbers of citizens are engaged. Engagement includes attending, viewing or participating in professional or amateur arts activities, including public art, as well as learning about various art forms in educational programs. Opportunities for engagement are accessible when they are diverse, yet meaningful to the people of Calgary and their everyday lives.
Calgary’s Artists Are Recognized for Their Excellence

Calgary is home to many artists who receive critical acclaim for the quality of their artistic achievements. This is an environment where artists challenge themselves to excel and where, despite the many other benefits available to Calgarians from a thriving arts community, the intrinsic value of art “as art” is cherished and celebrated.

Unique and Authentic Characteristics of Calgary’s Arts Scene are Identified and Strengthened

Calgary is a young city with a robust heritage, but is also a city where growth has been fuelled by inter-provincial and international immigration. Life in Calgary is shaped by the dramatic physical environment, the spirit of entrepreneurship that drives our economy, and more and more by the experiences of people from increasingly diverse geographies and cultures. Calgary’s arts scene reflects that reality in all its forms.

Stakeholders Cooperate and Create Connections to Realize the Full Potential of the Arts

Cooperation is facilitated by purposefully created connections across geographies, arts disciplines, economic sectors, and with sister agencies focused on other aspects of the community. A cooperative approach to infrastructure investment initiatives and determining strategic priorities for the sector will assist in bringing the resources of new supporters to Calgary’s arts-related priorities.

Culture and heritage Are Recognized as an Important Part of a Vibrant City

The existence of a thriving culture and heritage sector is itself an indicator of a healthy and balanced city with the capacity to deal with many of the challenges of growth. The arts and creative industries make a significant contribution to Calgary’s economy through direct employment and spending multipliers due to local consumption and tourist spending. The arts also have the potential to increase social inclusion, improve mental and physical health, and give youth significant learning advantages.

Culture and heritage Considerations are Included in Municipal Planning

Calgary’s Public Art Program requires City business units to incorporate art in large capital development projects. Tremendous additional benefits can be realized using additional mechanisms such as urban design panels, policies for
alternative bonusing structures for incorporating arts in a development, or zoning changes to make “artist-friendly” neighborhoods.

**Accountability is Maintained When Making Arts-Related Investments**

Citizens of Calgary expect their leaders to make sound investments that will improve the quality of life in Calgary. All partners in this initiative will strive to maintain transparent processes, good governance, and the measurement of and reporting on investment outcomes.

**Municipal Investments in the Arts Leverage Investment from Other Orders of Government and Other Sectors**

Though comparisons are difficult due to data differences, other orders of government have historically spent proportionately less on culture and heritage in Alberta than in other provinces. Throughout policy consultations, one message was clear: if The City makes culture and heritage a priority, with a compelling vision and clear plans to benefit the citizens of Calgary, other supporters will come to the table as partners.

**Investments Made in the Arts are Focused on Long term Growth and Sustainability of the Sector as a Dual Responsibility of Funders and Arts Organizations**

While acknowledging the need to encourage artists and arts organizations to take risks, this policy represents a commitment to the long-term growth and sustainability of the arts in Calgary. The City of Calgary and other partners will work to increase the level of resources available for the arts in the city, and expects an equivalent commitment to sustainability principles from the organizations it supports.

**PROCEDURE (Operational Guidelines)**

**Structure Guidelines**

City Council will delegate the creation, maintenance, and implementation of a long-term strategic plan for the arts, in line with this policy, to a single arm’s- length arts authority.

City Administration will ensure that The City of Calgary’s organization structure provides clear responsibility and accountability for all City of Calgary arts-related operations and policy.

**COUNCIL POLICY MANUAL**
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City Administration will ensure that The City of Calgary's arts-related operations complement
and support the work of the arm's-length arts authority, with no duplication of activities.

**Funding Guidelines**

All municipal funding to external arts organizations will go to a single arm's-length arts authority, which will have the final decision on all arts-related funding matters.

City Council will refer all arts-related capital and operational funding inquiries to the arm's-length arts authority.

Funding recommendations related to City-operated programs and facilities will be made by the City division responsible for arts-related operations and policy.

**Reporting Guidelines**

The City’s arts authority will provide City Council with an annual report on the outcomes of all municipal culture and heritage funding and the activities of any culture and heritage related committees.

**AMENDMENTS**

2004 April 14th 1996 June 10th

**COUNCIL POLICY MANUAL**

2004/05/31 Page 6 of 6
APPENDIX I
CADA Fact Sheet

Calgary Arts Development Facts

Calgary Arts Development was formed as The City of Calgary’s designated arts development authority in 2004 to deliver on Calgary’s Civic Arts Policy.

Calgary Arts Development allocates municipal funding for the arts provided by The City of Calgary through granting programs for more than 190 arts organizations in Calgary.

In 2012, The City of Calgary invested $3.7 million in 157 arts organizations through Calgary Arts Development’s Operating Grant Program.

Calgary Arts Development in partnership with The Calgary Foundation established cSPACE Projects in 2011 to respond to the need for stable, affordable, suitable space for artists and non-profit organizations.

Calgary’s first Poet Laureate program, administered by Calgary Arts Development, was established by Calgary City Council in July 2011.

Calgary Arts Development was instrumental in the bid for the Calgary’s designation as the 2012 Cultural Capital of Canada, and now administers legacy programs including InvestYYC.com, the Cultural Leaders Legacy Artist Awards and Living a Creative Life: An Arts Development Strategy for Calgary (formerly Arts Plan).

Other Calgary Arts Development programs and initiatives currently include:

- **Artist Opportunity Grant**: a pilot program running in 2013 and 2014 to invest in professional development opportunities for individual professional artists.

- **Arts for All Program**: a pilot program running in 2013 and 2014 to invest in arts activity outside of the downtown core, with a focus on east Calgary.

- **Calgary Culture**: a free, self-service listings website for arts events in Calgary.
o **Cultural Space Investment Process (CSIP):** a capital project evaluation process created through the Civic Arts Policy to inform The City of Calgary of priorities for community-led, cultural infrastructure projects.

o **The Mayor’s Lunch for Arts Champions:** an annual event relaunched in 2013 in collaboration with the Office of the Mayor.

For more details, refer to Calgary Arts Development’s 2012 Accountability Report or view a full list of our publications at CalgaryArtsDevelopment.com/publications.
APPENDIX J

Community Innovation Labs
A national initiative managed by EmcArts
Summary as of January 2015

About the Community Innovation Labs
In three US communities in 2015, EmcArts will pilot a new approach to solving tough social challenges by deeply integrating artists and artistic experiences into rigorously designed and facilitated change processes. Over eight months, the pilot Labs will bring together a diverse, cross-sector group of stakeholders in each location, including city agencies, community organizers, business leaders, artists, cultural organizations and nonprofit service providers, to tackle a specific and urgent local challenge in civic and cultural life. Lead support for the work is being provided by the Kresge Foundation.

Why is this so important?
In this time of rapid social change, the country faces deep divisions and unprecedented cultural challenges. Views are increasingly polarized, progress is slow, and ingrained ways of working exclude most citizens from decision-making. In order to unlock complex challenges we need unconventional approaches that bring multiple viewpoints together, drawing those drawing those who have historically been empowered and those who have been disempowered into new relationships in order to imagine and develop new ways forward. These Labs offer the opportunity for the creative sector to play a vital role in community change, using artistic practices to build a shared vision, explore new possibilities, and advance adaptive solutions.

What are we testing in this pilot initiative?
Over the next year, three pilot Labs will serve as an action-research project that builds on learning from current initiatives in social innovation and creative placemaking. Our hypothesis about these emerging fields of practice is that community efforts to address problematic situations will be deeper and more sustainable if: 1) artists, artistic practices, and cultural organizations are fully integrated into the process, and 2) the process framework is rigorous, balances control and emergence, and builds on existing local capacities.

Why is EmcArts leading this project?
We know that systems can change for the better, if people are brought together to discover shared purpose and given space to explore mutual interests. EmcArts has a strong and unique track record of successfully designing and implementing Innovation Labs. Our previous Labs have provided cultural and social service nonprofits with the frameworks, time, space, facilitation and resources to develop and prototype significant new strategies in response to major complex challenges that had previously remained unsolved. Our master facilitators bring decades of experience in governmental, corporate and nonprofit-based change efforts.

Who will be involved?
This national initiative will not be the effort of a single agency. Richard Evans, President of EmcArts, will lead the project within the EmcArts team. Michael Rohd of The Center for Performance and Civic Practice is a Research Partner. A Special Innovation Team, comprised of stakeholders from the culture sector, social service sector, business community, and city government, will meet regularly to contribute to key decisions and evaluate progress. The project will also be supported by National Advisors with expertise in relevant topics like urban planning, teaching artistry, social innovation, and creative placemaking. The majority of participants will be community members in each pilot location.

Project Activities & Timeline
The project kicked off in October 2014 with several months of research and design. In early 2015, three communities will be selected as pilot locations for the Lab and co-design work will continue in each location. Key decisions will all be locally driven, including the choice of challenge to address through the Lab and the cross-sector participants to involve. From April to September 2015, participants will engage in a series of community forums and facilitated working sessions in each pilot site, to share perspectives on the challenge, unfreeze past assumptions, and design new approaches.