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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Campbell River Sustainable Official Community Plan (SOCP) was adopted as a bylaw in February 2012, providing a 50-year vision for the municipality that includes a wide range of social development goals. Based on an extensive community consultation process during a period of economic decline in the region, the SOCP represents the aspirations of Campbell River residents for a bright future. However, as many of the SOCP’s social goals reach beyond the jurisdiction or resources of the municipal government, progress will rely to a large degree on the community’s non-profit agencies and coalitions working together to implement those sections of the Plan.

Within that context, this report presents recommendations to the project’s client, the City of Campbell River’s Sustainability Department, on promising approaches for local multi-sector collaboration with a main focus on the City’s role and non-profit sector leadership and participation. The project’s objectives were to examine potential models for Campbell River that would:

- engage diverse community agencies and groups in joint initiatives that increase their collective capacity to advance social development priorities in the SOCP
- build consensus on how to achieve SOCP social development goals
- strengthen working relationships among participating agencies and groups, and between the participants and City Council and staff.

Methods

The research consisted of five sequential methods, all qualitative in nature:

1) analysis of local non-profit agencies and coalitions to identify a sample set of potential project participants
2) purposive sampling to select and recruit project participants from the sample set
3) review of documented community engagement examples and related literature in the public domain using online Internet search strategies and telephone enquiries to select four examples with elements of relevance for the project interviews
4) in-person interviews with the project participants to generate data for a comparative analysis of similarities and differences in their views
5) a follow-up focus group session with project participants to discuss viable approaches for a Campbell River collaboration model.
Literature Review

The literature review had three interrelated focuses:

1) community engagement concepts
2) conceptual frameworks for analyzing community engagement models
3) challenges - benefits for non-profit sector collaboration.

Focuses 1) and 2) led to the study’s terminology and conceptual framework for providing a consistent basis for understanding, discussing and comparing four fundamentally different examples of community engagement selected for the project. The framework consisted of two components:

- a continuum of progressive levels of integrated activity and interdependence increasing from networking to cooperation to coordination to collaboration
- five dimensions for analyzing collective endeavours functioning at any of the levels of integrated activity: governance, administration, organizational autonomy, mutuality, and norms of reciprocity and trust.

Applying the conceptual framework to the four community engagement examples provided congruent descriptions of the examples for deliberation at the project interview discussions on possible options for Campbell River.

The literature review on challenges - benefits for non-profit sector collaboration yielded a bleak array of cautions including the continuing legacy of competition for limited funding and lack of trust among potential participants; acute lack of time and resources to participate; little support for the sector to build a stronger collaborative culture; a fragmented lens in understanding social problems; rigidity of preset measures of success deterring emergent and innovative solutions; and the overall predicament of federal and provincial government downloading to the local level without adequate increases in financial and other forms of support.

Against this daunting list of challenges, the literature review also identified benefits of collaboration as reduced duplication, increased sharing of resources and risks, being a catalyst for innovation – and the most compelling benefit of being the necessary strategy for responding to complex social needs. Finally, the literature review recommended a number of approaches to mitigate the challenges including building on relationships and
collaborative momentum already in place; having influential champions, a shared vision, effective communications and effective use of technology; and achieving early successes.

**Interview and Focus Group Findings**

The discussions in the interviews and focus group session largely reflected the issues identified in the literature review. At the highest level, project participants shared the aspiration for the non-profit sector to increase its effectiveness and reduce fragmentation in understanding, articulating and resolving local social development priorities. The main obstacles raised as impeding that goal were:

- the absence of an overall picture of social development in the community
- funding norms that reinforce competition and undermine trust within the sector
- federal and provincial government downloading of social priorities to the local level with the expectation to do more with less
- inadequate municipal government and business sector involvement
- a profound lack of time and resources to participate in collaborations.

In reviewing the four community engagement examples, the consensus was that none of the examples would be an ideal model for Campbell River, but a hybrid of preferred elements was identified. The interviews also produced an impressive list of ideas for building on existing assets, and measuring and reporting progress. Of particular note, however, was participants’ lack of enthusiasm for drawing on their limited resources to be involved in community-wide collaboration unless directly of benefit to their own goals.

**Discussion**

Analysis of the interview and focus group findings in light of the literature review reinforced key considerations for determining recommendations:

- the SOCP regaining relevance as a strategy for social development
- the City developing a new vision of its social development role
- the importance of common concepts, a shared vision, and a community lens
- the imperative but improbability of trust
- a high functioning structure with champions to support the model
- moving forward in ways that are agency and community paced with early successes.
**Recommendations**

Five of the 16 recommendations presented in the report are highlighted:

- The City should hire a Social Planner and support a volunteer multi-sector Steering Committee to guide development and implementation of the model.
- The City should consult with the Social Planning and Research Council of BC (SPARC) to develop a new vision for the City’s role and for assistance with identifying possible funding for the Campbell River model.
- A Campbell River Non-profit Network should be created and tasked with mapping a big picture of local social development activities and identifying the model’s emergent priority action areas.
- An adapted charrette workshop process should be used for multi-sector participation in determining the model’s brand, mission, vision, values and immediate focuses.
- A proposal for a phased model should be prepared, based on the charrette and project focus group outcomes, for community feedback in order to finalize the model.

Allowing a three-year timeframe is advisable for implementing the recommendations.

**Conclusion**

Developing a Campbell River community-wide collaboration model is a necessary strategy for achieving the SOCP’s complex social development priorities. Leadership is needed now to overcome the considerable challenges to realizing that goal.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

British Columbia’s *Local Government Act* (1996) authorizes every municipality and regional district in the province to develop an official community plan as a municipal bylaw setting out longer-term policies and objectives to guide development of their respective jurisdictions. In addition to requiring policies and objectives on land use and infrastructure, public facilities, housing development, and targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the Act specifies that the official community plan may include “policies of the local government relating to social needs, social well-being and social development” (para. 878(1)(a)), as well as protection and enhancement of the natural environment. A sustainable official community plan places these focuses in the context of “the three pillars of sustainability – economy, society and culture, environment…and ensures they are addressed in a comprehensive, integrated way” (City of Campbell River, 2012a, p. 1-7). Sustainability in this sense is about having the ability and capacity to “gain from new opportunities and be resilient in the face of current and future challenges” (City of Campbell River, 2012b, p. 5) in order to support “a high quality of life while maintaining or restoring the health of our environment and communities” (City of Campbell River, 2012a, p. 1-7). Following an extensive community consultation process, the *City of Campbell River Sustainable Official Community Plan* (SOCP) was officially adopted as a bylaw in February 2012, providing a 50-year vision for the municipality’s future that reflects multi-sector input and perspectives (City of Campbell River, 2012a, n.d.b). The SOCP is far-reaching in encompassing strategy areas that interconnect to varying degrees including social development, cultural development, affordable housing, land use and urban design, economic development, transportation, waste management and reduction, water conservation, parks and ecosystem protection, agriculture opportunities and food security (City of Campbell River, 2012a).

As summarized in this report, the *Community Engagement in Implementing a Sustainable Official Community Plan* (Community Engagement) research project was completed for the City of Campbell River’s Sustainability Department to explore approaches for engaging local non-profit agencies and groups in working together to help address the priorities in the SOCP’s *Social Well-Being* chapter (City of Campbell River, 2012a) as set out in Appendix A. Further to that purpose and as presented in Appendix B,
descriptions of the priorities have been elaborated and timeframes, implementation mechanisms and supports have been added in the Social Well-Being chapter of the SCR Framework: Campbell River’s Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP), the companion document to the SOCP (City of Campbell River, 2012b). As well, both Social Well-Being chapters outline the boundaries of the City’s role in addressing the priorities. Therefore the SOCP and ICSP established one dimension of the Community Engagement project’s scope in delineating a range of desired actions to increase the social well-being of Campbell River residents and the community as a whole, and how the City envisions its involvement. The project’s scope focused on Campbell River non-governmental, non-profit agencies and coalitions as important participants to engage in further developing and implementing the actions, and as well on examples of community engagement models that could be adapted or scaled to a Campbell River context in terms of concepts and requisite resources.

1.1 Background

Campbell River is a relatively small city located on the scenic east coast of Vancouver Island in British Columbia. With a population in 2011 of approximately 31,200 residents, the City is neighbours with three First Nations reserves: the Wei Wai Kum Nation Reserve with a population of 424, the We Wai Kai Nation Reserve with a population of 246, and the Homalco Nation Reserve with a population of 203 (Statistics Canada, 2012). Approximately two-thirds of the City’s residents are in the 15 to 64 age group, considered the working cohort, with the remaining third divided nearly equally between children to age 14 (almost 16%) and seniors 65 and over (almost 17%) (Statistics Canada). In addition to this diversity in ages, a diversity profile of Campbell River prepared by BC Stats (n.d.b) based on Statistics Canada’s 2006 Census indicates that 8.6% of the population are Aboriginals, 3.7% of the population are visible minorities, and the mother tongue for 91% of all residents is English. BC Stats (2013) ranks the Campbell River - Vancouver Island West region as the 34th most challenged of 77 local health areas in the province for overall socio-economic indicators that assess economic hardship, crime, health problems, education concerns, and children and youth at risk. BC Stats (n.d.a)

1 BC Stats has combined Campbell River (Local Health Area 72) and Vancouver Island West (Local Health Area 84) in determining the socio-economic indices (BC Stats, n.d.c).
explains that these indicators are relative measures comparing regions in the province in order to “flag regions that may be experiencing higher levels of socio-economic stress” (Socio-Economic indices, para. 1). A factor affecting Campbell River has been the traditional heavy reliance on resource-based industries which resulted in a dramatic economic downturn over the past five years with the decline of the forestry industry and closure of the paper mill as main employers and sources of municipal tax revenue (Human Capital Strategies, 2011). However, renewed optimism for revitalization is emerging with major construction and infrastructure projects starting in 2013, and growing retail, tourism, green energy, fishing and creative arts industries (Human Capital Strategies). Against this backdrop of urgency to forge a bright future, the SOCP will be integral to guiding a positive transition with its far-reaching span to 2060.

Importantly, the parameters of the City’s jurisdiction and role are described in the Social Well-Being chapter in the SOCP:

While major social development programs, policies and funding is the responsibility or jurisdiction of the Provincial Government, local governments can assist in advancing social objectives through: regulation of land use and design; guidance on developer-provided amenity contributions; taxation and incentives; programs and facilities; and coordination and facilitation of collaborative partnerships. (City of Campbell River, 2012a, p. 11-3)

The ICSP’s Social Well-Being chapter elaborates on these boundaries:

The City can develop land use and transportation policies that promote active lifestyles and overall social well being. The City operates community facilities and programs which include recreational opportunities. The City works collaboratively with other governments and community stakeholders and advocates for convening diverse participation and fostering partnerships to develop, support and implement strategies to achieve social well-being. (City of Campbell River, 2012b, p. 56)

Therefore, progress on many of the social development strategies in these plans will rely in large part on community agencies, groups and individuals as a shared vision, and the Community Engagement project specifically aims to contribute to that process in a manner that enriches every aspect, from effective partnerships and collaboration to successful outcomes.
1.2 Project Objectives

The Community Engagement research project was carried out with the objective of providing recommendations to the project’s client, the City of Campbell River’s Sustainability Department, on promising approaches for:

- engaging diverse community agencies and groups in joint initiatives that increase their collective capacity to advance social development priorities identified in the SOCP
- building consensus on how to achieve SOCP social development goals with efficient, harmonious implementation
- strengthening working relationships among participating agencies and groups, and between the participants and City Council and staff.

With these focuses, the project aspires to leave a legacy of having promoted norms of cooperation and collaboration that strengthen the critical role of Campbell River’s non-profit sector in the overarching objective of a sustainable, healthy and productive community. Therefore the project’s objectives extend to contributing to the ongoing work of various City departments, City advisory commissions, and community-led initiatives. It is hoped, as well, that the research findings will be of interest and useful to other locations.

1.3 Rationale

The rationale for the Community Engagement research project stems from a number of sources. Foremost, an increasing call for collaboration to achieve community development goals and address socioeconomic inequities is evident in research findings and stakeholders’ experiences. Over two decades ago, Peterson (1991) spoke of the growing awareness that service agencies should work together to tackle such problems as (a) duplication of services and simultaneous gaps in services, (b) poor coordination among agencies offering interrelated and possibly interdependent services, (c) diminishing financial resources to support human services programs that are similar or involve the same populations, and (d) poor accessibility of services. (p. 89)

This awareness resonates today with BC Healthy Communities (BCHC) in assisting local groups and governments across the province with building capacity to improve and sustain
community well-being and resiliency (BC Healthy Communities [BCHC], n.d.). BCHC is observing that the complexity of the underlying causes of issues facing communities requires “looking for ways to respond that move beyond silos and work with the whole system…unifying what is often a fragmented approach” (BCHC, n.d., p. 1). Moreover, the BC Ministry of Health’s (2006) review of evidence on effective practices in community development proposes that “[i]nterventions to address complex issues in the community are often best implemented in partnership with a variety of health and social service sectors, municipal or regional governments, non-profit organizations, ad hoc community groups and individual citizens” (p. 54). In fact, collaboration and developing partnerships are frequently explicit requirements for non-profit initiatives applying to funding bodies for grants and other forms of support as fundamental to successful outcomes (Amyot, 2013; Frey, Lohmeier, Lee, & Tollefson, 2006).

There also is empirical evidence that municipal governments need the endorsement and active engagement of community groups that are pivotal to implementing sustainable plans. A survey in 2011 of over 200 municipal governments primarily located in British Columbia on their experiences with promoting and supporting sustainability within their respective communities (de Vries, 2011) provides this broader context and substantiates the merit of the Community Engagement project. The survey findings ranked lack of human resources for public education and engagement as the third top external barrier to sustainability (de Vries). At the same time, the survey respondents ranked facilitated focus groups and meetings as well as partnerships with non-profit groups and local organizations amongst the most important approaches for enabling and encouraging sustainability (de Vries). The objectives of the Community Engagement project align well with these findings. Indeed, as stated in the Sustainable Campbell River Background Series (City of Campbell River, n.d.c),

Social sustainability is about whether we can meet our basic needs and reach our individual potential, as well as contribute to the overall well-being of our communities. It is also about our collective level of cooperation, cohesiveness and reciprocity, all of which are essential to vibrant economies and prosperity, and influence our relationship with the natural world. (p. 1)
The community agencies and groups in front line or advocacy roles for addressing social development needs are at the heart of this call for collective cooperation to build social sustainability in Campbell River and therefore they are the project’s primary community engagement focus.

1.4 Organization of the Report

This report has been organized into eight chapters followed by references and a set of appendices. Beginning with an introduction, background, main objectives and the rationale for the Community Engagement project in the current chapter, the report continues in chapter 2.0 with an explanation of the project’s design and methodology. This part of the report concerns the selection of community engagement models, recruitment of project participants from Campbell River’s non-profit sector, and gathering data from participant interviews and a follow-up focus group session. Known and potential design issues for the project are also noted. In chapter 3.0, the focus of the report turns to a review of concepts, terminology and processes found in the literature to describe and characterize different levels of integrated community engagement and how the levels interrelate. This examination provided the basis for developing a conceptual framework for chapter 4.0’s analysis of four different examples of active community engagement relevant to the project’s objectives. The literature review also revealed both benefits and challenges of higher levels of integrated engagement for non-profit organizations and groups, and a summary of those findings concludes chapter 3.0.

With the background context and scope of the project established in the previous chapters, findings from the interviews and focus group are presented in chapter 5.0 in light of the literature review, and discussed in chapter 6.0 leading to recommendations for a Campbell River community engagement model in chapter 7.0. The main body of the report closes with concluding remarks in chapter 8.0. All citations in the report are referenced using American Psychological Association (APA) style following chapter 8.0. Finally, the appendices at the end of the report provide the excerpted text of the Social Well-Being chapters in the SOCP and ICSP, brief profiles for a sample set of Campbell River non-profit organizations and coalitions, and the protocols and forms used in interactions with project participants.
2.0 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The research design for this project was devised to explore the types of models that could be developed to increase cohesive cooperation and collaboration for local non-profit agencies and coalitions in working together to help implement social development priorities in Campbell River’s Sustainable Official Community Plan (SOCP). The following sections provide a summary of the methods used, all of which were qualitative: (1) an analysis of non-profit agencies and social purpose coalitions active in Campbell River; (2) the selection and recruitment of project participants; (3) a review of documented community engagement examples and related literature in the public domain; (4) interviews with the project participants to generate data for a comparative analysis of preferred elements in a Campbell River model; and (5) a follow-up focus group session with project participants to discuss viable approaches for Campbell River.

2.1 Analysis of Non-profit Sector

The primary method for analyzing the non-profit sector active in Campbell River at the time of the study was review of existing community directories, and agency and coalition websites. In some cases, annual reports and other handout materials on programs and services were also reviewed. Directories providing baseline data were:

- John Howard Society of North Island’s (2013) local community services directory
- Campbell River Social Planning Committee’s (2010) inventory of local social development assets
- GoCampbellRiver’s (n.d.) listing of community groups.

The entries in these resources and supplementary information were analyzed to identify a broad cross section of non-profit sector agencies and coalitions for inclusion in the sample set of potential project participants presented in Appendix C. Emphasis was placed on organizations and groups with mandates relevant to helping to achieve the SOCP’s social development objectives. The sample set was then reviewed to determine primary target groups and priority focuses in order to generate a straightforward taxonomy for charting the agencies and coalitions, also presented in Appendix C, and facilitate the process for selecting interview candidates as the project participants.
2.2 Selection and Recruitment of Project Participants

The selection of agencies and coalitions as the project participants to be interviewed and subsequently invited to take part in the focus group session was based on purposive sampling, specifically a combination of stakeholder sampling and expert sampling (Palys, 2008). As described by Palys (2008), stakeholder sampling would identify those non-profit agencies and coalitions with a major vested interest in the SOCP’s social development priorities, while expert sampling would identify key informants most likely to advance the research project’s goals. In addition to being guided by the mandate commonalities and differences highlighted in the sample set chart in Appendix C, selection of desired interviewees took into account the author’s extensive knowledge of local agencies and coalitions in striving for representational coverage across the sector while adhering to Palys’ (2008) general principle of purposive sampling: “Think of the person or place or situation that has the largest potential for advancing your understanding and look there” (para. 15). Selection of the potential project participants was determined considering all of those criteria. Of the 20 interview invitations issued, 16 were accepted involving 18 interviewees as listed in Appendix D.

Project participants were formally recruited following the method that had been pre-approved by University of Victoria’s Human Research Ethics Board. For the interviews, the executive director of each selected agency and a senior member of each selected coalition received a written request for consideration, sent electronically by email or delivered in person by the author. The request introduced the author, the project and the purpose of the interview, emphasizing that participation was entirely voluntary and could be ended by any participant at any time. The request also noted the opportunity to attend the follow-up focus group session. Interview candidates who expressed interest in participating were sent background information prepared by the author in consultation with the project’s client, together with a written consent form that briefly outlined what participation would involve, secure handling of data, confidentiality provisions, and dissemination plans for the study’s findings. Only candidates who had read the consent form and provided the author with a signed original were able to continue to the interview stage. A similar invitation and consent form process, also pre-approved by the Human Research Ethics Board, was used for the focus group session, with recruitment restricted to
the people who had been interviewed. The recruitment scripts, consents forms, and withdrawal form are provided in Appendix E.

2.3 Selection of Engagement Models for Participant Interviews

A main component of the project was to discover and examine a variety of community engagement strategies in order to present a small selection of examples to interview participants for their perspectives on desired options for a Campbell River approach. This component focused on reviewing documented case examples of different forms of community engagement models that the author considered relevant to implementing community plans, and that had been deemed by those involved in the examples or researchers as promising practices. Online search strategies using key words – often identified through an iterative process for subject terms and names of specific organizations, initiatives and researchers – as well as telephone enquiries resulted in selecting four community engagement models for analysis using the study’s conceptual framework as summarized in chapter 4.0.

2.4 Participant Interviews and Comparative Analysis of Interview Data

The main research methods used in the study were in-person interviews conducted by the author with the project participants, a qualitative comparative analysis of the data generated from the interviews, and a follow-up focus group session with the participants which was facilitated by the author. Each of the 16 interview sessions began with a review of the consent form, addressing any related questions, and obtaining the signed form from the participant before continuing. The project’s background information, which had been provided in advance, was discussed to ensure participants understood the study’s purpose, and the project’s conceptual framework was explained. With one exception, overviews of the four community engagement models they would be commenting on were highlighted, and discussion was guided by the set of four open-ended questions presented in Appendix F. The one exception, as desired by the interviewee given the time constraints, omitted the overview of the engagement models (and therefore the related interview question), and focused on the remaining three questions. All perspectives and responses were collected as data through the author’s notes taken during the interviews for the comparative analysis.
The question set was developed by the author and the project’s client, and had been included in the Human Research Ethics Board’s review.

The comparative analysis assessed similarities and differences in the participants’ views to draw out promising features from the four different models considered in the interviews. Notes were taken during the interviews to record strengths and concerns identified by the participants for each of the models as summarized in section 5.1. As well, seven main issues for sector-wide collaboration emerged in the notes and were logged to record the number of interviews identifying each theme and related participant perspectives, also summarized in section 5.1. Finally, participants’ specific suggestions for a Campbell River model after considering the four engagement examples, and their ideas for building on existing local assets were highlighted in the notes as listed in section 5.1.

Taking these results and the literature review findings into account, the author, in consultation with the project’s client, developed two possible community engagement models for a Campbell River approach to present at the focus group session. Chapter 5.0 presents the outcomes of these steps including the two models.

2.5 Focus Group Session

Interview participants were invited to the focus group session and a total of 10 were present (Appendix D). A set of five open-ended questions (presented in Appendix F) and the facilitator’s protocol (presented in Appendix G) guided discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of the two models (section 5.1, Figure 6: Key elements of two possible Campbell River collaboration models) presented to the participants, and then for corresponding revised models emerging from the initial discussion or a hybrid of the revised models as further described in section 5.2 on the outcomes of the focus group session. As noted by Morgan (2008),

[t]he defining element of focus groups is the use of the participants’ discussion as a form of data collection. In particular, there is no requirement to reach consensus or produce a decision; instead, it is the participants’ conversation about the research topic that is of interest. (para. 2)

As well, Gajda (2004) contends that focus group discussion on collaboration can serve to promote collaboration as a natural effect of sharing views and concerns. The group
discussion was facilitated in the spirit of these insights and recorded using a combination of methods: wall charts of the models being considered, colour-coded dots for preferred or rejected elements on the charts and postable notes for recommendations to add to the charts – processes that were embedded in the session’s format – as well as through notes taken by the author and the project’s client during the session. The analysis of the session is included in the study’s findings in chapter 5.0 and also in the discussion of the findings in chapter 6.0 leading to the recommendations in chapter 7.0.

2.6 Design Issues

Issues inherent to the study’s research design included the possibility of unintentionally disaffecting agencies and groups who were not selected to participate – a potentially negative impact for the focus on developing an inclusive Campbell River cooperation and collaboration model. However, this drawback could not be avoided given practical constraints, and the study’s recommendations serve as groundwork for further consultation within the non-profit sector. Another issue was confidentiality. As noted in the interview participant’s consent form, “[t]he size of the health and social services sector in Campbell River may inadvertently affect anonymity without being the result of any action” (Appendix E), and further noted in the focus group participant’s consent form, “due to the nature of group activities, the researcher would be unable to guarantee confidentiality of participants’ discussions in the focus group session” (Appendix E) despite requesting confidentiality of all those present at the session. The risk of breach of confidentiality by participants was tempered by repeated verbal and written reminders, and for the author and the project’s client by the consent form’s confidentiality provisions.

Recruitment of project participants revealed that their preparation for the interview sessions would be challenging in some cases, and a few interviewees found they were not able to read the background materials in advance. With the project targeting senior roles in non-profit organizations and coalitions, participants’ available time to be involved was an anticipated design issue that led to condensing the background information provided prior to and at the interviews. In effect, complex concepts and examples were presented in very short timeframes. From the author’s perspective, the approach of having participants grasp a range of non-profit sector cooperation and collaboration models at an overview level was
a sufficient platform for eliciting input. However, even when that context is explained, this expedited approach can feel unsatisfying from the interviewee’s perspective in being asked to comment on how the examples might apply in practice in their community. One participant suggested the idea of presenting all or part of the background information and key elements of the community engagement models in a video format which might help with this aspect if feasible within project resources.

Similar to the interviews, two hours for the focus group meeting constrained the overall design of the session and depth of discussion, but was a necessary condition for most participants to be able to attend given their other commitments. A short timeframe also limits providing background context during the session for anchoring the discussion, and, when introductory activities need to be brief, can affect the dynamics of participants coalescing as a group and comfort level to express views.

In summary, these design issues, whether inherent or emergent in the project, are considerations to take into account when relevant to undertaking other research. In particular, the limited time for key informants to participate may be able to be mitigated with sufficient incentives. Possible ideas, if resources allow, are having a prominent speaker help launch the research project to provide a compelling context, or incorporating key informant participation into important networking opportunities that extend the value of their involvement. However, despite limitations in the project design and as presented in the following chapters, the interviews and the focus group session provided rich data supported by the literature review for determining recommendations on a collaborative model for Campbell River.
3.0 Literature Review

The literature review aimed to inform the study’s examination of practical models for engaging local non-profit agencies and groups to work together in a cohesive manner to help implement social development priorities in the SOCP. To meet that intention, the review focused on three interrelated topics:

- community engagement concepts
- conceptual frameworks for analyzing community engagement models
- challenges - benefits analysis for joint initiatives.

Consideration was given to agreement and divergence amongst different authors’ views. As well, main themes in the literature’s discussion of community engagement models provided the basis for selecting specific examples to present to the study’s interview participants for their perspectives on suitability for a Campbell River approach.

3.1 Community Engagement Concepts

As discussed in the Introduction chapter, research findings and empirical evidence indicate that creating healthy, sustainable communities relies on engaging all sectors in collaborative approaches to address complex social issues such as reducing poverty. What is meant by community engagement and collaboration, and is it important to have a common understanding of these terms and associated terms like cooperation and coordination? In fact, the meaning of engaging in collaborative endeavours continues to be contested among scholars despite having grown into a distinct field of research (Thomson, Perry, & Miller, 2009). However, Bailey and Koney (2000) argue that consistency in the terminology that describes engaging in joint endeavours is important in order to promote mutual understanding of what involvement entails for participants and amongst stakeholders, and also to encourage accountability and a learning environment. Gajda (2004) adds evaluation as another factor benefitting from consistent terminology in finding that the definition of collaboration “is somewhat elusive, inconsistent, and theoretical…making it difficult for those seeking to collaborate to put into practice or evaluate with certainty” (p. 66), and Thomson, Perry and Miller (2009) extend that concern to the realm of academic research in “making it difficult to compare findings across studies and to know whether what is measured is really collaboration” (p. 24). Therefore, as
summarized in this section, deciding on the community engagement terms, their definitions and continuums to be used in this study was an initial goal of the literature review.

Wheatley and Frieze (2006) herald the power of collaborative endeavours “among people who discover they share a common cause and vision of what’s possible…Through these relationships, we will develop the new knowledge, practices, courage, and commitment that lead to broad-based change” (para. 1). Their insights highlight the notion of building and nurturing relationships through community engagement to foster working together for the betterment of communities and society as a whole. Based on the work of Fawcett et al. (1995), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention /Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry Committee for Community Engagement (CDC/ATSDR Committee) (1997) developed the following working definition of community engagement:

…the process of working collaboratively with and through groups of people affiliated by geographic proximity, special interest, or similar situations to address issues affecting the well-being of those people. It is a powerful vehicle for bringing about environmental and behavioral changes that will improve the health of the community and its members. It often involves partnerships and coalitions that help mobilize resources and influence systems, change relationships among partners, and serve as catalysts for changing policies, programs, and practices. (Concepts of Community Engagement, para. 1)

This explanation remains current today as the wording is retained without change in the recent update of the CDC/ATSDR Committee’s work (Clinical and Translational Science Awards Consortium Community Engagement Key Function Committee Task Force, 2011). The working definition aptly captures this study’s focus on engaging the geographic community of Campbell River non-profit sector agencies and coalitions in shared endeavours which contribute to achieving mutually relevant objectives in their respective mandates and address the Campbell River SOCP’s social development priorities.

Definitions often elicit the question of the meaning of their key descriptive terms and therefore it is useful in this study to also rely on the CDC/ATSDR Committee’s inclusive notion of a coalition as organizations, agencies, groups and/or individuals working together in a formal arrangement to achieve shared goals.
While the CDC/ATSDR Committee’s (1997) working definition provides an overall connotation of community engagement, general agreement exists in the literature that community engagement in collective endeavours takes place at different levels of participant interaction. The different levels are characterized by progressive stages of mutual exchange and interdependence, with researchers and practitioners using terms such as networking, cooperation, coordination and collaboration to distinguish between the degree of integration in participants’ planning, activities and use of resources (Bailey & Koney, 2000; Camarina-Matos & Afsarmanesh, 2008; Frey et al., 2006; Gajda, 2004; Himmelman, 2001; Hogue, 1993; Hogue, 2004; Peterson, 1991; Thomson & Perry, 2006; Wolff, 2010). However, as presented in Table 1, variance in how researchers and practitioners define these terms is also evident in the literature, and consequently in the integration continuums they derive from their respective definitions as illustrated by the sequential numbering in Table 2. For example, both Hogue (1993) and Himmelman (2001) use the terms cooperation and coordination, but their definitions (Table 1) yield opposite sequences in their continuums for those stages (Table 2), adding another layer to consider in the call for consistency in terminology noted above.

Table 1: Examples of community engagement terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td><strong>Hogue (1993):</strong> “dialogue and common understanding…create base of support; non-hierarchical; loose/flexible links; roles loosely defined; communication is primary link among members” (Community Linkages – Choices and Decisions, row 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Himmelman (2001):</strong> “exchanging information for mutual benefit; it does not require much time or trust nor the sharing of turf” (p. 277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td><strong>Peterson (1991):</strong> “offer general support, give information, or provide endorsements for each other’s activities…decisions are autonomous…each agency pursues its own goals and plans as determined internally” (p. 90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or Alliance)</td>
<td><strong>Hogue (1993):</strong> “limit duplications of services; ensure tasks are done; central body of people as communication hub; semi-formal link; roles somewhat defined; links are advisory; little or no new financial resources” (Community Linkages – Choices and Decisions, row 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bailey and Koney (2000):</strong> “informal strategic alliance process through which fully autonomous organizational entities share information to support each other’s activities” (p. 184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Himmelman (2001):</strong> “exchanging information, altering activities, and sharing resources for mutual benefit and a common purpose; it requires significant amounts of time, high levels of trust, and a significant sharing of turf” (pp. 277-278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td><strong>Peterson (1991):</strong> “two or more agencies synchronize their activities to promote compatible schedules, events, services, or other kinds of work that contribute to the achievement of each agency’s individual mission and goals” (p. 90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or Partnership)</td>
<td><strong>Hogue (1993):</strong> “share resources to address common issues; merge resource base to create something new; central body of people consists of decision makers; roles defined; links formalized; group leverages/raises money” (Community Linkages – Choices and Decisions, row 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Examples of engagement integration continuums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Terms</th>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Cooperation</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Coalition</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Coadunation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peterson (1991) continuum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hogue (1993) continuum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bailey and Koney (2000) continuum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Himmelman (2001) continuum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The sequence of numbers in each row denotes progression along that continuum as derived by the respective authors from their definitions of the engagement terms (Table 1), with “1” signifying their lowest level of integrated engagement through to their highest level.
As observed by Frey et al. (2006), while the different continuum models have some variation in how stages are named and described, they have in common moving from low to high levels of collaborative endeavour and alliance that represent increasing levels of integration. It also is noted in the literature that the continuums are not applied in practice with the intent to always progress from lower to higher integration of roles and activities, but rather fluctuate or aim for a particular level as most suited to particular circumstances and desired outcomes of working together (Camarinha-Matos & Afsarmanesh, 2008; Hogue, 2004; Wolff, 2010). Moreover, once a continuum has been determined, differentiating between which level of integration is in play can be vague at times in practice (Camarinha-Matos & Afsarmanesh, 2008; Thomson & Perry, 2006; Wolff, 2010). Such ambiguity would parallel the effects of inconsistency in terminology (as described above) in terms of uncertainty amongst participants and stakeholders’ understanding of expectations, accountability and evaluation outcomes. In fact, higher levels in a continuum of integration typically involve the less intense levels remaining active as being integral to the higher level processes (Camarinha-Matos & Afsarmanesh, 2008; Petersen, 1991) - a dynamic that perhaps is best exemplified in Himmelman’s (2001) continuum where the descriptions for each level explicitly incorporate all lower levels. Finally, collaboration is a method for scaling up – also a contested term but typically involving the replication or expansion of an idea, approach or initiative to increase impacts (Kohl & Cooley, n.d.). All of these continuum characteristics are useful for understanding the dynamics and challenges of developing and implementing community engagement strategies.

Subsequent to the literature noted in Tables 1 and 2, a number of studies and practical guides either adopted or adapted these frameworks to examine or promote community agencies and coalitions progressing to the collaboration level. As cases in point, Gajda (2004) builds on Peterson’s (1991), Hogue’s (2003) and Bailey and Coney’s (2000) continuums in developing an assessment tool for safe school alliances. Frey et al.’s (2006) research on measuring collaboration amongst grant recipient partners relies on Hogue’s (1993) continuum with the added possibility of an initial “coexistence” (p. 385) stage where no interaction has been occurring. Himmelman’s (2001) continuum is the framework used in the Australian State Government of Victoria’s (2003) guide on agency collaboration to encourage a systems-wide integrated approach to health promotion within
a catchment area, as well as in later publications including Camarinha-Matos and Afsarmanesh’s (2008) examination of modelling for collaboration networks in services and industries, Wolff’s (2010) assessment and engagement tool to help communities transform from fragmented to more effective responses for complex societal issues, and the Australian Victorian Health Promotion Foundation’s (2011) resource for developing and maintaining partnerships. In considering these examples as well as relative simplicity and flexibility for application in practice, Himmelman’s definitions and corresponding continuum of integrated engagement were selected to include in the project’s conceptual framework.

### 3.2 Conceptual Framework for Analyzing Community Engagement Examples

The project’s conceptual framework was developed to provide a consistent logic for organizing and understanding different community engagement examples in order to guide selecting several examples with some fundamentally different elements for stakeholder feedback at the project’s interview sessions. The framework consists of two components as presented in Table 3. The first component identifies the level of integrated engagement based on Himmelman’s (2001) continuum of integrated engagement, increasing from networking to coordination to cooperation to collaboration as summarized in the left column of Table 3. This part of the framework intentionally is not bookended with Frey et al.’s (2006) initial state of coexistence or Bailey and Coney’s (2000) end state of coadunation. Both of those levels fall outside of the project’s interest in studying engagement examples that already are, or have been, active and that maintain institutional autonomy of the participating agencies and coalitions.

The second component of the framework adds functions and features embedded in collective endeavours at any of the engagement continuum levels. This component is based on Thomson and Perry’s (2006) five interdependent dimensions for “the essence of collaboration processes” (p. 23) discerned from Thomson’s extensive analysis of descriptions of collaboration in the multidisciplinary research (as cited in Thomson and Perry):

1. governance - determining rules for relating, decision making, implementation, and shared leadership
2. administration - managing relationships, roles, communications, and monitoring
3. organizational autonomy - balancing individual goals and accountability with the collective’s goals and accountability

4. mutuality - benefitting from interdependence and foregoing the pursuit of individual interests if harmful to the collective’s interests

5. norms of reciprocity and trust - developing trust and establishing fair reciprocal exchange.

These dimensions, listed in the right column of Table 3, provide additional features for describing and contrasting community engagement examples. In fact, Thomson and Perry maintain that the five dimensions must be understood and actively managed in each situation in order to have effective collective action.

Table 3: Conceptual framework for analyzing community engagement examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuum of Engagement Integration (Himmelman, 2001)</th>
<th>Dimensions of Integration (Thomson &amp; Perry, 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progressive engagement levels</td>
<td>Functions and features of all engagement levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Determining rules for relating, decision making, implementation, and shared leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking plus: altering activities for a common purpose</td>
<td>Managing relationships, roles, communications, and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination plus: sharing resources</td>
<td>Balancing individual goals and accountability with the collective’s goals and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Mutuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation plus: enhancing the capacity of partners for mutual benefit and a common purpose by sharing risks, responsibilities, resources and rewards</td>
<td>Benefiting from interdependence and foregoing the pursuit of individual interests if harmful to the collective’s interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing trust and establishing fair reciprocal exchange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Community engagement at any of the integration levels in the first column can be further described using the second column’s integration dimensions which focus on how the engagement functions in practice.

In chapter 5.0, the conceptual framework has been applied to existing community engagement examples selected for the project by first considering the degree and trajectory
of engagement integration (left column of Table 3), and then how the engagement functions using the five integration dimensions (right column of Table 3). While constrained by the available information for the community engagement examples reviewed in the study, applying the framework in this way highlighted similarities and differences in a systematic manner in order to facilitate discussion at the project interviews as well as the subsequent analysis leading to recommendations.

3.3 Challenges - Benefits Analysis for Effective Collective Initiatives

The project’s consideration of community engagement models included an analysis of challenges and benefits characteristic of increasing non-profit sector cooperation and collaboration – that is extending beyond sharing information and coordinating activities to also sharing resources and developing more interdependent approaches to fulfilling mandates. The literature includes abundant recognition of challenges for collective initiatives, notably for addressing social needs. To start, Thomson and Perry (2006) identify the persistent challenge of whether self-interests yield to collective interests, and conclude that “[u]nless the particular problem is of sufficient urgency to all partners, it is likely that individual missions will trump collaboration missions” (p. 26). Thomson and Perry also emphasize attaining and maintaining trust as critical to collaboration but requiring excessive time and attention. They observe that the issue of time also includes joint initiatives being slowed down by the collaboration process which can cause participants to lose interest. In fact, the authors state that “[t]he most costly resources of collaboration are not money but time and energy” (p.28), and caution that adequately budgeting for all three factors is too often overlooked.

Self-interest and fragile trust in the non-profit sector are the legacy of a long history of competition being central to funding decisions by governments and granting bodies as the way to achieve lower costs (Amyot, 2013; Hogue, 2004; Osborne & Murray, 2000). More recently though, competition has been recast as less economical than collaboration for social development priorities (Osborne & Murray) and, as previously noted, funders increasingly expect partnerships to be included in non-profit sector bids for contracts and applications for grants (Amyot, 2013; Frey et al., 2006; Thomson, Perry, & Miller, 2007). However, given the confounding dichotomy of being both partners and competitors, this
shift is tenuous without sources of investment to support the sector in transitioning to a stronger collaboration culture in face of obstacles ranging from how to make joint decisions to managing differences in accountability practices (Thomson et al.). Moreover, reaching agreement at a general level on priorities and strategies, does not mean there are effective approaches in place for reaching agreement on the details where, as Chaskin (2008) highlights, “[g]ains for some are losses for others” (p. 73). Wolff (2010) identifies other obstacles: a fragmented community lens in understanding and responding to social problems, moving forward with incomplete or biased information, limitations in ability to share information, and too little funding for strengthening and building on community assets compared to the dominant model of financial support for servicing needs. Success of local initiatives also can depend on factors beyond their control or influence such as government imposed policies and constraints (Chaskin, 2008; Osborne & Murray, 2000). A troubling example is the downloading of support for social needs by federal and provincial governments to the municipal level where the tax base is primarily designed to pay for physical infrastructure (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, n.d.). In her extensive review of changing government procurement practices for community services and the impact on non-profit organizations, Amyot (2013) concludes: “As the sector has been tasked with an ever increasing role in providing programs that are now core public services, the current procurement model is no longer appropriate to the task” (p. 32).

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges, however, is a collective change in mindset amongst funders and other stakeholders from the prevailing reliance on rigid planning with predefined actions and results that will be used to measure success or failure. In assessing that mindset, Kania and Kramer (2013) conclude that “solutions and resources are quite often not known in advance…effective solutions will emerge though the exact timing and nature cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty…a very uncomfortable state of being for many stakeholders” (p. 6). The authors advise collaborative efforts to value, and funders to support, the process of coming to a common understanding of the issues, goals and indicators of progress. Wheatley and Frieze (2006) also argue for valuing process in collaboration as the catalyst for emergent solutions over the traditional focus on preset outcomes.

Given these considerable challenges, Thomson and Perry (2006) strongly advise against “[c]ollaborating for collaboration’s sake” (p. 28) and to carefully consider when
collaboration will be a worthwhile endeavour. Benefits that can contribute to making collaboration worthwhile include reducing duplication, sharing of resources and risks, and increasing innovation in approaches and solutions (Wolff, 2010). Navigating through collaboration challenges in order to gain the benefits requires proven strategies. Osborne and Murray (2000) astutely point out that “competitive tensions will continue to be a legitimate part of collaborative ventures and need to be recognized and managed, not ignored” (p. 17). They counsel to build on relationships and collaborative momentum already in place, advice that is repeated elsewhere in the literature (Hanleybrown, Kania, & Kramer, 2012). Working with the same target populations has been found to be a strong impetus for creating and sustaining collaborations (Thomson & Perry, 2006). Research also shows that early successes are essential to maintaining the commitment of collaboration partners (Hanleybrown et al., 2012; Thomson & Perry, 2006), along with practical and influential factors such as having frontline champions, a shared vision, effective communications (Hanleybrown et al., 2012), and utilizing technology to link and involve participants (Hogue, 2004).

In summary, when assessing challenges against the benefits of collaboration in the non-profit sector, it is evident that governments are playing a pivotal role in shaping that equation, and communities must heed numerous cautions, considerations and recommended strategies for success. Indeed, the research findings in the next chapter markedly reflect the literature review findings touched on in this section. The question, though, is not whether to increase collaboration but how best to do so. As Gajda (2004) succinctly states: “Increasingly, collaboration between business, non-profit, health and educational agencies is being championed as a powerful strategy to achieve a vision otherwise not possible when independent entities work alone” (p. 65). More recently, this assertion has become a definitive statement evident in the conclusion of Hanleybrown et al.’s (2012) research that “[t]here is no other way society will achieve large-scale progress against urgent and complex problems, unless a collective impact approach becomes the accepted way of doing business” (p. 6).

While Hanleybrown et al. (2012) consider a collective impact approach to surpass what is typically called collaboration in requiring five conditions – a common agenda; common measures for results; coordinated, mutually reinforcing participant activities; continuous communication; and an appropriately skilled and resourced organization providing supporting infrastructure – their cautions remain applicable to this paper’s focus on collaboration models.
4.0 ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT EXAMPLES

Selecting the community engagement examples to include in the study took into account several parameters: diversity in the range of approaches used in the examples in order to have a variety of options for the participant interviews; adaptability of the examples in whole or in part to a smaller municipality like Campbell River in terms of scope of activities and required resources; and a balance of practicality with innovation to attract local non-profit sector interest in working together. The descriptions and analysis of the community engagement examples reflect their respective stages of development at the time they were researched which served their intended purpose as catalysts for generating discussion and ideas in the project interviews and focus group session. The examples, along with the challenges - benefits analysis (section 3.3), were central in determining the research project’s recommendations presented in chapter 7.0 below.

4.1 Community Action Plan on Poverty

The Community Action Plan on Poverty (CAPP) was launched in 2012 for the Greater Victoria region on Vancouver Island in British Columbia and is an example of a grassroots, self-organizing approach to community engagement. A diverse Steering Committee, led by the Community Social Planning Council of Greater Victoria (CSPC) and comprised of 15 social purpose organizations and individual community members, developed the CAPP based on extensive community consultations (Community Social Planning Council of Greater Victoria [CSPC], 2012a, 2012b). The Action Plan includes its vision statement “to achieve sustainable livelihoods for all people in the Capital Region” (CSPC, 2012c, Vision, para. 1), its rationale and guiding principles, ten key action areas that impact poverty, and the shared commitment “to coordinate actions that foster a sense of community and collective purpose, with justice, respect and dignity for all” (Key Areas and Actions, para. 1). The CAPP vision is firmly grounded in the belief that Canada is a nation with the means to eradicate poverty amongst its citizens (CSPC, 2012c). To date, the initiative has been funded as a United Way of Greater Victoria program and with a grant from the Catherine Donnelly Foundation, as well as in-kind support from the CSPC,

---

3 The ten action areas are: access to meaningful work; childcare; strong local economy; access to justice; education and training; food; health; housing; transportation; income (CSPC, 2012c, Key Areas and Actions).
SocialCoast.org (social networking for community activism), IdeaZone.ca (website development), and significant volunteer efforts (CSPC, 2012a, 2012b). Following the start up, important goals are to secure multi-year funding and increase in-kind support (M. Albert, personal communication, September 7, 2012).

The CAPP website was created in May 2012 to provide a platform for organizations and residents in the region to become involved (CSPC, n.d.b). In brief, organizations from all sectors and residents can participate by registering online to support the CAPP (CSPC, 2012g), and then if interested in taking the next step, can proceed immediately or in the future to the pledge webpage to submit details of their respective commitments to undertake, or continue, specific actions for one or more of the Plan’s ten priority areas (CSPC, 2012f). Participants making pledges can choose any of the ideas provided on each action area’s webpage or decide on their own ideas, and all pledges can be viewed online (CSPC, 2012h). While still at a formative stage, facilitated workshops are being used as a means of connecting Steering Committee members with agencies, businesses and individuals who have registered to support the CAPP, made pledges or are otherwise interested in the initiative, and as a process for building consensus on next steps towards achieving the Plan’s objectives (M. Albert, personal communication, September 7, 2012; Moreno, 2012). A workshop, held in November 2012, with approximately 40 attendees, resulted in participants identifying a number of specific projects to progress towards concrete outcomes in a coordinated manner, and discussing strategies for rebranding, communications and sponsor recruitment (M. Albert, personal communication, November 20, 2012). Planning is underway to add more formats for obtaining community input and providing opportunities for peer learning such as teleconferences and webinars.

Analyzing the CAPP initiative with the research project’s conceptual framework indicates that Steering Committee members are at the coordination level of integration in working together for the common purpose of creating and guiding implementation of the Action Plan, while pledge participants are starting at the networking level with potential to use the CSPC’s facilitating role and the workshops to move into the higher engagement integration levels. An indicator is the intent for the workshops to “generate a concrete number of priority collaborative initiatives that are achievable and will have an impact on reducing poverty in the short term” (Moreno, 2012, para. 6), an intent that is taking shape.
The conceptual framework’s five integration dimensions are currently at different degrees of development:

- **Governance and Administration**: The CSPC, a registered charity (CSPC, n.d.a), is in the managing governance and administration roles in “promoting, developing and evaluating the Action Plan, with the collaboration of all groups who are interested in participating” (CSPC, 2012b, para. 4) which would include the other members of the Steering Committee as well as input from workshop attendees and others in the community to maintain the initiative’s grassroots foundation. In addition to the Steering Committee’s overall leadership and guidance in developing and implementing the Action Plan, workshops and other engagement opportunities, Committee members are ambassadors by raising awareness of the initiative and taking action in their own organizations and circles as well as in the broader community. The Steering Committee brings the diverse perspectives, experiences and expertise necessary to continue to identify needs, gaps and possible solutions (M. Albert, personal communication, September 7, 2012).

- **Autonomy and Mutuality**: At the time of writing this report, the CAPP has been endorsed by 40 organizations (including the City of Victoria, District of North Saanich, Town of Sidney, a range of non-profit agencies including local business associations, and at least one business) and over 100 individuals (CSPC, 2012d, 2012e). In becoming signatories endorsing the CAPP, all of these supporters maintain their individual autonomy but with the intention of mutuality – that is, to not undermine the CAPP objectives when pursuing their separate or common interests as manifest by virtue of having agreed to the CAPP’s actions statement and guidelines (CSPC, 2012c).

- **Engagement Norms**: As a relatively new initiative, developing trust amongst pledge participants and other supportive relationship norms is in the early stages. The initiative’s design as an open, from the ground-up approach to shaping next steps bodes well in this regard. As an example of respectful norms, the CAPP begins with the statement: “We recognize and acknowledge the territory of the Coast and Straits Salish peoples and thank the Nations for the opportunity to live and work within their traditional territories” (CSPC, 2012c, Territorial Recognition). The CAPP’s
guidelines include that participants’ actions “will be inclusive ensuring that those affected by the issue are part of the solution…will actively challenge discriminatory practices…will build capacity and transfer knowledge between organizations and community members” (CSPC, 2012c, Principles). It also is noteworthy that there is a strategy for communications and engagement as well as for evaluation (CSPC, 2012c) which could play major roles in establishing and maintaining trust and fair reciprocation norms.

A notable challenge at this stage is having more registered supporters make action pledges, and turning action pledges into concrete, cohesive outcomes. The CAPP’s communications plan, engagement strategies such as the website and workshops, and an evaluation process are the present tools intended for achieving that progression. Figure 1 provides a schematic of the CAPP program as currently designed.

**Figure 1: Schematic for Community Action Plan on Poverty Initiative**

![Figure 1: Schematic for Community Action Plan on Poverty Initiative](image)

*Note. Figure 1 is based on a review of content on the Community Action Plan on Poverty Website (2012) and correspondence with CSPC staff (M. Albert, personal communication, January 11, 2013).*
The CAPP model is of interest to this research study because of its grassroots, self-selection premise using a website and workshops as primary accessible channels for agencies, businesses, governments and individuals to participate in identified priority action areas. Both straightforward and more complex commitments have a place in the model – for example, CAPP pledges to improve food security range from providing backyard apples for those in need to establishing pay-as-you-can food co-ops (CSPC, 2012h) – and all sectors in the community are able to be involved. The model offers other core elements to consider for Campbell River including the stabilizing structure of a lead organization and a diverse steering committee, the role of effective communication and engagement plans to promote involvement and integrated efforts which are evaluated and improved in a learning environment, and the need for dedicated funding. It also may be of interest that the CAPP approach has the potential to capture continual snapshots of ongoing and new social development activity within the municipality to the extent that there is participation by relevant agencies, coalitions, government departments and residents, and in doing so provide more data for increasing cohesion.

4.2 Niagara Poverty Reduction Network

The Niagara Poverty Reduction Network (NPRN) was established under the broader umbrella of the Niagara Prosperity Initiative created in 2008 by the Niagara Region municipality in Ontario using a research-based approach to support poverty reduction and prevention for its citizens (Niagara Region, 2013). The NPRN fulfills the specific role of providing “leadership in informing and changing attitudes about poverty, sharing ideas, resources and information services to leverage, collaborate and maximize the opportunities for community engagement” (Niagara Poverty Reduction Network [NPRN], 2012, p. 1). This role places the NPRN at the collaboration level in the project’s conceptual framework for integrated endeavours. To this purpose, the NPRN’s (2012) Terms of Reference articulate the Network’s mission as “Private, Voluntary and Public sectors

4 The Niagara Poverty Reduction Network (NPRN) was formerly named the Niagara Prosperity Community Committee (NPCC), with the name change adopted in September 2012 (R. Merritt, personal communication, January 2, 2013).
working together to improve the quality of life in Niagara” (p. 1) and, as noted below, one of the Network’s four subcommittees is focused expressly on fostering collaboration amongst service providers in the region (NPRN, n.d.a). Membership in the Network aims to be representative of the region, including health and social service organizations, government, education, businesses, and residents experiencing poverty (NPRN, 2012). Members receive information on latest developments and activities, and also can attend the NPRN meetings where decisions about direction are determined (R. Merritt, personal communication, January 2, 2013).

Figure 2 provides a schematic depicting how the NPRN is currently organized, with the Network’s goals in the centre surrounded by the Niagara Prosperity Steering Committee and three core institutionalized functions:

- the Convener function to develop and engage community partnerships in the Network and broader Niagara Prosperity Initiative, build capacity for community involvement and leverage across-sector support. The Niagara Community Foundation has been contracted by the Niagara Region Community Services Department to fulfill the Convener role (NPRN, 2012).

- the Secretariat function to provide administrative services to the Network, particularly its Steering Committee. The Business Education Council of Niagara has been contracted by the Niagara Region Community Services Department to fulfill the Secretariat role which also extends to managing the broader Niagara Prosperity Initiative’s applications for grants and the contracts for funding the selected projects and programs (NPRN, 2012).

- the Support role provided by the Niagara Region Community Services Department which presently allocates $1.5 million annually in part to support the NPRN but largely to fund the broader Niagara Prosperity Initiative projects and programs selected for grants (Niagara Region, 2013; R. Merritt, personal communication, January 2, 2013).

The Steering Committee is comprised of three community representatives (from whom the Committee’s chair and vice-chair are selected) and a designate from each of Niagara Region Community Services, the Secretariat, and the Convener (R. Merritt, personal communication, January 2, 2013).
Figure 2 expands to the Network’s four subcommittees – communication, engagement, collaboration, and research – and then to an outer circle of current working tables comprised of community agencies and individuals with interests that advance the Network’s goals (NPRN, n.d.a). The NPRN’s four subcommittees can include members who are otherwise not part of the NPRN (R. Merritt, personal communication, January 2, 2013). The Communication Subcommittee develops strategies for keeping the community informed of NPRN goals and key messages, and for linking messaging of local and provincial poverty reduction initiatives; the Engagement Subcommittee works to expand involvement and develop a network of all sectors relevant to NPRN’s goals, including residents with lived experience of poverty; the Collaboration Subcommittee arranges opportunities for service providers to share information and build working relationships; and the Research Subcommittee assists with obtaining relevant data and developing evaluation methods to inform the NPRN’s and the subcommittees’ planning and activities (NPRN, n.d.a).

Figure 2: Schematic for Niagara Poverty Reduction Network

NPRN meetings are held at least six times annually and require a quorum of 10 members to be present in addition to the Network’s chair or vice-chair (NPRN, 2012). Meetings involve updates from the four subcommittees, the Convener, and the working tables as relevant to the agenda, leading to discussion that ensures overall direction and “alignment of goals and actions in order to reduce duplication of effort and maximize positive outcomes” (Niagara Prosperity Community Committee [NPCC], 2012, p. 6). Each subcommittee meets separately, or with one or more of the other subcommittees when productive, to undertake tasks and develop recommendations for next steps based on the outcomes of the Network meetings, including work plans and progress by the working tables (NPCC). To a great extent, the Convener role connects the Network’s circles by participating in subcommittee and working table meetings as possible (R. Merritt, personal communication, January 3, 2013).

The NPRN’s (2012) Terms of Reference formalize the objectives and responsibilities for the Network’s components and set out operating protocols. The Terms together with information on their practical application provided by the Network’s Convener (R. Merritt, personal communication, January 3, 2013) have been analyzed using the conceptual framework’s five integration dimensions:

- **Governance**: The Steering Committee drafts governance documents such as the Terms of Reference and reviews policy recommendations from the subcommittees in order to bring governance matters to the Network meetings for discussion and ratification (R. Merritt). Therefore, the attendees at the NPRN meetings ultimately determine governance of the Network with consensus required for decisions (NPRN, 2012).

- **Administration**: As the Secretariat, the Business Education Council of Niagara is in the lead administration role for financial management of funds allocated to the Network, making arrangements for Network meetings, maintaining the distribution list and managing communications, as well as preparing meeting agendas, materials and minutes for the Steering Committee (NPRN, 2012; R. Merritt). Responsibility for administration in terms of managing relationships rests primarily with the Niagara Community Foundation’s Convener role, including bringing together groups who would not normally meet, promoting cohesiveness across the different
Network components, and encouraging community engagement by keeping stakeholders outside of the Network informed (R. Merritt).

- **Autonomy and Mutuality:** While all NPRN participants maintain their organizational or individual autonomy as the case may be (R. Merritt), the conflict of interest section of the Network’s *Terms of Reference* calls for mutuality by including the requirement for members to ensure their actions do not interfere with “the objective exercise of his/her duties as a member of the Network” (NPRN, p. 2), or result in or be perceived as an “advantage for an organization with which the member is directly involved…or has a financial interest” (NPRN, p.2).

- **Engagement Norms:** Building and maintaining trust and reciprocation amongst Network members are ongoing priorities facilitated by having the Convener role as well as the subcommittee and working table structures as continuing formats for establishing principal working relationships (R. Merritt). Using a consensus model for final decisions made at the Network meetings likely contributes to supportive norms, and the dispute resolution process for members set out in the *Terms of Reference* (NPRN, 2012) allows for a respectful approach to repair fractured relationships. However, the enormity of the Network’s mission is perhaps most persuasive in achieving supportive engagement norms in eclipsing the capacity of any one organization, group or sector and thereby dependent on the strength of working together.

A recent review of the broader Niagara Prosperity Initiative draws attention to the reality that competition amongst non-profit agencies and community groups for limited resources discourages the intended level of collaboration and attendant trust within the Network (Pennisi, 2011). Also, at present, another challenge for the Network is underrepresentation of businesses as well as residents with lived experience of poverty (R. Merritt), impeding the goal of engaging and including all sectors in the community. However, the recently launched NPRN (n.d.b) website includes specific actions for businesses, educators, faith groups, health professionals, individuals and service groups to contribute to reducing poverty which may lead to increased representation from these groups.

The NPRN is of interest to this study as an example of a structure that connects topic-specific participation at the working table level with centralized strategic planning.
and support. Groups with different focuses – such as community gardens, transportation, and micro credit job creation – can progress at their own intensity of activity while concurrently being part of a grassroots collective designed for increasing cohesion in a larger shared vision. The Network’s model utilizes and builds on existing assets in the community, and creates new assets by developing collaborative relationships in a manner that promotes harmony in recognizing both established and emerging identities, expertise and interests. While the model is complex and ambitious, as is appropriate for a bold mission, and takes place within a large regional setting with considerable resources, adaptation to a smaller-scale Campbell River approach could use a similar asset-based premise supported by centralized functions and subcommittees.

4.3 HC Link

HC Link (n.d.c), formerly known as the Healthy Communities Consortium, provides information exchange, consultations, learning and networking events, research, and referral services for Ontario organizations, groups and individuals involved or interested in health promotion. HC Link (n.d.b), is not an organization but rather a collaborative partnership between three separate charitable organizations: Health Nexus⁶, Ontario Healthy Communities Coalition (OHCC), and Parent Action on Drugs (PAD) (HC Link, n.d.b). The partners’ respective missions are:

- Health Nexus (2013) “is a designated bilingual organization that works with diverse partners to build healthy, equitable and thriving communities” (para. 2).
- OHCC (n.d.a) creates “innovative solutions to meet community challenges and build strong, equitable and sustainable communities through education, engagement and collaboration” (para. 1).
- PAD (2013) “provides innovative, evidence based programs and resources for youth, families, professionals and community members concerning issues that impact substance use and youth” (para. 2).

The Ontario Public Health Association was also a partner from HC Link’s inception in 2009 until the Association refocused its direction in 2012 while remaining an important contact for resources and future projects (HC Link, n.d.c).

---

⁶ Health Nexus was formerly named the Ontario Prevention Clearinghouse, with the name change effective as of April 2008 (Health Nexus, n.d.).
HC Link’s client services are designed to help build capacity for all phases of developing and implementing health promotion policies and programs, creating effective partnerships and connections, and increasing knowledge and empowerment of local initiatives for a range of focuses and priority populations (HC Link, n.d.c). The services manifest the partnership’s mission statement: “HC Link is dedicated to providing health promotion consultation services, educational resources and learning activities in English and French. We enhance the capacity of communities to build, strengthen and sustain healthy vibrant communities” (HC Link, n.d.a, para. 3). Funding is provided by the Government of Ontario’s Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care with the expectation that HC Link services can be accessed without cost to clients in the province, or on a cost-recovery basis if needed for conferences or other special initiatives (HC Link, n.d.a; A. Bodkin and S. Schwenger, personal communication, April 30, 2013).

Within a year of being formed in 2009, the HC Link alliance “moved from coordination and delivery of joint activities to a full collaborative partnership” (HC Link, n.d.b, para 3). While the three partners all have missions, programs and services extending beyond HC Link, and maintain separate offices in Toronto, Ontario (Health Nexus, 2013; Ontario Healthy Communities Coalition [OHCC], n.d.; Parent Action on Drugs [PAD], 2013), the collaboration takes the form of a consolidated presence through the HC Link website. Each of the partners contributes a number of their staff, typically on a part-time basis, to serve as HC Link consultants who provide expert client services, along with other resources such as working space, equipment and supplies within their respective facilities (A. Bodkin and S. Schwenger, personal communication, April 30, 2013). Since April 2012, the role of HC Link Coordinator has been a dedicated position housed within Health Nexus and tasked with the objective to maximize synergy of current and planned activities while supporting participating organizations, acting as the HC Link spokesperson, and providing an informed, interconnecting role for all aspects of operations. Along with other staff, the Coordinator assists with day-to-day administration and is one of the HC Link consultants with topic-specific expertise to offer clients.

Information provided by HC Link’s Coordinator and Manager on how the collaborative partnership functions is summarized below using the conceptual framework’s
five integration dimensions and then illustrated in Figure 3 (A. Bodkin and S. Schwenger, personal communication, April 30, 2013):

- **Governance:** Health Nexus holds the contract with the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care for HC Link funding, and has a memorandum of understanding with each of OHCC and PAD – documents that combine to define the partnership’s governance relationship and commitments. Guided by terms of reference, an Executive Committee comprised of the Executive Director or a Manager from each of the three partners determines HC Link’s strategic directions, policies, procedures, and decisions about roles and responsibilities. The HC Link Coordinator sits on the Executive Committee as a non-voting member to help inform discussions and decisions. The Executive Committee also relies on an Advisory Committee of representatives from different client groups. The Advisory Committee meets two or three times annually to provide input on HC Link services and work plans from a client perspective.

- **Administration:** As the contracted lead organization, Health Nexus has legal accountability for administration of the partnership’s finances and operations. A detailed manual sets out policies and procedures to be followed including expectations for client service standards, managing expenditures, and tracking statistics. Under that fiduciary umbrella, administrative and operational responsibilities are distributed amongst the three partners and implemented by staff subcommittees. For example, PAD currently leads communication, promotion and knowledge exchange activities and also organizes a biannual conference; OHCC leads needs assessment, evaluation and client learning activities; and Health Nexus leads the development of French language services, networking activities and coordination functions. The HC Link Coordinator participates in all subcommittees both as a contributor and to increase consistency across initiatives.

- **Autonomy and Mutuality:** As separate organizations, the three partners maintain their autonomy outside of what has been agreed in their memoranda of understanding for participating in HC Link and related work plans. For example, it would be acceptable for the partners to compete for the same grant opportunities. Therefore, mutuality in foregoing the pursuit of individual interests in favour of the partnership’s interests
could be strengthened in having missions, visions and values that align with HC Link’s objectives and activities, or alternatively could be vulnerable in needing to find support as separate agencies largely from the same funding sources.

- *Engagement Norms:* The partnership’s comprehensive strategic planning process fosters trust and reciprocity. In particular, establishing a collaborative culture where dissenting views are respected and valued maintains trust and productive working relationships. As well, internal evaluations are conducted to ensure the partnership structure is meeting staff and clients’ needs.

**Figure 3: Schematic for HC Link**

*Note.* Figure 3 is based on discussions with HC Link’s Coordinator and Manager (A. Bodkin and S. Schwenger, personal communication, April 30, 2013).
HC Link’s success is evident in numbers – service delivery has increased by approximately 20% each year, and client reach by 40% with exceptional satisfaction ratings (A. Bodkin and S. Schwenger, personal communication, April 30, 2013). HC Link (n.d.c) reported:

In 2011-2012 HC Link delivered 355 services to 5,846 community members and professionals working in health promotion and healthy communities (18% received services in French). These individuals represent approximately 3,533 organizations such as social services, local grass-roots organizations, public and community health, recreation, municipalities and community-based collaboratives, partnerships and networks. (p. 2)

However, challenges have accompanied HC Link’s success with budget cutbacks and ongoing uncertainty about continued funding along with the question of maintaining such a high level of collaboration weighed against HC Link becoming an organization (A. Bodkin and S. Schwenger, personal communication, April 30, 2013).

While these challenges would almost certainly apply to a similar model adapted and scaled for Campbell River, HC Link provides an excellent example of community engagement designed to both motivate and strongly support social development activities at all levels of the conceptual framework’s continuum of integration while building the capacity of organizations, groups and individuals to be successful in shared endeavours. HC Link is particularly of interest in demonstrating how various local agencies’ assets can be leveraged into a cohesive resource for community engagement without diminishing a participating agency’s identity, mission and autonomy.

4.4 Campbell River Community Accord in Support of Workforce Development

Simpson-Cooke (2010) presents a case study of community engagement in Campbell River involving the development of an accord for supporting local workforce development which was motivated by the economic downturn in the region and the realization that “no single organization could drive the economic shift needed” (p. 91). In being specific to Campbell River, this example is of particular interest in considering the potential of this model to increase cohesive cooperation and collaboration across the broader local non-profit sector’s varied mandates. Simpson-Cooke’s findings identify a
number of prerequisites for the “Campbell River Community Accord in Support of Workforce Development” (North Island Employment Foundations Society [NIEFS], 2011), highlighting the pivotal influence of the attitudes, values and goals of individuals in leadership roles and a willingness to share information and coordinate strategic planning – and in this case, a catalyst in the form of a champion in the community.

As illustrated in Figure 4 below, the Accord serves as an aspirational document in providing a shared vision, goals, guiding principles, and definitions for signatory organizations, thereby providing a consistent context for creating a wide variety of Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) between two or more signatories agreeing to coordinate, cooperate or collaborate for particular purposes (D. Preston, personal communication, April 17, 2013). In this manner, the Accord offers a process for engagement at the organizational level that can withstand personnel changes within organizations. Moreover, the Accord – MOUs combination is an elegant approach to resolving the conundrum of “creating engagement without action or creating action without engagement… and wasted effort when organizations see the lens of community only through their specific target group and mandate” (D. Preston, personnel communication, April 17, 2013).

The Colorado Non-Profit Association (2013) provides a toolkit on creating a Memorandum of Understanding which is defined in the toolkit as “a written agreement, usually simpler and less formal than a legal contract, which outlines an agreement between parties” (p. 2). However, this description continues by noting that “[t]he inclusion of certain elements in an MOU can make it a legally-binding document” (p. 2), indicating that MOUs need to be carefully written to ensure the articulation of the parties’ obligations do not overstep their intentions in being involved. The following examples demonstrate that MOUs can serve diverse purposes and involve diverse signatories:

- the MOU between the Union of British Columbia Municipalities, the British Columbia Ministry of Health, the 2010 Legacies Now Society, and the British
Columbia Recreation and Parks Association (2007) “to collaborate to support in a coordinated manner across the province, the implementation of Age-Friendly Community Guides by Local Government and communities” (p. 2).

- the MOU between International Mountain Bicycling Association Canada (2012) and Vélo Québec, two non-profit organizations, “to build capacity, improve collective knowledge, leverage resources, and provide a united voice for mountain bikers in Québec through a collaborative provincial partnership” (para. 2).

A MOU typically names the participating partners who are signatories, states the collaboration’s purpose and timeframe, and outlines the agreement’s terms including governance structure, partner roles and responsibilities, and policies and procedures for a range of activities such as making decisions, securing funding and managing finances, communication protocols, planning, evaluation, resolving conflicts, and similar provisions (Colorado Non-Profit Association, 2013; Nonprofit Risk Management Center, 2013).

Formally launched in February 2011, the Campbell River Accord (NIEFS, 2011) remarkably has over 30 signatories and thereby promotes forming MOUs that are consistent with the Accord’s vision, goals and guiding principles. The signatories represent:

- non-profit organizations providing employment and/or business services including North Island Employment Foundations Society, Campbell River Chamber of Commerce, North Vancouver Island Aboriginal Training Society, Community Futures Strathcona, Campbell River Multicultural and Immigrant Services Association [known as Campbell River Immigrant Welcome Centre], Campbell River Creative Industries Council, and Vancouver Island North Film Commission
- academic institutions comprising School District 72 and North Island College
- the governments of the City of Campbell River, Strathcona Regional District, Campbell River Indian Band, and Homalco Indian Band
- Campbell River Daybreak and Noon Hour Rotary service clubs
- a range of local for-profit businesses including firms providing financial management, personnel management, accounting or legal services, natural resource consulting and management, and retail companies selling goods and services
Simpson-Cooke’s (2010) case study refers to the Campbell River Accord’s objective to address critical issues which affect potential outcomes such as “weak linkages in the community for sharing strategic information and linking planning processes between key stakeholders” (p. 93), challenges that grow in complexity with the number of Accord participants and therefore point to the importance of effective engagement methods.

An analysis using this study’s conceptual framework places the Accord at the coordination level overall with its emphasis on participants sharing information and taking the Accord’s purpose, vision and goals into account in their respective strategic planning. However, for the MOUs among subgroups of Accord participants, there are opportunities for moving further along the framework’s continuum of engagement integration to the cooperation and collaboration levels in undertaking joint initiatives. As an example, an MOU was signed that links the strategic planning of North Island Employment Foundations Society and the Campbell River Chamber of Commerce to support the development and communication of local labour market information, the launch of two major economic development projects, and the increased engagement of employers in the skill development of their employees (D. Preston, personnel communication, May 7, 2013).

The framework’s five integration dimensions help to describe the engagement methods and norms currently in place:

- **Governance:** The Accord sets out a purpose, vision, goals and principles that are agreed to by all signatories, including the principle of partners working together towards the express purpose of advancing the Accord’s workforce development goals with “the support of leadership that is committed to concrete, specific, and measurable actions” (NIEFS, 2011, p. 2). With that aspirational context, Simpson-Cooke’s (2010) case study explains the governance role as specific to each project that is undertaken as a MOU where a project leader is identified by the participating organizations and the other participants fulfill supportive roles. In addition, a strategic plan may be developed to ensure a coordinated approach (NIEFS, 2011) in recognizing that “the greatest threats to success are piecemeal and/or individualistic approaches” (Human Capital Strategies, 2011, p. 29).

- **Administration:** Responsibility for communications, managing relationships and monitoring at the Accord level currently rests with one of the signatories, North
Island Employment Foundations Society, while administration roles for MOUs and specific projects are decided by the participating MOU partners (D. Preston, personnel communication, April 17, 2013).

- **Autonomy and Mutuality:** The Accord maintains each member’s autonomy with the process of members obtaining internal approval to join the Accord through their respective governance procedures, and self-determination on whether to initiate and participate in any MOUs (NIEFS, 2011). Mutuality in upholding the Accord’s collective intent is expressed primarily in asking signatories to “[r]eflect in their strategic and operational plans their commitment to support this Accord, its purpose, vision, goals and principles...Where there are common goals and/or strategies, organizations will seek to link actions that will enhance workforce development” (NIEFS, 2011, p. 4).

- **Engagement Norms:** One of the Accord’s guiding principles focuses specifically on developing trust and fair reciprocal exchange: “Community capacity, goodwill and productive relationships will arise from collaborating, communicating and planning in an effective and efficient manner” (NIEFS, 2011, p. 2). Therefore, the implication is that supportive engagement norms will grow from being effective and efficient in successfully implementing initiatives. As well, the Accord was preceded by other community accords and MOUs in Campbell River involving small numbers of signatories and with focuses relevant to local workforce development (Simpson-Cooke, 2010), thereby providing circumstances to have developed trust and commitment amongst some of the Accord organizations.

It is notable that the Accord does not include some terms that may be advisable for this kind of endeavour such as how signatories can be added or removed, and how related conflicts will be resolved (Colorado Non-Profit Association, 2013). Even if made explicit in the MOUs, these terms may require attention at the Accord level if it is renewed periodically or a situation arises with a signatory that undermines the Accord’s authenticity. Indeed, if the Accord is not monitored, updated and renewed periodically, or is not effectively sustained as an ongoing shared aspiration, its important role in this community engagement model could be at risk of disconnecting from the MOU component.
Simpson-Cooke (2010) observes about the Accord: “Momentum has been created where leadership across the community is looking at how coordinated efforts can build community capacity to respond to economic change, manage the resulting impacts and participate in new opportunities” (p. 94). Therefore, building on this momentum and practical experience in Campbell River is an important option to consider for the possibility of community engagement through a coordinated series of Accords and MOUs spanning the broader scope of all of the City’s SOCP social development priorities.
4.5 Conceptual Framework Summary of Engagement Examples

Tables 4 and 5 provide summaries of the four community engagement examples using the research project’s conceptual framework. Table 4 compares levels of engagement integration, with the Community Action Plan on Poverty (CAPP) and the Campbell River Community Accord/MOUs extending to the coordination level, while Niagara Poverty Reduction Network (NPRN) and HP Link extend to the collaboration level. The rankings have been derived based on the analysis of each example at the time of researching their activities and are the same as stated in their respective sections in this chapter. As well, the right column of the Table concurs with the observation in the literature that less intense levels of engagement integration typically remain active when shared initiatives are functioning at a higher level of integration as elemental to the higher level processes (Camarinha-Matos & Afsarmanesh, 2008; Petersen, 1991).

Table 4: Summary of engagement examples by typical level of integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuum of Engagement Integration (Himmelman, 2001)</th>
<th>Community Engagement Examples Accord/ MOUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Low
| Networking
*Exchange of information for mutual benefit* |
| Coordination
*Networking plus: altering activities for a common purpose* |
| Cooperation
*Coordination plus: sharing resources* |
| Collaboration
*Cooperation plus: enhancing the capacity of partners for mutual benefit and a common purpose by sharing risks, responsibilities, resources and rewards* |
| CAPP | NPRN | HP Link | MOUs |
|・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |
|・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |
|・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |
|・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |
|・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |
|・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |
|・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ |

Table 5 highlights key features of how the four examples function according to the framework’s five dimensions of integration. Table 5 also illustrates diverse approaches
to community engagement for the purpose of achieving social development goals, with the four examples providing a rich array of methods that could be combined in different variations and adapted as possibilities for Campbell River.

Table 5: Summary of engagement examples by five dimensions of integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Integration (Thomson &amp; Perry, 2006)</th>
<th>Community Engagement Examples</th>
<th>Campbell River Accord/MOUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td>Community Social Planning Council of Greater Victoria + Steering Committee</td>
<td>Accord document sets out aspirations for common principles and goals while governance roles are decided in each MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td>Steering Committee + decisions made by NPRN members at Network meetings</td>
<td>North Island Employment Foundations for the Accord, while MOU partners decide their roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy</strong></td>
<td>Executive Committee comprised of one senior staff from each of the three HC Link partner agencies + Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Accord members retain their autonomy while autonomy at MOU level determined by MOU partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutuality</strong></td>
<td>Conflict of interest section in NPRN’s Terms of Reference calls for member mutuality</td>
<td>Accord sets out aspirations for mutuality, while each MOU can specify MOU partners mutuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norms</strong></td>
<td>Mutuality supported by alignment of the partner agencies’ missions but they can compete for the same grant opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Strategic planning process fosters trust and reciprocity, and internal evaluations assess how the partnership is working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>Supportive norms anticipated to come from shared planning and success with joint initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 FINDINGS

The research findings were drawn first from the interview sessions with representatives in senior roles for local non-profit agencies and coalitions as groundwork for planning a focus group meeting for those interviewees able to attend. Based on a comparative analysis of the interview sessions, and taking into account the challenges – benefits analysis in section 3.3, two potential collaboration models for Campbell River were developed by the author in consultation with the project’s client for discussion at the focus group session. The session’s outcomes provided additional insights to guide the report’s recommendations.

5.1 Interview Sessions

An analysis of the 16 interview sessions revealed clusters of common views as well as some singular perspectives, although key points almost always were stated by more than one interview participant. At the highest level of analysis, a majority collective goal emerged as a shared aspiration for local non-profit sector collaboration:

*Increase our effectiveness and reduce fragmentation in the understanding, articulation and resolution of social development priorities in Campbell River, particularly for groups and individuals who experience being marginalized and/or underserved.*

However, as can be the case with grand aspirations, important issues for achieving this goal were also raised in the interviews when considering the community engagement examples, and potential obstacles identified by interviewees were most often substantiated by challenges for collaborative efforts recognized in the literature (section 3.3). As depicted in Figure 5, key issues raised could be grouped into seven themes pertinent to developing the two models for discussion at the focus group session, and ultimately to take into account in recommendations for a Campbell River approach. The comparative font sizes in Figure 5 correspond to the number of interviews where the theme was raised as a main consideration.
A recurring comment in most of the interviews was feeling hindered by not knowing who in the community was undertaking, or planning to undertake, specific social development activities, or apply for specific grants, and generally the absence of an overall picture of gaps and progress. Concerns included finding out after the fact that more than one agency had applied for the same grant and sometimes for similar projects; other duplication and fragmentation of efforts resulting in inefficient use of limited resources; lack of coordination leading to confusion for target groups; conflicting timing of events resulting in poor turnouts; and damage to working relationships when information is perceived to have been withheld and not shared. In the words of one participant, “There is no community vision in taking action or sense of collectively moving forward.”

Two other participants specifically mentioned the SOCP – respectively, that the SOCP needs “multiple streams of alignment” to be implemented, and that there is “no linkage of the SOCP to [agency] strategic plans.”

A related issue raised was how organizers of different initiatives are identifying agencies and groups to participate, and desiring a more inclusive process for such decisions. Comments ranged from not being made aware of, and hence being excluded from, shared initiatives important for the agency’s mandate, to wanting far more effective ways to include First Nations, marginalized or smaller groups, and members of the community. In addition, an example was given to
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Quotes from interview participants have not been cited in order to comply with the confidentiality requirements for the project’s interview sessions (Appendix E) as such citations could identify the interviewee.
demonstrate the need for more awareness of how an agency’s activities targeted to a particular group positively impact other groups and the broader community – in effect, the need to understand the value of interconnections that are not apparent without the benefit of a community lens. The example highlighted programs for specific demographics or health and social conditions that provide free or low-priced healthy meals as a regular part of the activities and consequently can reduce pressure on community services such as the Food Bank, reduce stress for families and caregivers, and contribute to better health outcomes which lower healthcare costs.

- **Funding norms for non-profit sector programs and services (raised in 11 interviews)**

  Interview participants raised several main issues about current funding norms for grants and contracts awarded for non-profit sector initiatives. One of the issues raised was how funders view attribution of outcomes. The prevailing approach was characterized as requiring a lead agency to be the applicant with outcomes attributed either entirely or primarily to that agency despite the imperative to enlist active partners as an important funding condition. Consequently, agencies in the supporting roles find their resources being consumed without building a track record for applying for other grant and contract opportunities.

  Another issue involved the shifting of government funding for non-profit organizations’ programs and services to a contractual procurement model based on competitive bids – an approach that was felt to typically favour larger, established organizations, conjuring up the prospect of ‘big box’ agencies squeezing out smaller contenders. As noted by one interviewee, this changing environment means “non-profit organizations require higher skill levels and more complex structures than in the past.” Moreover, as one participant observed about grants, “Funding for non-profit work focuses on projects that end and not the reality that the needs do not end.”

  The other related concern was the increasing pressure for small non-profits to survive on fundraising with diminishing returns in a booming global market of causes asking for donations, and further weakened by a national economy where
financial support from foundations has been reduced due to low interest rates for their endowments. As a ray of hope, two interviewees noted that some Campbell River non-profits have demonstrated a surprising amount can be accomplished with modest dollars and ingenuity. In one case, the interviewee spoke about experiencing how “many small activities add up…drops in the bucket fill the bucket.” The other interviewee found that referral processes and networking led to partnerships and collaboration in services and programs for shared target groups.

In all cases, the effects were deemed to preserve and reinforce competition within the non-profit sector, and lead to a survival-of-the-fittest mentality that reduces capacity building and diversity in qualifying for funding. This reality was felt to be exacerbated by the complexity of application processes, onerous reporting responsibilities, and the explicit or implicit need for risk management expertise – any or all of which can be beyond the capacity of smaller non-profits.

- **Government involvement in local social development (raised in 11 interviews)**

  Some participants emphasized that communities are facing federal and provincial government downloading of social development priorities to local governments, the non-profit sector, families and individuals without adequate corresponding increases in funding and other forms of support. They felt many non-profits are struggling with cutbacks juxtaposed with higher demand for their services and programs, thrusting collaboration towards only being of interest if self-serving. These participants expressed the view that non-profit sector attempts to rise to the challenge of this changing landscape are well intentioned but short sighted and precarious in absolving governments of their responsibilities. In one participant’s words, “When communities pick up priorities, it lets governments off the hook.”

  Particular interest was expressed in having a clear understanding at the local level of the Campbell River municipal government’s legal and jurisdictional boundaries for being involved and investing in social development in view of variances across the province. One example given was some other municipal governments in British Columbia, such as the City of Nanaimo, have a Social
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Planner on staff. Some interviewees recommended focusing on broader ownership of the SOCP beyond being a City responsibility, but most interviewees felt the City’s involvement through direct participation in local social development and support for coordination needed to increase. A few interviewees emphasized the desire for mutuality in arrangements with the City that supports their agencies’ autonomy when determining priorities and making decisions.

- **Collaboration resources – dollars, people, time (raised in 9 interviews)**

Most interviewees considered time constraints for staff and volunteers to be a top challenge for increasing collaborative efforts, and particularly for people in leadership roles whose involvement would often be necessary for making commitments and reaching decisions. For example, one participant felt it would be possible to be part of a strategic planning session but “ongoing involvement would be too much.” They find that the same people are relied on to participate which ultimately is not viable, and additional funding would be required to maintain partnerships once formed and to support collaboration outcomes. Comments included needing more staff or extending current staff hours to be able to participate, coordination and implementation expenses, and costs of effective risk management, a relatively new standard for non-profits. Interviewees pointed out that allocation of funds and other resources for collaboration simply were not identified in agencies’ budgets and annual plans, and therefore collaborative work was seen as an unfunded, discretionary add-on.

Specific mention was made about increasing the capacity of City Council and staff to be involved in non-profit sector social development endeavours, and increasing participation of young professionals as a priority for sustaining the sector. As well, several interviewees stressed more investment needs to be made in developing leadership and connecting with Campbell River youth and young adults as the community’s future stewards who will help to shape the values, norms and expectations of non-profit organizations. One interviewee stated, “We need young people to stay in Campbell River” and saw this investment as part of “giving them a reason to stay.”
• **Building relationships first (raised in 9 interviews)**

Creating trust by building relationships was mentioned in a number of the interviews as a prerequisite for sustaining collaboration. Special mention was made about desiring a Campbell River model that included First Nations and Aboriginal organizations based on developing empowering relationships and learning respectful practices. A notable comment was that some of the past and current collaborative efforts amongst local non-profit agencies and groups have grown naturally out of relationships developed from sharing information or connecting through networking, events and workshops. However, participants had mixed views on whether trust could be achieved and maintained. Cautionary remarks included: “Cause-based organizations have the fiercest competition.” “Non-profits are in survival mode where collaboration becomes what’s in it for me.” “A crisis is needed to get involvement.”

• **Business sector involvement (raised in 6 interviews)**

Some interviewees were emphatic that involvement of the business sector would be critical to a Campbell River model, and would require businesses to have a much better understanding of how social development priorities are interconnected with prosperity. Generally, they felt businesses would need to see evidence of how participating in cross-sector collaborations would benefit their bottom line. Related comments noted that for-profit and not-for-profit values and objectives differ to the point of needing effective motivators for businesses to participate, such as taxation incentives and increased status in the community. It also was noted in one interview that local businesses are constantly facing competing requests and expectations from non-profit organizations to provide various forms of support for many social causes and initiatives without any coordinating mechanism. A related comment identified “needing better linkages between business and non-profits” as an underlying barrier to address.

• **Ability to affect political will (raised in 6 interviews)**

Some interview participants expressed strongly that the non-profit sector does not have effective avenues for impacting political priorities, policies and decisions, including at the municipal level. One participant said, “Having
government representatives involved and giving presentations to City Council often do not end up being effective in increasing political awareness or interest in priorities.” They want Campbell River City Council and staff to better understand the benefits of investing in various ways in broader social development in the community, to better understand the ubiquitous interconnections with economic development, and to develop a new vision of their role. They questioned whether there is the requisite political will and felt that City Council and staff need to be proactive in taking more interest in the activities and contributions of non-profit agencies. There also were some comments about feeling bypassed when attempting to seek City Council and staff interest, involvement or support.

Table 6 summarizes the interview participants’ main concerns and their perceived impacts and implications.

**Table 6: Priority issues and impacts/implications identified by interview participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding the big picture</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impacts/Implications</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • no common vision or community lens for: 
  - planning and coordinating activities 
  - seeking funding and other supports 
  - identifying and understanding gaps 
  - identifying and valuing interconnections 
  - articulating overall progress 
  - promoting inclusive participation | • duplication and fragmentation in addressing social development priorities 
• inefficient use of limited resources 
• confusion for target groups 
• not seeing and undervaluing benefits of interconnections between initiatives 
• excluding some key stakeholders |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding norms for non-profit sector programs and projects</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impacts/Implications</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • competitive model for grants couched in a partnership context 
• funders attribute results only to grant applicant, not partners 
• shift to contractual procurement of non-profit services based on competitive bids 
• onerous application and reporting processes 
• small non-profits must rely on fundraising in highly competitive global fundraising market | • preserves and reinforces competition within non-profit sector 
• undermines effective partnerships 
• requires complex agency structures and staff skills 
• favours larger agencies and squeezes out small non-profits 
• reduces capacity building and diversity in the non-profit sector |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government involvement in local social development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impacts/Implications</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • federal and provincial government downloading to community level 
• funding cut backs juxtaposed with higher demands for non-profits 
• limited involvement of local government | • non-profits attempting to meet under-resourced expectations not sustainable 
• scarcity leads to collaboration only if self-serving 
• more direct participation and investment from local government needed |
Collaboration resources – dollars, people, time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Concerns</th>
<th>Impacts/Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• time constraints for staff and volunteers</td>
<td>• limited or no time to participate in collaborative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• same people relied on to participate</td>
<td>• collaborative work seen as unfunded, discretionary add-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• no funding to support collaboration processes</td>
<td>• involve young professionals and youth to develop leadership and sustain sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• resources for collaboration not allocated in agencies’ budgets and operational plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• inadequate leadership development and succession planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building relationships first

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Concerns</th>
<th>Impacts/Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• creating trust a prerequisite for collaboration</td>
<td>• building trust as a planned objective of networking, events and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• creating trust challenging to achieve</td>
<td>• developing empowering relationships and respectful approaches with First Nations and Aboriginal organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• connecting through networking, events and workshops as opportunities to build trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• collaboration model to include First Nations and Aboriginal organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business sector involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Concerns</th>
<th>Impacts/Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• incentives needed for involvement of businesses</td>
<td>• need more business sector participation in multi-sector collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lack of common objectives, linkages and coordination between business sector and non-profit sector</td>
<td>• priority to have local businesses understand interconnections between social development, prosperity and their bottom lines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ability to affect political will

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Concerns</th>
<th>Impacts/Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ineffective avenues for affecting political priorities, policies and decisions at all government levels</td>
<td>• need Campbell River City Council and staff to develop a new vision of their role in the community, and be more open, proactive, interested, and involved in local non-profit sector activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• local municipal government’s limited understanding and political will for contributing to social development initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these broader issues, participants in 15 of the 16 interview sessions provided perspectives and comments specific to the four community engagement examples:

- **Community Action Plan on Poverty (CAPP)**

  Most interviewees felt the CAPP model was a promising approach for Campbell River, particularly as a catalyst to build grassroots involvement where everyone in the community could contribute in a variety of ways. Organizations, groups and individuals, including beneficiaries of the model’s activities, could participate from shaping the way forward to taking part in specific projects. Some interviewees pointed out that the model’s structure of ten action areas facilitated a self-organizing approach to implementation, and allowed participation without
requiring significant changes to an agency’s operations. In addition, some interviewees noted that a series of small steps forward, along with community awareness of progress being made, should not be underestimated as a means to achieving change. However, they felt replicating the CAPP would require dedicated funding, paid coordination and administration roles, and a prominent steering committee of influential representatives, including representation from the City. Diligent monitoring and evaluation plans, and successful communications and engagement approaches were also noted as necessary components along with demonstrating progress towards a collective vision.

Several procedural issues were raised as concerns such as the potential for mix ups and chaos with so many ad hoc interactions, a process for participants to withdraw from commitments, and the need for effective safety protocols to ensure proper use of the website and appropriate participation in initiatives. As well, some interviewees questioned whether the website-centred approach would appeal as a main source of connecting in a smaller setting. They felt the CAPP’s face-to-face workshop component would be important for Campbell River while cautioning that time to participate would be a foremost challenge. A recommendation for improving this model was to incorporate a self-assessment tool for organizations to determine the best way to participate and to identify the potential value of their involvement.

- **Niagara Poverty Reduction Network (NPRN)**

  While a few interviewees placed the NPRN model as the top choice for adaptation to a Campbell River approach, most expressed reservations that the model as a whole would be overly complex, costly and document-heavy for a smaller community, and overburden key participants. There also was some concern about arriving at a good process for how decisions would be made, and not having the process cause chronic delays particularly for the working groups. However, interviewees valued the model’s cohesive approach and felt scaling down some of the model’s elements would be of interest – particularly a research function to guide priority-setting, and a communications function for harmonizing planning and activities – with the possibility of evolving to a fuller model over time. The importance of having a paid coordinator, a broad-based group in the steering
committee role, and a community vision was mentioned in several interviews. Concrete strategies to involve all sectors, including a strong role for local government, was also noted and the question was raised of how the City’s current Advisory Commissions might be incorporated into this model.

**HP Link**

Some of the interviewees perceived strengths of the HP Link collaboration as having corresponding weaknesses. They felt the intensive sharing of resources, joint strategic planning and ‘one-stop’ access to services and information increased efficacy for clients – a case of the proverbial sum being greater than its parts – without creating a new organization, in effect avoiding a new competitor seeking scarce funding and similar expertise. Features of the model identified as important for success included having a lead organization and also documented processes that supersede the personalities of whoever is involved. Conversely, concern was expressed about securing adequate funding and the substantial, continuous logistics of the model’s dependence on daily cross-agency administration, coordination and reporting. There also was the question of whether the high level of trust and commitment amongst the partner agencies could be maintained amidst their individual priorities and internal politics. However, interviewees did point to the model’s advisory group being comprised of clients as a good approach to ensure a strong grassroots connection and input based on frontline experience. Finally, an intriguing parallel idea was suggested where the three organizations in the HP Link model would be replaced by the non-profit, private and public sectors, thereby creating an intersection at the centre for highly collaborative planning and action.

It was noted in several interviews that there currently are some similar, though a great deal less intricate, approaches in Campbell River. One example is where several agencies serving similar client groups are located in the same office suite which facilitates sharing resources, aligning services and providing what often can amount to ‘one-stop’ access for clients. Another example is a coalition formed by independent agencies supported by a shared grant for delivering common programming in their respective Central – North Vancouver Island locations. The coalition has terms of reference with one of the member agencies acting as the
coordinator and administering the grant, meets on a regular basis, and supports an external evaluation of the common program. Other examples mentioned involve networked groups and initiatives with aligned goals that naturally promote collaborative opportunities amongst independent agencies. These examples demonstrate the idea of cluster relationships, an approach the some interviewees suggested could be scaled out in the non-profit sector.

- **Campbell River Community Accord and MOUs**

  The Accord /MOUs approach to cooperation and collaboration was a familiar concept for most of the interviewees. Their own experience with local multi-participant MOUs in the non-profit sector, however, had shown this method to be largely documenting intentions rather than resulting in firm commitments. Consequential signatory roles often faded after initial enthusiasm, thereby falling short in realizing the desired collaborative actions. Several contributing factors were suggested including when a large scope dilutes priority focuses for participants and they lose interest, involvement in too many MOUs becoming overwhelming, or when changes to participants’ mandates are not able to be accommodated. Furthermore, some organizations may have capacity to be part of a planning process but not subsequent capacity to undertake action, or they may have funding agreements that restrict what activities can be undertaken. The issues of time required to participate and any addition to already stretched workloads were seen as barriers to maintaining more than symbolic buy-in to an Accord over time. Moreover, competition amongst cause-driven agencies for scarce resources was seen as adding fragility to these kinds of agreements.

  Some interviewees felt the challenges could be mitigated by an Accord/MOUs model with a paid coordinator; terms of reference that included well-defined roles for efficient, active leadership; a detailed strategic plan based on a common vision; reliable monitoring and communication plans; and incorporating working groups into the structure. A recommendation was to focus on discussing potential joint projects first and then consider how Accords/MOUs could be shaped on a project-driven, shared objectives basis. It was noted by one interviewee that, importantly, MOUs can be valuable in formally opening doors to participating
organizations’ key contacts who otherwise may be difficult to contact directly. More generally, most interviewees felt Accords/MOUs afforded opportunities to engage key players, articulate interconnections and goals, and establish common ground.

Table 7 summarizes perspectives on strengths and challenges of the four community engagement examples expressed in the interview sessions.

Table 7: Perspectives on community engagement examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Action Plan on Poverty (CAPP)</th>
<th>Perspectives on Strengths</th>
<th>Perspectives on Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusive, grassroots participation by organizations, groups and individuals</td>
<td>• Ensuring safe participation, including Internet safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structured around 10 priority action areas</td>
<td>• Stable, adequate funding for coordination and administration roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Valuing all levels of activity, including very small initiatives</td>
<td>• Creating a common community vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-organizing approach using highly accessible website platform</td>
<td>• Potential mix ups/chaos from ad hoc, self-organizing approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regular planning and information workshops for participants and broader community</td>
<td>• Time to participate in committees and workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niagara Poverty Reduction Network (NPRN)</th>
<th>Perspectives on Strengths</th>
<th>Perspectives on Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Highly structured, cohesive approach that could be scaled down</td>
<td>• Complex, costly and document heavy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involving all sectors including local government</td>
<td>• Large burden placed on key participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Priority setting guided by research</td>
<td>• Stable, adequate funding for coordinator role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong emphasis on communications to facilitate planning, coordination and participation</td>
<td>• Creating a common community vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HP Link</th>
<th>Perspectives on Strengths</th>
<th>Perspectives on Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Joint strategic planning and sharing resources</td>
<td>• Ongoing, adequate funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Centralized hub for health promotion clients</td>
<td>• Dependence on intensive, continuous cross-agency logistics for coordination and administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner organizations maintain their autonomy</td>
<td>• Maintaining partner agencies’ trust and commitment over time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documented, harmonized operational processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advisory Committee comprised of clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Accord and MOUs</th>
<th>Perspectives on Strengths</th>
<th>Perspectives on Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Bringing different organizations/groups together</td>
<td>• Going beyond intentions to collaborative outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing formal connections among participants</td>
<td>• Participants’ commitment diluted by larger MOU scopes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifying interconnections and common ground</td>
<td>• Restrictions in participants’ mandates and/or funding agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documented goals, objectives and roles</td>
<td>• Time and resources to participate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some Campbell River examples to build on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In combination, the interviews indicate that none of the four community engagement examples as presented would be considered an ideal model for Campbell River.

Interviewees commented on constructing hybrid models by piecing together preferred elements from the four engagement examples. Elements of the CAPP and NPRN models were specifically mentioned in several interviews as a basis for a hybrid. Main suggestions included:

- branding the Campbell River approach with a common vision, mission and identity representing all sectors
- a website component supplemented by email and social media to keep everyone in the community informed and to facilitate grassroots involvement
- regular networking opportunities including one or two meetings per year specifically to look at the ‘big picture’ for moving forward as a community
- a themed and objectives based approach to sharing and aligning strategic planning to achieve complementary goals and activities
- opportunities to develop relationships and trust such as workshops and events
- a research and evaluation based approach for planning and setting priorities, but with room for innovative ideas to be piloted
- efficiency by including a working groups component and using subcommittees
- a learning environment including ways to share experiences, being able to openly identify when an approach is not working well, and bringing in experts and speakers from other communities to stimulate ideas
- neutrality in overarching roles for coordination, administration and facilitating decision making
- meaningful roles for individuals in the community
- celebrations to acknowledge progress and participation

In moving forward, a strong view expressed by most interviewees was the imperative for collaborative activities to be productive with tangible beneficial impacts in order to be worthy of the time and effort involved. Related comments highlighted the need to build consensus on how time allocated for the planning process would be balanced with moving on to achieve outcomes. The question of needing different kinds of incentives to participate was also raised, with the recommendation that incentives should be periodically reviewed
and renewed in order to maintain commitment and energy amongst competing priorities. Suggestions included publicly recognizing participants’ status as community leaders in contributing to the Campbell River collaboration model, as well as ensuring shared attribution for all involved in the outcomes of the collective work being done.

All of the interview sessions concluded with questions on how to build on Campbell River’s current assets in developing a collaborative model, and how progress towards achieving the Campbell River SOCP’s longer-term social development goals could be measured and reported back to the community. Interviewees offered a number of suggestions:

- **Building on existing assets**
  - chart existing assets by SOCP social development themes for the non-profit, public and private sectors, and also note where there are overlaps, interconnections and gaps in order to provide a ‘big picture’ lens
  - do an environmental scan to identify where collaborative momentum is currently evident and could be leveraged or replicated for other focuses
  - support a coordinating body for SOCP social development priorities
  - develop a community-wide vision and build community-wide consensus on definitions of key social development concepts
  - be more inclusive with invitations to participate in social development initiatives for both organizations and individuals including First Nations, youth, seniors, immigrants, and arts and culture groups
  - develop and impose conflict of interest rules for participants in collaborative social development initiatives
  - develop innovative ways to acknowledge contributions to collective endeavours and ensure shared attribution
  - increase overall community capacity by having local organizations (non-profit, businesses and government) include some dedicated time in at least one staff position’s responsibilities for participation in collaborative social development activities
  - have non-profit sector trade shows open to everyone in the community
- have the Campbell River Chamber of Commerce, local business associations, service clubs and the Campbell River Social Planning Committee work together to increase coordination of business sector support for social development priorities
- build local capacity by procuring the services of local talent rather than contracting consultants from other cities
- organize opportunities for intergenerational learning and transfer of knowledge and skills
- recognize diversity in how different groups access information
- organize periodic City Council and staff visits to local agencies to increase their understanding of non-profit sector activities, contributions and challenges
- analyze how the City is balancing private and public interests

**Measuring progress and updating the community**
- determine key SOCP social development milestones that will be monitored and baseline data for each milestone
- for each SOCP social development area, identify how key stakeholders are measuring their impacts, and implement a system for feeding that information into measuring overall SOCP progress
- circulate an annual ‘report card’ that includes both successes and challenges for the key SOCP social development milestones
- use a variety of ways to update the community on key progress indicators for Campbell River including a website, newsletters, articles in the local media, in social media and at community events
- report on impacts in addition to completion of activities
- recalibrate the SOCP phases and objectives as progress is assessed to make the SOCP a living document and retain its relevance for the community

General concern was expressed, however, about how evaluation strategies can ensure that interpretations of measurements are not based on simplistic or obscure analysis, or for political advantage – the obligation to provide accurate contextual information for a clear understanding of the meaning and implications of the measurements. As simply put by several interviewees, misinformation must be avoided.
Analysis of the perspectives shared in the interview sessions guided the author, in consultation with the project’s client, in proposing main elements of two models for consideration at the subsequent focus group meeting with the intent of stimulating discussion on a viable approach for Campbell River: an online-centric collaboration model and a network-centric collaboration model. As illustrated in Figure 6, both models begin with the same five elements which would use an incremental, interactive approach in order to build relationships, trust, inclusivity, and interest and capacity to participate while achieving the following results:

- establishing a dedicated coordinator role and a multi-sector steering committee
- developing a collaboration framework comprised of a collective brand and common definitions, mission, vision and values, and up to 12 priority social development action areas guided by, but not limited to, those identified in the SOCP
- mapping relevant multi-sector mandates/objectives across the priority action areas
- developing a self-assessment tool that helps organizations determine the best way to participate and the potential value of their involvement

Completing the five elements would call for a considerable investment of time, energy and commitment and require valuing the incremental process as setting the foundation for creating community-wide affiliation to advance the SOCP’s goals and objectives.

Figure 6 then separates into the two different emphases:

- online-centric which draws from the CAPP approach and has a self-organizing platform with a moderated interactive website and three in-person meetups annually as main components.
- network-centric which draws from the NPRN approach and has a structured platform with an information website, committees and working groups as main components.

Figure 6 concludes with the two models converging into an annual open house series to provide a variety of opportunities for participants to update the big picture map, showcase specific collaboration activities, help to evaluate the collaboration model, network and celebrate. For both models, implementation could be incremental by starting with two or three action areas where there already is some collaborative momentum, and a few selected elements.
**Figure 6: Key elements of two possible Campbell River collaboration models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator and Multi-sector Steering Committee</th>
<th>Common Brand, Definitions, Mission, Vision and Values</th>
<th>Up to 12 Priority Social Development Action Areas</th>
<th>Big Picture Mapping of Mandates/ Objectives</th>
<th>Self-assessment Tool for Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model A: Online-centric</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Moderated Interactive Website:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presents collaboration framework: brand,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common definitions, mission, vision and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priority action areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presents the big picture mapping of mandates/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives with real time update functionality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides downloadable participant’s self-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- has sign-on function for joining the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration and identifying current and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned initiatives by the priority areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides tools for creating effective MOUs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides an ideas ‘bank’ where ideas for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moving forward by priority area and related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiencies, potential solutions to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges, etc. can be ‘deposited’ by local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations, groups and individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses an online crowdsourcing process to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicate support for ideas in the ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank to be considered for further incremental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses an online crowdsourcing process to help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify which community projects should be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>given priority for funding and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides a grants calendar with linked space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to indicate and coordinate interest in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnering for applying for specific funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides questions and answers section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific to the collaboration model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides links to other relevant websites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and support materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three In-person Meetups Annually:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- networking opportunity to share information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and feedback, learn from expert speakers,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and promote partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model B: Network-centric</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information Website:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presents collaboration framework: brand,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common definitions, mission, vision and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values, priority action areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presents the big picture mapping of mandates/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives with scheduled calls for updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides downloadable participant’s self-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides tools for creating effective MOUs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- announces news relevant to the collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and action areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- showcases local collaboration stories and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highly applicable examples in other locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides questions and answers section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific to the collaboration model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides links to other relevant websites and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working Groups:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- builds on existing coalitions and processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- organized by individual or combined priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action areas with option to use MOUs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- updates Steering Committee periodically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- work plans created by committees with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- research committee to provide centralized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistance in identifying research findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of particular relevance to the priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- grants committee to help identify and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote funding opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- communications committee to develop a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehensive communications strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual Open House Series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- updates big picture mapping and showcases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress and interesting local approaches/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- includes a process for evaluating the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- celebrates the efforts and contributions of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The outcomes of the focus group discussion, which included consideration of the two models, are presented in the next section.

5.2 Focus Group Session

Ten of the interview participants attended the focus group session which was facilitated by the author with assistance from the project’s client. Guided by the facilitator’s protocol (Appendix G), the session began with a reminder about confidentiality and the research project’s purpose and objectives, followed by an overview of the SOCP and its social development priorities. A summary of the main outcomes of the interviews (as outlined in section 4.1) was presented to inform the group of those findings and how they were used in developing the two collaboration models to be considered during the session – Online-centric Model A and Network-centric Model B in Figure 6. With that background in place, participants provided their perspectives on the elements of the Models in terms of developing a Campbell River approach. These comments were interspersed with more general conversation about misalignment of the tax base and economic goals with funding for social development priorities – to quote one participant, “When economic projects are created, they need to look at social and community goals.”

As illustrated with green-highlighted checkmarks in Figure 7 below, the group discussion about the two Models indicated agreement on the whole that – with the exception of the self-assessment tool – all of the top level common elements would be foundational next steps. Specific mention was made of a paid coordinator being essential and also needing representation from the City on the Steering Committee with a role that includes helping to coordinate funding opportunities as well as advocating for funding support for smaller non-profits from the BC government and the Union of BC Municipalities. Further, the recommendation was made to change the order of the top row of common elements by switching “Big Picture Mapping” with “Common Brand, Definitions, Mission, Vision and Values” – that is, begin with an inclusive process for sharing mandates, goals, and strategic plans prior to and as the basis for deciding on a common brand and up to 12 priority social development action areas”. The reordering becomes:

- Coordinator and Steering Committee
- Big Picture Mapping
- Up to 12 Action Areas
- Common Brand, Definitions, Mission, Vision and Values
- Self-assessment Tool
This change in sequence would preclude using the priority action areas as an initial framework for organizing the big picture mapping. Instead, the priority areas would be emergent from analyzing the mandates/objectives to identify key social development themes.

Figure 7 also points out strong views about specific aspects of Model A and Model B using:

- a green-highlighted ✓ for strongly preferred elements;
- a yellow-highlighted ? when doubts were raised about retaining an element;
- a “post-it note” for comments made about an element.

In addition to top level common elements noted above, favoured elements in Model A were:

✓ an interactive website in some form; an ideas ‘bank’; and in-person meetups.

For Model B, favoured elements were:

✓ working groups; a research committee; and a communications committee.

None of the elements in the Models were explicitly rejected but there was some concern about using an online crowdsourcing process to help identify community projects to support.

The post-it notes in Figure 7 elaborate on related considerations including ensuring in-person interactions, grassroots involvement, and effective use of social media.

Figure 7: Focus group discussion outcomes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model A: Online-centric</th>
<th>Model B: Network-centric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderated Interactive Website:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information Website:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presents collaboration framework: brand, common definitions, mission, vision and values, priority action areas</td>
<td>- presents collaboration framework: brand, common definitions, mission, vision and values, priority action areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presents the big picture mapping of mandates/objectives with real time update functionality</td>
<td>- presents the big picture mapping of mandates/objectives with scheduled calls for updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides downloadable participant’s self-assessment tool</td>
<td>- provides downloadable participant’s self-assessment tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- has sign-on function for joining the collaboration and identifying current and planned initiatives by the priority areas</td>
<td>- provides tools for creating effective MOUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides tools for creating effective MOUs</td>
<td>- announces news relevant to the collaboration and action areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ provides an ideas ‘bank’ where ideas for moving forward by priority area and related efficiencies, potential solutions to challenges, etc. can be ‘deposited’ by local organizations, groups and individuals</td>
<td>- showcases local collaboration stories and highly applicable examples in other locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼ uses an online crowdsourcing process to indicate support for ideas in the ideas bank to be considered for further incremental development</td>
<td>- provides questions and answers section specific to the collaboration model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼ uses an online crowdsourcing process to help identify which community projects should be given priority for funding and other resources</td>
<td>- provides links to other relevant websites and support materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides a grants calendar with linked space to indicate and coordinate interest in partnering for applying for specific funding opportunities</td>
<td>✓ Working Groups:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides questions and answers section specific to the collaboration model</td>
<td>- builds on existing coalitions and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provides links to other relevant websites and support materials</td>
<td>- organized by individual or combined priority action areas with option to use MOUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Three In-person Meetups Annually:</td>
<td>- updates Steering Committee periodically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- networking opportunity to share information and feedback, learn from expert speakers, and promote partnerships</td>
<td><strong>Committees:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- work plans created by committees with Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ research committee to provide centralized assistance in identifying research findings of particular relevance to the priority action areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- grants committee to help identify and promote funding opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ communications committee to develop a comprehensive communications strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Annual Open House Series</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- updates big picture mapping and showcases progress and interesting local approaches/solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- includes a process for evaluating the collaboration model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- celebrates the efforts and contributions of all involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note #4:** Participants expressed the need for some form of interactive website that was dynamic and easy to navigate, and also augmented by using email, Facebook and other social media.

**Note #5:** The ideas bank encourages grassroots participation which is important for a Campbell River approach.
Note #6: There was some concern that crowdsourcing could unduly influence decisions about selecting projects as priorities for funding and other supports without the crowdsourcing participants adequately understanding the choices and impacts, or adequately representing community perspectives.

Note #7: Kickstarter.com and indiegogo.com are examples of crowdsourcing where good ideas are voted on and individuals can provide suggestions, comments and funding.

Note #8: The Campbell River model needs to include in-person/face-to-face interactions.

Note #9: There was some concern that Model B would lead to a top down approach.

Note #10: Limited time to participate in working groups and committees would be a major consideration.

Note #11: Agencies’ boards of directors are often underutilized as a resource in broader community initiatives.

Analyzing participants’ deliberation of Model A and Model B revealed that neither model was thought to be ideal for Campbell River. When asked to choose either Model A or Model B, participants were equally divided but preferred a hybrid option that included their favoured elements. They felt Model B was a traditional approach more familiar to, and therefore more comfortable for, non-profits compared with Model A. However, Model A’s online emphasis was seen as more in line with how challenging social development changes are increasingly being achieved both locally and globally, and also as being far more engaging for youth. Importantly though, the majority view was that identifying the big picture and priority areas needed to be completed first in order to decide on a model.

Beyond the focus on the two Models, analysis of other commentary during the session provided equally important considerations to take into account in the recommendations presented in the next chapter. Participants seemed to have a relatively high level of readiness to collaborate within silos of either common target groups (for example, young children) or shared objectives (for example, increasing employment). In contrast, the idea of overarching, coordinated community-wide collaboration did not engender a lot of enthusiasm for drawing on their limited resources to be involved at a practical level. Comments such as “the model must be kept simple”, “time to participate is very limited”, and “I’d be interested when there is a direct benefit for my goals” further pointed to challenges for creating a cohesive collective response to local social development priorities identified in the SOCP.

The focus group session proved to be particularly valuable in identifying useful components to include in a Campbell River collaboration model, and gauging possible courses of action against key contributors’ ability and interest to participate.
6.0 DISCUSSION

Analysis of the project interviews and focus group session in light of the literature review brings interrelated considerations to the forefront of particular interest for the project’s research question applied to Campbell River: What types of models could be developed to increase cohesive cooperation and collaboration for Campbell River non-profit agencies and coalitions in working together to help implement social development priorities in the SOCP? These key considerations, as summarized in this chapter, provide an informed basis for the recommendations presented in chapter 7.0.

Role of Campbell River’s municipal government: The majority of participants in the project interviews, as well as in the focus group session, identified increasing the City’s role in achieving the SOCP’s social development priorities as essential for a successful Campbell River collaboration model. The SOCP is a City of Campbell River Bylaw and thereby a municipal government plan (City of Campbell River, 2012a). As noted in the Introduction chapter of this report, the Bylaw states that the Campbell River SOCP “integrates the three pillars of sustainability – economy, society and culture, environment…and ensures they are addressed in a comprehensive and integrated way” (City of Campbell River, p. 1-7). The implication is that implementing the SOCP involves ensuring in some manner that there will be a comprehensive, integrated approach which includes addressing the SOCP’s social development priorities. However, in the project’s interviews, considerable doubt was expressed about the likelihood of the SOCP fulfilling that purpose, and whether the SOCP was retaining relevance as a community strategy. This scepticism is reflected to some extent in the Bylaw stating that “the Plan is intended to be fluid to respond to changing community circumstances and does not commit Council to implementing the policies of the plan” (City of Campbell River, p. 1-6). The recommendations should revitalize interest, confidence and value in the SOCP as a major undertaking by the City that represents “the aspirations and concerns for the future of the community as expressed by citizens, stakeholders and partners who participated in Campbell River’s most extensive community engagement to date” (City of Campbell River, p. 2-1).

Furthermore, the literature review for the rationale for this study (section 1.3) substantiates the imperative to work collaboratively with the whole socioeconomic system...
in order to achieve complex social development goals (BCHC, n.d.; Gajda, 2004; Hanleybown et al., 2012). With the SOCP having identified local social development priorities based on extensive community consultation, the recommendations need to include leadership from the City to assist with moving beyond the collaboration silos and fragmentation that characterize current social development in Campbell River. Importantly, however, Campbell River’s municipal government has jurisdictional boundaries as well as resource constraints, and the recommendations must not diminish prominent leadership roles for others in the community. In fact, as noted early in the report (section 1.1), progress on many of the SOCP’s social development strategies will need to rely in large part on the community’s non-profit agencies, groups and individuals.

The SOCP explains the parameters of the City’s role in the Social Well-Being chapter as assisting social development through “regulation of land use and design; guidance on developer-provided amenity contributions; taxation and incentives; programs and facilities; and coordination and facilitation of collaborative partnerships” (City of Campbell River, 2012a, p. 11-3). While this description validates the City having a coordinating and facilitating role, the project interviews revealed there is confusion about the boundaries of what municipal governments could contribute to social development and a strong desire for the City to develop a new vision for its involvement. In this regard, British Columbia’s Community Charter (2003) explicitly identifies the purpose of a municipality as extending to include “fostering the economic, social, and environmental well-being of its community” (para. 7(d)), but no guidance is provided and it is not readily evident what that could offer. Therefore the recommendations should include seeking expert advice to interpret this section of the Community Charter and assist the City with developing a new vision of its role within jurisdictional and practical constraints. Importantly, expert advice has the potential to influence outdated beliefs and entrenched attitudes that unnecessarily limit possibilities and no longer align with progressive trends, while also helping the community to have realistic expectations of the City. Habkirk’s (2014) resource guide, How do local governments improve health and community well-being which was written for BC Health Communities and BC Healthy Families, captures a present day perspective in declaring, “Today, local governments are leaders, policy makers,
and partners in promoting the health and well-being of citizens and building healthy communities” (p. 5).

In moving forward, the project’s findings indicate most participants are counting on this multi-faceted local government role for supporting multi-sector involvement in achieving positive social change, while also cautioning that, as much as possible, simple approaches are needed. The recommendations should aim to improve the prospects for balancing these considerations and increasing conviction that a community-wide collaboration model for social development is feasible and necessary.

**Common concepts and vision:** An important consideration for a Campbell River collaboration model identified in the literature review is reaching a common understanding of the concepts and vision that will frame the model. The literature points out that the meaning of key terms, such as cooperation and coordination, remain contested from scholars through to community members, causing confusion about what will be involved in participating in the collaboration and expectations for accountability and evaluation (Bailey & Koney, 2000; Gajda, 2004, Thomson, Perry, & Miller, 2009). Further a common vision has been found to be powerful in striving for shared endeavors that are effective (Hanleybrown et al., 2012; Wheatley & Frieze, 2006; Wolff, 2010). The project’s interview and focus group participants also identified and fully supported the importance of these factors. They proposed compiling ‘who is doing what’ in the community relevant to social development as the first step and as a basis for then deriving a common brand, definitions, mission, vision and values for a Campbell River model. The recommendations, therefore, should include a process for providing a “big picture” of current contributors and their activities followed by a multi-sector process for coming to a shared description of these foundational elements to anchor the model and facilitate attracting participation from all sectors over time.

**Competition versus collaboration and trust:** An analysis of the literature review and project interview outcomes immediately brings attention to the predicament of non-profit agencies being both foes and friends. They live in a competitive funding environment characterized by demands to do more with less, while also requiring partnerships to be part of contract bids and grant applications (Amyot, 2013; Frey et al., 2006; Thomson, Perry, & Miller, 2007). The project participants find that these funding norms for their sector
continue to reinforce rivalry and undermine trust. Increasingly, they feel larger agencies are
winners and smaller agencies are continually at high risk of being losers rather than allies,
resulting in a self-serving mindset lurking in the background of joint endeavours. Trust is
identified in the literature as pivotal for collaboration (Hanleybrown et al., 2012; Thomson
& Perry, 2006), but the interview participants question whether trust can be achieved. They
suggest proactive measures such as a good process for coming to a common vision,
networking and workshop opportunities designed to build relationships and connection,
being inclusive of all groups in the community, ensuring neutrality in lead collaboration
roles, ensuring transparency generally and for conflicts of interest specifically, and frequent
public recognition of the contributors to the collaboration model. In addition, as Osborne
and Murray (2000) note, competitive reactions are a part of collaborations and need to be
openly accepted and managed. The recommendations should include these approaches for
building trust amongst participants in the Campbell River collaboration model, recognizing
that “collaborations are inherently fragile systems” (Thomson & Perry, 2006, p. 29) and
maintaining trust must be a continuous focus.

**High functioning structure:** As presented in the project’s conceptual framework
(section 3.2), the literature review describes five interdependent dimensions which impact
efficacy and sustainability of collaborative work (Thomson & Perry, 2006), and as such
directly pertain to a Campbell River model. Two of these dimensions are functional: (1)
governance, and (2) administration, and the remaining three dimensions are features of
collaborative work: (3) degree of participants’ autonomy; (4) mutuality; and (5) norms for
reciprocity and trust. Achieving a high functioning structure across these dimensions will
determine the degree of success for enduring collaborations (Thomson & Perry), and in
effect will require participants to, as aptly stated by Hogue (2004), “exhibit the
characteristics of a high-performance organization” (p.10).

It bears repeating that the literature highlights major challenges that fit within the
five dimension framework including self-interest yielding to collective interests and
devising an effective decision-making process that is satisfactory to participants (Thomson
& Perry, 2006; Thomson, Perry, & Miller, 2007). The importance of communications in a
high functioning structure for collective endeavors is also a particular focus in the literature
(Hanleybrown et al., 2012; Hogue, 2004) and a priority raised by the project participants as
imperative but difficult to achieve. In Hogue’s (2004) words, the challenge is to “continuously cultivate a work environment that fosters connection and a sense of community” (p. 11), and Hogue notes the extraordinary role technology can play to link “all kinds of groups, leaders, and supporters who communicate, dialogue, negotiate, and collaborate to accomplish shared objectives” (p. 9). Project participants are of the same view in desiring the Campbell River model to have a communications strategy that includes a well-designed interactive website augmented by email, Facebook and other social media.

Further, based on many years of experience, project participants are adamant that a paid coordinator (or equivalent) position would be essential in a Campbell River model. They also support having a volunteer multi-sector steering committee which signals valuing an inclusive approach. While a paid position has associated costs, the Social Planning and Research Council of BC (SPARC) (2008) observes that “[m]unicipal councils who choose to support community social planning ensure the sustainability of their communities” (p. 15), and that “[r]elaying community issues and concerns to higher levels of government is a vital function of government at the municipal level, and if done effectively, can result in funding to properly address these issues” (p. 5). Examining how other municipalities have been successful in securing financial support for similar purposes would be a next step.

Effectively responding to these types of core challenges corresponds with how well the five dimensions are managed. As might be anticipated and as summarized with examples in Table 8, the project interviews and focus group outcomes correlate to a large extent with the dimensions framework.

**Table 8: Examples of participants’ priorities correlating with collaboration dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration dimensions</th>
<th>Examples of correlation with interview and focus group priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>• multi-sector steering committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• conflict of interest rules for collaboration participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>• paid coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• volunteer communications subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• effective communications strategy including interactive website, email and social media, and recognizing diversity in how different groups access information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ autonomy</td>
<td>• support autonomy when making decisions and deciding priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• interest in participating largely restricted to collaboration that directly benefits participant’s agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants’ mutuality

- themed and objectives-based approach for sharing and aligning strategic planning to achieve complementary goals and activities
- “big picture” lens of social development work in the community showing where there are overlaps, interconnections and gaps
- coordination of business sector support for social development priorities

Participants’ reciprocity and trust

- regular networking opportunities, workshops, events and celebrations that promote developing relationships and trust
- inclusive approaches to participation to include all groups in the community
- acknowledge contributions to collective initiatives and ensure shared attribution

This concurrence between the literature review findings and project participants’ priority elements for a collaboration model is useful in pointing to concrete directions for recommendations for Campbell River.

**Ability to participate:** The interviews and focus group session revealed profound concerns about the ability for non-profit agencies to add more demands to their workloads by participating in collaborations as they struggle to meet their own mandated responsibilities with shrinking resources. The literature is explicit that adequate time and energy are essential for collaboration and cautions against discounting these considerations given the scarce funding available for developing a stronger collaboration culture within the non-profit sector (Thomson et al., 2007; Wolff, 2010). Some ideas for increasing the sector’s ability to participate were suggested during the project interviews: having collaborative priorities determined by research and evaluation while leaving some room for innovative options; building on and replicating existing collaborative momentum in the community; efficient approaches such as using subcommittees and working groups; and ideally, each organization formally including dedicated time for collaborative social development activities in at least one staff position’s responsibilities. The literature particularly concurs with collaboration being facilitated by building on relationships and collaborative momentum already in place (Hanleybrown et al., 2012; Osborne & Murray, 2000), and adds commonality in working with the same target populations (Thomson & Perry, 2006). However, perhaps most persuasive for expanding collaboration would be promoting understanding of the benefits in reduced duplication and fragmentation, increased sharing of resources and risks, encouraging innovative solutions (Wolff, 2010), and ultimately the necessity to move beyond working individually or in silos in order to achieve complex social change (BCHC, n.d.; Gajda, 2004; Hanleybown et al., 2012). Hanleybrown et al. (2012) maintain that an influential, highly respected champion or a
group of champions is the most critical factor for embedding and growing those convictions and participation in the community – a perspective also strongly expressed in one of the project interviews when discussing recruiting a steering committee. Given significant ambivalence expressed during the focus group session for a sector-wide collaboration, champions are important to include in recommending a model for Campbell River. Careful attention should be given to selecting steering committee members who are respected as innovative community developers and bring the desired mix of diversity, skills and experience to the committee.

**Community paced:** While linked to the preceding issue of time to participate, the notion of being community paced introduces additional factors for consideration. The literature emphasizes that early successes are important for the continued commitment of collaboration partners (Hanleybrown et al., 2012; Thomson & Perry, 2006), and project participants also expected collaborative activities to produce tangible benefits with a balanced approach between planning and achieving outcomes. Therefore it would be judicious to develop a model at a pace conducive to producing early positive results. However in doing so, the roll out of the model should heed limited tolerance expressed by project participants for adding more or complex demands on already overburdened agencies. In addition, some project participants advocated for taking adequate time to build relationships as the first step towards collaboration. First Nations and Aboriginal organizations were specifically mentioned, but this would be pertinent to forging relationships with the business sector and between non-profit collaboration silos as well. Being community paced would mean respecting and taking into account cultural and sectoral differences in how collaborations are formed. Related to this consideration, the literature review includes valuing process in collaborations as a catalyst for emergent solutions (Kania & Kramer, 2013; Wheatley & Frieze, 2006), and the project’s focus group session revealed a similar desire to have the Campbell River model unfold organically beginning with the process of understanding the community’s current social development landscape. Therefore determining recommendations has the challenge of allowing time for a community-paced approach where tension between valuing both process and early outcomes must balance impacts on maintaining momentum and participants’ commitment.
**In summary:** Overall, the literature substantiates project participants’ priorities and concerns for a Campbell River collaboration model. Figure 8 provides a quick view of the key considerations discussed in this chapter and the inherent complexities ahead.

**Figure 8: Key considerations for a Campbell River model**

The high level of congruence between the literature review and the project interviews and focus group outcomes affords some assurance that recommendations based on common findings have promise. However, project participants’ perspectives and ideas are paramount to take into account in designing a collaboration model given their combined wealth of knowledge and experience specific to Campbell River, and the value of their involvement in moving forward as leaders within the non-profit sector and community.
7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The 16 recommendations presented in this chapter aim to advance the project’s objectives (section 2.1) to develop and implement a Campbell River collaboration model that will:

- engage diverse community agencies and groups in joint initiatives that increase their collective capacity to advance social development priorities identified in the SOCP
- build consensus on how to achieve SOCP social development goals with efficient, harmonious implementation
- strengthen working relationships among participating agencies and groups, and between the participants and City Council and staff.

The recommendations consider the review of the literature, and analysis of the project interview and focus group discussions as summarized in the previous chapter. In addition, the recommendations recognize the importance of incremental steps to allow time for building relationships and trust as well as for phased development to be community paced. In combination, the impact intends to extend to revitalizing interest and confidence in the SOCP for the community as a whole, and as a valuable social development blueprint for City Council and staff.

Recommendations 1 through 4 establish the City of Campbell River Council and staff in an overarching leadership role for promoting a community-wide collaboration model.

**Recommended short term actions for City Council:**

1) Approve creating a Social Planner staff position and hire a Social Planner on a part- or full-time basis as funding allows.
2) Approve City in-kind support for a volunteer multi-sector Steering Committee to guide development and implementation of the collaboration model.
3) Consult with SPARC about pursuing funding and other potential support for the Campbell River collaboration model.
4) Consult with SPARC to help determine an appropriate, effective vision for the City’s involvement in community social development.

**Desired Results for Model:**

- paid coordinator
- City in-kind support and external funding support for model
- new vision for City’s social development role
- increased City involvement
- increased use and value of the SOCP for shaping the community’s future
development activities aligning with the Community Charter. The vision should reinforce the SOCP as a social development tool for City Council and take into account constraints, what is happening in other municipal governments, and the interview and focus group outcomes of this study.

In completing these actions, City Council should request assistance from City staff, including the Social Planner, and also could request assistance from the Community Services, Recreation and Culture Commission\textsuperscript{9}. Further, the recommendation to consult with SPARC reflects SPARC’s extensive experience with community development in municipalities in British Columbia and knowledge of a range of approaches being used across the province with varying degrees of complexity and success (Social Planning and Research Council of BC, n.d.).

**Recommended short term actions for Social Planner:**

5) Prepare Steering Committee terms of reference which include the Committee’s mandate, composition criteria, and protocols for meetings with transparency and accountability regarding making decisions and managing conflicts of interest. Composition should reflect multi-sector and demographic representation. It is recommended that the Social Planner be named as chair for a minimum of the first year as part of the City’s overarching leadership role and to model neutrality.

6) Recruit and orient Steering Committee members from the non-profit sector, business sector, and general community. Careful attention should be given to selecting members who are highly respected in the community and will be influential as champions of the collaboration model, and who have the desired mix of diversity, innovative ideas, skills and experience.

\textsuperscript{9} The Commission, comprising three City Councillors and nine community members, provides advice and can make recommendations to City Council about “City parks, recreation and culture services, early childhood development, seniors and youth programs, community support services, organized sports, visual arts, heritage conservation, outdoor recreation, community beautification and community safety” (City of Campbell River, n.d.a, para. 1).
Recommendations 5 and 6 stabilize the role of the SOCP as a community-wide strategy for social development priorities.

**Recommended short term actions for Steering Committee:**

7) Create two volunteer subcommittees: one for research and one for communications. Selection of subcommittee members is another opportunity to demonstrate inclusivity.

8) Work with the Research Subcommittee to find and assess examples of branding of community-wide collaborations, cross-sector collaboration initiatives particularly involving the business sector, and collaboration model components favoured by project participants such as an ideas ‘bank’.

9) Work with the Communications Subcommittee to prepare a communications strategy that includes a phased plan for an interactive website, effective use of social media, and in-person opportunities for informing the community on progress and obtaining community input.

10) Spearhead creating a Campbell River Non-profit Network which will serve to connect the sector as a whole and with the initial assignment to compile non-profit agency and coalition mandates, objectives and strategic plans.

An existing non-profit coalition, such as the Campbell River Social Planning Committee, could be approached to lead forming the Campbell River Non-profit Network, or a new coalition could be formed for this purpose.

**Recommended short term actions for Campbell River Non-profit Network:**

11) Establish community presence with the initial purpose of compiling a big picture of ‘who is doing what’ relevant to social development activities in the community.

12) Compile non-profit agency and coalition mandates, objectives

---

and strategic plans. Build momentum with early adopters.

13) Use working groups to analyze and cluster commonalities in mandates, objectives and strategies, and link the outcomes to main SOCP social development goals in order to identify emergent up-to-12 priority action areas.

14) Map agency and coalition mandates, objectives and strategic plans to emergent action areas and relevant SOCP goals. Figure 9 provides a schematic demonstrating a possible process.

Recommendations 11 through 14 aim to bring the non-profit sector together with a consolidated identity and an initial purpose that builds connection. The recommendations also can demonstrate some early concrete achievements. A grant could be pursued by the Network to support this work.

**Figure 9: Mapping agency and coalition participation into action areas**
Recommended medium term actions for Steering Committee and Non-profit Network:

15) With assistance from the Research and Communications Subcommittees, organize and implement an adapted charrette workshop process for multi-sector participation in determining a common brand, key definitions, the mission, vision and values for the Campbell River collaboration model, and the first two or three areas for multi-sectoral collaborative action selected from the up-to-12 action areas emerging from recommendation 13.

Desired Results for Model:

- workshops fostering connection
- building interest, relationships and commitment
- inclusivity
- common brand, definitions
- mission, vision, values
- concrete outcomes

Charrettes are designed to involve a large number of diverse participants in working collaboratively to come to decisions on multiple topics in a relatively short period of time (Lennertz & Lutzenhiser, 2003; Tremonti, 2014). The process, in and of itself, is an opportunity to build connection, interest and commitment amongst previously disparate groups and individuals. While charrettes are typically used for design of built environments (Lennertz & Lutzenhiser), the procedure could be adapted for other purposes. As an example, MindTools.com’s (2009) Brainstorming Toolkit includes guidelines for holding a charrette suited to the focuses in recommendation 15. This recommendation supports several notable priorities for the project participants: having inclusive approaches, a willingness to take part in strategic planning, overall concern about efficiency given limited time to participate, and the imperative for collaborative activities to be productive with tangible outcomes.

16) With assistance from the Research and Communications Subcommittees and using the outcomes of recommendation 15 and the project’s focus group session, prepare a proposal for a phased Campbell River collaboration model for detailed feedback from the charrette participants and general feedback from the community in order to finalize the model. The model should also include a process for evaluating and reporting on progress relevant to achieving the SOCP social development priorities, and ensuring ongoing public recognition of the contributors to developing and implementing the model.

Desired Results for Model:

- the Campbell River model
- evaluation of progress relevant to SOCP social development priorities
The Community Foundations of Canada’s (n.d.) *Vital Signs* program could be reviewed for evaluation ideas. *Vital Signs* provides annual assessments conducted by Canadian community foundations on key areas affecting quality of life in their respective communities.

Table 9 presents a top level summary of the recommendations as a framework for moving forward with a highly collaborative approach that will be needed to achieve the SOCP’s complex social development objectives. Allowing a three-year timeframe for implementing the recommendations is suggested.

**Table 9: Recommendations at a glance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campbell River City Council</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hire a Social Planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support a volunteer multi-sector Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consult with SPARC on pursuing funding and other supports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consult with SPARC on a new vision for the City’s role in social development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Planner</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Prepare Steering Committee’s Terms of Reference with Social Planner as chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recruit and orient diverse Steering Committee members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steering Committee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Create a volunteer Research Subcommittee and a volunteer Communications Subcommittee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Work with the Communications Subcommittee to prepare a communications strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Spearhead creating a Campbell River Non-profit Network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campbell River Non-profit Network</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Establish community presence and initial purpose of compiling a big picture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Compile non-profits’ mandates, objectives and strategic plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Use working groups to cluster commonalities, link to SOCP goals and identify emergent up-to-12 priority action areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Map agency and coalition mandates, objectives and strategic plans to emergent action areas and related SOCP goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steering Committee and Non-profit Network</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. With assistance from the Subcommittees, hold an adapted charrette workshop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. With assistance from the Subcommittees, propose a collaboration model, obtain feedback and finalize model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.0 CONCLUSION

Four considerations arising throughout this report are identified by Kohl and Kooley (n.d.) in assessing the potential of agencies and coalitions to work together:

- potential participants’ perceived need for the collaborative approach
- the value to potential participants’ mission and vision
- the capacity of potential participants’ to be involved
- the compatibility of the potential participants’ organizational culture and values

with the collaborative approach

The project’s findings point to significant challenges for Campbell River on all four factors. While the findings demonstrate some readiness and experience in collaborating within silos focused on common target groups or common objectives, local non-profit sector participation in a community-wide collaboration model as a strategy for implementing the SOCP’s social development goals is neither deemed a high priority nor strongly embraced at a practical level.

The project’s review of the literature is resolute in affirming that surmounting these challenges will be necessary for creating the collective vision, commitment and means to achieve the social development aspirations charted in the SOCP. The recommendations in this report endeavour to help navigate through the obstacles towards a community-designed collaboration model that builds the critical mass of interest, involvement and momentum for transforming the SOCP’s social objectives into a bright future for Campbell River and all its residents sustained by the power of working together.
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Appendices

Appendix A

City of Campbell River Sustainable Official Community Plan:

Social Well-Being

The City of Campbell River’s (2012a) Sustainable Official Community Plan includes a Social Well-Being chapter that states:

Campbell River is a safe community, home to healthy, engaged residents who enjoy a high quality of life with meaningful opportunities for community involvement, active living, and lifelong learning.

Desired Outcomes for Our Social Well-being By 2020:

Campbell River will significantly improve in all key social well-being indicators, including:
» increased public safety;
» reduced crime rate for theft and violence;
» increased accessibility of places and services;
» increased education levels;
» reduced obesity rates;
» increased number of community events, including those that celebrate ethnic and cultural diversity, and more.

By 2060:

» Campbell River will be inclusive, respectful, and socially aware.
» Campbell River will be home to healthy residents who enjoy a high quality of life.
» Campbell River will be a community of learning.
» There will be a high level of youth involvement and recreation, including both formal and informal activities in sport, arts, and culture.
» People in all aspects will be engaged and connected, and support innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieving these Desired Outcomes furthers the following Sustainability Priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>» Skilled Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Social Equity &amp; Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Food Self Sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Identity &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Individual Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Shelter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context

Urban development and change can have significant impacts on a community’s social wellbeing, including health, quality-of-life, civic participation, affordability, safety, social
cohesion, and accessibility. Likewise, the social dimension of sustainability is very important in making progress on the other dimensions of sustainability because social-wellbeing is an essential component of vibrant economies and influences our relationships with the natural world.

In Campbell River:

» At the time of the last census (2005), the percentage of low income families in the Campbell River area was the same as the provincial average, which is slightly higher than 13% of the total population.

» Although Campbell River’s population is slightly younger than the rest of the country’s, the median age increased from 35 years in 1996 to 38.4 years in 2006. In the Campbell River area, the proportion of elderly people (i.e. people not earning an income or requiring care) is projected to increase from 22% in 2009 to 35% in 2019. This is 6% higher than the provincial projection, providing rationale for attracting more professionals and young families to Campbell River.

» While immigration continues to bring newcomers to Canada and diversity to its communities, visible minorities make up 3.3% of Campbell River’s population in 2006 (compared with nearly 25% of BC’s population).

» Stakeholders in Campbell River have said that more space, programming, and resources are needed for residents to foster understanding across cultures.

City’s Role

While major social development programs, policies and funding is the responsibility or jurisdiction of the Provincial Government, local governments can assist in advancing social objectives through: regulation of land use and design; guidance on developer-provided amenity contributions; taxation and incentives; programs and facilities; and coordination and facilitation of collaborative partnerships.

Objectives & Policies

11.1 Increase social inclusion, accessibility, and community development opportunities.

11.1.1 The City will consider a social planning role to achieve the desired outcomes outlined in this Chapter.

11.1.2 The City will work collaboratively with other levels of government and community stakeholders and advocate for convening diverse participation and fostering partnerships to develop support and implement strategies to achieve social wellbeing.

11.1.3 All new public spaces and transportation infrastructure will be designed for universal accessibility (i.e. for a range of physical capabilities).

11.1.4 Incentives such as fast-tracked rezoning and development applications, and density bonuses may be provided to rezoning and development applicants that provide accessible residential units or community amenities and spaces that foster social interaction.

11.1.5 Opportunities for intergenerational social interaction will be encouraged through park and public space design, and City recreation and cultural programming.
11.1.6 Community spaces and programs that promote cultural understanding and interaction among diverse populations will be established and maintained.

11.1.7 The City will encourage access to social services and community services in all areas of Campbell River.

11.1.8 Access to civic activities and information regarding community services and amenities will be improved. This includes ensuring use of plain language and clear communication through the use of multi-media tools.

11.1.9 The City will implement strategies for on-going community outreach and consultation through various means to foster inclusiveness and transparency and to achieve the following benefits:

- to keep the community well informed about City operations;
- to create diverse opportunities for people to put forward ideas and take part in processes which interest or affect them;
- to generate and share knowledge, ideas and insights with the community;
- to reduce barriers to information or opportunities consultation
- for those in the community that cannot easily attend public engagement events.

11.2 Enhanced public safety.

11.2.1 Crime prevention strategies such as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) will be considered in the review process for rezoning and development applications, as well as in lighting improvements, beautification measures, and community clean-ups.

11.2.2 Consult with senior levels of government and community groups to identify opportunities to establish addictions recovery and emergency shelters for vulnerable populations.

11.3 Increase opportunities for training, employment, and income security.

11.3.1 The City will collaborate with the Chamber of Commerce, local socioeconomic development organizations, other governments, School District 72, and others to support implementation of workforce transition strategies and skill development opportunities.

11.3.2 Maintaining and enhancing the prominence of high-quality educational institutions and opportunities for learning for all ages and stages of life will be encouraged and supported.

11.4 Improve health and build on existing well-being.

11.4.1 Programs, partnerships, services, and infrastructure that support the health and well-being of all segments of the population, including seniors, youth, families, newcomers and other minorities, and vulnerable groups, are encouraged.

11.4.2 Transportation, land use, and physical design decisions will support active transportation and recreation opportunities as a means to integrate daily activity and exercise into the lives of residents.

11.5 Children and Youth Friendly Policies

11.5.1 The City will support programs and initiatives that promote the health and well-being of children and youth.
11.5.2 Diverse learning opportunities for children and youth will be supported.

11.5.3 The needs of children and youth will be considered in planning initiatives such as land use, transportation, parks, and community facilities.

11.5.4 The City will encourage the development of quality, affordable early learning and child care opportunities.

11.5.5 Outreach efforts will be built upon to provide meaningful engagement opportunities for youth in City planning, programming, and community initiatives.

11.5.6 The City will maintain a Youth Advisory Committee or similar structure to provide input to Council on issues and opportunities impacting youth.

11.5.7 The City will support the development of a Youth Charter and a Youth Engagement Strategy to maintain meaningful youth involvement.

11.5.8 Safe, youth friendly spaces for recreation, arts and culture will be encouraged.

**11.6 Seniors Supportive Policies**

11.6.1 The City will support programming and social gathering spaces for seniors.

11.6.2 The needs of seniors will be considered in planning initiatives such as land use, transportation, parks, and community facilities. (pp. 11-1 - 11-6)
Appendix B

Campbell River’s Integrated Community Sustainability Plan:
Social Well-Being

The City of Campbell River’s (2012b) Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP) includes a Social Well-Being Chapter that states:

**Integrated Goal**

Create a safe community, home to healthy, engaged residents who enjoy a high quality of life with many opportunities for community involvement, active living, and formal and informal education.

**Spheres of Influence**

- The City can develop land use and transportation policies that promote active lifestyles and overall social well being.
- The City operates community facilities and programs which include recreational opportunities.
- The City works collaboratively with other governments and community stakeholders and advocates for convening diverse participation and fostering partnerships to develop, support and implement strategies to achieve social well-being.

**Relationship to Sustainability Priorities**

**Climate & Energy**
Active individuals walk, cycle and take transit, which also reduces energy and emissions from transportation sources.

**Ecosystem Integrity**
The use of trails and natural areas contributes to spiritual and physical health.

**Water**
Campbell River’s water is among the highest quality in Canada and contributes to the health and well-being of local residents.

**Local Economy**
Health and recreation service providers support economic activity in the community.

**Skilled Workforce**
Skilled employees will be needed to provide specialized health services. Also, reaching one’s full capacity relies on access to life-long learning opportunities.

**Social Equity & Cohesion**
Low income families, immigrant or ethnic groups, people with disabilities, youth and seniors and other marginalized or minority populations often need specialized services or programs.

**Food Self-Sufficiency**
Access to healthy, affordable food choices is critical for social well-being and health.

**Identity & Culture**
Connection to culture and identity contributes to emotional and spiritual health.

**Health**
Access to health services, opportunities for active lifestyles, health promotion, primary prevention and treatment is critical for individual, family and community well-being.

**Shelter**
Safe and appropriate housing is critical for living a well-balanced and healthy lifestyle.
## Important Initiatives & Supportive Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Devices</th>
<th>Objectives and/or actions that relate to this goal can be found in the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainable Official Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting our Social Mosaic: Social Development Priorities (2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive Tools &amp; Techniques</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Campbell River Social Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vancouver Island Health Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School District 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Island Jade Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• John Howard Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Campbell River North Island Transition Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Addiction Service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health, fitness and cultural programs at Community Centre and Sportsplex; local sports clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Library services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rose Harbour (BC Housing women’s transition housing project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Priority Actions for Going Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase social inclusion and accessibility and initiatives in community development, taking into consideration the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require that all new public space and transportation infrastructure be designed for accessibility (i.e. for a range of physical capabilities) and adapt existing infrastructure where possible;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilize municipal incentives such as fast tracked development applications, tax exemptions, and density bonuses to encourage the development of accessible, affordable residential units and the provision of community amenities that foster social interaction;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish community locations and programs that promote cultural understanding and interaction among diverse populations;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with community partners to increase access to recreation and community involvement opportunities for all, including vulnerable populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Work to increase public safety, taking into consideration the following:  
- Continue to support the City’s Crime Prevention Strategy, and focus on implementation of the recommendations;  
- Incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design into land use design regulation;  
- Support the establishment of addictions recovery programs and shelters for vulnerable populations through community partnerships and strategic land use policy and regulation;  
- Partner with community organizations to organize dialogues on locally-relevant social safety topics, including suicide, depression, and bullying, and support community agencies in the development and implementation of strategies appropriate to Campbell River. |  | X |  |
| 4. Increase opportunities for training, employment, and income security, taking into consideration the following:  
- Support North Island Employment Foundation and local socio-economic development organizations in implementing Chapter 5 of *Supporting Our Social Mosaic: Social Development Priorities for the City of Campbell River*, which includes actions that address gaps dealing with training, employment, and income security.  
- Support local employers and the Chamber of Commerce in the Workforce Transition Strategy | X | X |  |
| 5. Improve health and build on existing well-being, taking into consideration the following:  
- Ensure programs, facilities, and – where appropriate – infrastructure provide healthy, safe living opportunities and needed service delivery for all segments of the population, including seniors, children, youth, families, people with disabilities, newcomers and other minorities, and vulnerable groups.  
- Through partnerships, programs and services/infrastructure, support School District 72, AIDS Vancouver Island, Public Health, BC Ministry of Education, Vancouver Island Health Authority, First Nations’ Band Councils, and local service providers in implementing Chapter 5 of *Supporting Our Social Mosaic: Social Development Priorities for the City of Campbell River*, which include actions that address gaps dealing with health and well-being, and the needs of children, youth, seniors, and families. | X | X | X |

(pp. 56-58)
Appendix C

Campbell River Non-profit Organizations and Social Purpose Coalitions:

Sample Set

Non-profit Organizations (NGOs)\(^{11}\)

1. Advocacy Services Centre (Vancouver Island North Women’s Resource Society program)
   Promotes the wellbeing of people in crisis or living in poverty, provides outreach to people who are homeless, and legal advocacy services for people who are disadvantaged or disabled.

2. AIDS Vancouver Island
   Provides support, counselling, advocacy, education and harm reduction for people infected or affected by HIV/AIDS and/or Hepatitis C.

3. Association Francophone de Campbell River
   Provides services for people interested in the French language and culture, a library of books and films, computer and internet access, translation of English to French, French classes and tutoring.

4. BC Schizophrenia Society – Campbell River Branch
   Support and education to families and their relatives suffering from schizophrenia and other serious mental illnesses, and related advocacy.

5. Birthright of Campbell River
   Confidential support services for girls and women who are experiencing dilemmas with unplanned pregnancy or changing circumstances during or after pregnancy.

6. Campbell River and District Adult Care Society
   Restores sense of dignity, reduces isolation, improves quality of life and assists adults with chronic health problems and seniors to remain independent in the community.

7. Campbell River and District Association for Community Living (CRADACL)
   Empowers and supports individuals with special needs to lead enriched and fulfilling lives as respected members of their community.

8. Campbell River and District Chamber of Commerce
   Provides services and benefits to members, creates networking events and educational seminars, identifies and advocate on critical business issues, promotes strategic partnerships, markets members’ businesses.

9. Campbell River and North Island Transition Society (CR&NITS)
   Provides safe shelter and access to local resources for women and children at risk of abuse, and supportive recovery for women with addictions. Works with a feminist perspective to achieve a balance of power in society.

10. Campbell River Beacon Club
    Provides adults with chronic mental health issues, and who may have concurrent addiction issues, with meaningful opportunities to develop and enhance independent life skills and achieve their potential.

11. Campbell River Child Care Society
    Provides safe, nurturing care and education for children to contribute to their social, cognitive, emotional, creative, and physical growth, and support for their families. Advocates for quality child care.

---

12. **Campbell River Community Arts Council**  
Fosters interest in all the arts in the community, and empowers, supports and validates the creative efforts of local artists. Fosters creative community partnerships to promote economic, social and cultural development.

13. **Campbell River Community Literacy Association**  
Promotes the importance of literacy in individual lives as well as for society as a whole, and provides a variety of programs to help individuals whose literacy skills are not fully developed.

14. **Campbell River Family Services Society**  
Provides counselling, education, prevention, crisis intervention and related programs for families and individuals.

15. **Campbell River Food Bank**  
Provides food to people who are on limited income, hungry or in an emergency situation.

16. **Campbell River Head Injury Support Society**  
Provides education, advocacy, support and fellowship to brain injury survivors, their caregivers, families, and provides education to the general public about brain injury.

17. **Campbell River Hospice Society**  
Provides compassionate support and companionship to individuals facing death, their families and their friends, and to those grieving a loss due to death.

18. **Campbell River Perinatal Society**  
Seeks support for safe housing for pregnant and postpartum women in need, where residents receive services to address physical, emotional, mental and social needs, in addition to pre- and postnatal care.

19. **Campbell River Seniors’ Centre Society**  
Provides a gathering place for seniors aged 55 and over for activities, snacks, socializing and information.

20. **Campbell River Supported Child Development**  
Helps families find child care programs, provides extra staff for the child's program if needed, coordinates services for developmental monitoring and screening, training for parents and child care providers.

21. **Canadian Cancer Society – Campbell River Unit**  
Provides support services and programs for people who have cancer, and education for the general community. Supports cancer prevention and cure research.

22. **Carihi’s Infant and Toddler Centre (Cari’s)**  
Provides quality care and early learning for children aged newborn to 36 month. Provides the Campbell River Young Parents Program giving priority to young parents who are students continuing their education.

23. **Christian Life Daycare**  
Provides quality care for children and meets their individual development needs in a creative, stimulating, and challenging program incorporating a Christian perspective.

24. **Forest Circle Child Care**  
Provides safe, nurturing and educational child care programs for families in the Campbell River area with children of all abilities from birth to five years old.

25. **Foster Parent Support Services Society – Upper Island**  
Provides meaningful and accessible support, education and networking services for continually enhancing the skills and abilities of foster parents to deliver the best care possible to the children in their homes.

26. **Greenways Land Trust**  
Works to enhance recreational and ecological greenways for people and wildlife through stewardship, public education, and community events.
27. Immigrant Welcome Centre of Campbell River
Works toward the elimination of racism, promotes inclusion, and assists immigrants and their families to settle and adapt to our community.

28. John Howard Society of North Island (JHSNI)
Promotes and fosters safer, healthier communities through rehabilitation, education, prevention and healing programs for those needing an opportunity to achieve, maintain or regain balance within their community.

29. Laichwiltach Family Life Society (LFLS)
Empowers and promotes healing in our communities from a First Nations perspective for all people of native ancestry in unity.

30. North Island Alcohol/Drug Information and Education Society (NADIS)
Provides information and resources to help people make informed choices about the use of alcohol and other drugs.

31. North Island Employment Foundations Society (NIEFS)
Provides work transition and employment support.

32. North Island Supportive Recovery Society (Second Chance)
Provides safe, supportive services to men in crisis from misuse of alcohol and drugs, treating each person with dignity.

33. North Island Survivors’ Healing Society
Offers professional counselling programs and services for adults affected by abuse, who are residents of Campbell River and the surrounding area.

34. Opportunities Career Services Society
Increases clients’ potential for success and achievement of their career/work goals through individual employment coaching and group workshops. Assists employers with recruitment and retention of employees.

35. Options for Sexual Health – Campbell River
Supports healthy sexuality, its diversity of expression, and a positive sexual self-image for individuals throughout life.

36. PacificCare Child Care Resource and Referral
Assists parents in finding quality child care for newborns to 12 years of age. Provides parents and child care providers with access to information, workshops and consultant services on early childhood development.

37. Salvation Army Community and Family Services
Provides emergency assistance with food, shelter, clothing, household items to people in need, and support for detoxification treatment.

38. Sasamans Society (12 First Nation and 4 urban Aboriginal organization members)
Develops and provides services to strengthen our children and families in a community-driven and culturally appropriate manner.

39. Stroke Recovery Association of BC – Campbell River Branch
Provides therapy-based services and information for stroke survivors and their families.

40. Sunrise Resources for Early Childhood Development
Provides services for children aged 0-3 years with developmental delay or at risk for delay in partnership with their families. Supports and assists families in making optimum use of resources.

41. Vancouver Island North Women’s Resource Society
Promotes equality and respect for all people through education, support and empowerment of women in a safe setting. Provides a drop-in centre, referral, anti-poverty programs, workshops, peer and crisis counselling.
42. **Volunteer Campbell River**

Provides ongoing support and encouragement to individuals as they seek ways to become actively involved as volunteers in the community, and also to member agencies in developing effective volunteer programs.

43. **Willow Point Supportive Living Society**

Provides safe, comfortable, affordable accommodation for seniors with low incomes and/or disabilities to enable them to live as independently as possible for as long as possible with dignity.

**Non-profit Social Purpose Community Coalitions**

44. **Active Campbell River**

Promotes awareness of the importance of active living, and encourages and supports the residents of the Campbell River area to move towards more active lifestyles.

45. **Altrusa Club of Campbell River**

Contributes to caring for the community, its children and its needs through volunteering, projects and grants.

46. **Campbell River Aboriginal Infant Development (AIDP) Networking Committee**

Provides networking opportunities for representatives from local First Nations Bands and off-reserve Aboriginal services to create a broader circle of unity for the health and well being of our children.

47. **Campbell River Aboriginal Visioning and Empowerment (CRAVE)**

Engages community agencies and community members in working together, in unity, toward positive change for Aboriginal children, youth and families.

48. **Campbell River Community Addictions Dialogue and Action Committee (CADAC)**

Works with the community to create a healthy social environment and strategic community responses and programs to prevent harm associated with alcohol and drug use.

49. **Campbell River Early Learning and Care Coalition**

Works collaboratively to advocate for quality early care and learning, including out-of-school programs, and to provide expertise on related issues in the community.

50. **Campbell River Family Network/Early Child Development (ECD) Table**

Raises awareness of the critical importance of children’s early years, and strengthens the capacity and commitment of the community to help all young children have a good start in life.

51. **Campbell River Homelessness Coalition**

Examines issues and recommends solutions to prevent and reduce homelessness in Campbell River.

52. **Campbell River Literacy Now**

Provides experiences to enable citizens of all ages to reach their personal literacy goals, and develops and implements a community literacy plan.

53. **Campbell River Rotary Club and Campbell River Rotary Club – Daybreak**

Develops and contributes service in the community, in the workplace, and throughout the world through volunteering, projects and grants.

54. **Campbell River Social Planning Committee**

Works collaboratively for the wellbeing of all residents in Campbell River by promoting and facilitating social development planning and effective solutions to community issues.

55. **Success by 6 Community Council of Partners**

Works collaboratively to coordinate and optimize resources, imagination, and commitment toward the healthy development of all children in the Campbell River area.
Table 10: Sample set of NGOs and coalitions by primary target groups and focuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>Primary target groups</th>
<th>Priority focuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Services Centre</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS Vancouver Island</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Francophone</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Schizophrenia Society</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthright</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Care Society</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. for Community Living</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Society</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Club</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Society</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Council</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Literacy Assoc.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Services Society</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Injury Support Society</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospice Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perinatal Society</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors’ Centre Society</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Child Development</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Society</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbi’s Infant/Toddler Centre</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Life Daycare</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Circle Child Care</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Parent Support</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways Land Trust</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Welcome Centre</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Howard Society</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of ‘Aboriginal Peoples’, ‘Newcomers’, or ‘At Risk Groups’ indicates a mandate specific to those populations. These groups are included generally when other target groups are selected (children, youth, families, women, men, seniors, all residents, and/or businesses and agencies).
### Primary target groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>Parental Services</th>
<th>Youth Services</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>Family/Children</th>
<th>Abortion Services</th>
<th>Aboriginal Services</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>Arts/Literacy</th>
<th>Business Services</th>
<th>Childcare Services</th>
<th>Community Development</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Healthcare</th>
<th>Homelessness</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Laichwiltach Family Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. NI Alcohol/Drug Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. North Island Employment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. NI Supportive Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. NI Survivors’ Healing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Opportunities Career</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Options for Sexual Health</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. PacificCare</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Salvation Army</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Sasamans Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Stroke Recovery</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Sunrise Resources for ECD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Women’s Resource Society</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Volunteer Campbell River</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. WP Supportive Living Soc.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority focuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Healing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Homelessness</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Laichwiltach Family Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. NI Alcohol/Drug Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. North Island Employment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. NI Supportive Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. NI Survivors’ Healing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Opportunities Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Options for Sexual Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. PacificCare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Salvation Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Sasamans Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Stroke Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Sunrise Resources for ECD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Women’s Resource Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Volunteer Campbell River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. WP Supportive Living Soc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NGOs and coalitions

Sample set of Campbell River NGOs and coalitions

(Recommendations in table highlighted in grey)

Communities and redevelopments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Redevelopments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NGOs

- 29. Laichwiltach Family Life
- 30. NI Alcohol/Drug Information
- 31. North Island Employment
- 32. NI Supportive Recovery
- 33. NI Survivors’ Healing
- 34. Opportunities Career
- 35. Options for Sexual Health
- 36. PacificCare
- 37. Salvation Army
- 38. Sasamans Society
- 39. Stroke Recovery
- 40. Sunrise Resources for ECD
- 41. Women’s Resource Society
- 42. Volunteer Campbell River
- 43. WP Supportive Living Soc.

### Coalitions

- 44. Active Campbell River
- 45. Altrusa Club
- 46. AIDP Networking Committee
- 47. Aboriginal Visioning – CRAVE
- 48. Addictions Dialogue/and Action
- 49. Early Learning and Care
- 50. Family Network/ECD Table
- 51. Homelessness Coalition
- 52. Literacy Now
- 53. Rotary Clubs
- 54. Social Planning Committee
- 55. Success By 6 Council
Appendix D
Interview and Focus Group Participants List

Interview Participants\(^{13}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Dates</th>
<th>Participants - Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2013</td>
<td>Ken Blackburn, Executive Director, Campbell River Community Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 2013</td>
<td>Camille Lagueux, Executive Director, Campbell River Family Services Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24, 2013</td>
<td>Rachel Blaney, Executive Director, Multicultural and Immigrant Services Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of North Vancouver Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25, 2013</td>
<td>Helen Whitaker and Maureen Alfonso, Members, Campbell River Seniors’ Centre Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 26, 2013</td>
<td>Doug Preston, Executive Director, North Island Employment Foundations Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31, 2013</td>
<td>Brenda Kobzey, Senior Legal Advocate, Advocacy Services Centre, Vancouver Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Women’s Resource Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31, 2013</td>
<td>One participant, Volunteer Campbell River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 2013</td>
<td>Wendy Richardson, Executive Director, The John Howard Society of North Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6, 2013</td>
<td>Gordon Taylor, Corps Officer, The Salvation Army Ocean Crest Community Church and Ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 8, 2013</td>
<td>Georgette Whitehead, Executive Director, Vancouver Island North Women’s Resource Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24, 2013</td>
<td>Colleen Evans, President and Chief Executive Officer, Campbell River and District Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 4, 2013</td>
<td>Pauline Janyst, Executive Director, Sasamans Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants - Coalitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Dates</th>
<th>Participants - Coalitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 16, 2013</td>
<td>Joyce McMann, Affiliation: Campbell River Early Years Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29, 2013</td>
<td>Anne Boyd, Literacy Outreach Coordinator, Campbell River Literacy Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 2013</td>
<td>Two participants, Altrusa Club of Campbell River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 26, 2013</td>
<td>Mary Catherine Williams, Chair, Campbell River Community Addictions Dialogue and Action Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) Participant names and/or affiliations have only been listed when written permission was provided to the author.
Focus Group Participants

Participants - Agencies

Rachel Blaney, Executive Director, Multicultural and Immigrant Services Association of North Vancouver Island
Camille Lagueux, Executive Director, Campbell River Family Services Society
Doug Preston, Executive Director, North Island Employment Foundations Society
Wendy Richardson, Executive Director, The John Howard Society of North Island
Helen Whitaker, Vice-President, Campbell River Seniors’ Centre Society
Georgette Whitehead, Executive Director, Vancouver Island North Women’s Resource Society
One participant, Volunteer Campbell River
One participant, one other participating agency

Participants - Coalitions

Anne Boyd, Literacy Outreach Coordinator, Campbell River Literacy Now
Joyce McMann, Affiliation: Campbell River Early Years Network

---

14 Participant names and/or affiliations have only been listed when written permission was provided to the author.
Appendix E
Participant Recruitment Scripts, Consent Forms and Withdrawal Form

Interview Recruitment Script

Hello/Dear [name of potential interview participant]. My name is Brenda Wagman and I am a graduate student in the School of Public Administration at University of Victoria. I am in the process of conducting research to complete my Master of Arts degree in Community Development. I would like to briefly explain the focus of my research project and ask whether I would be able to interview you for my project. [For telephone and in-person recruitment: Is this a convenient time to continue or would you like to arrange another time?]

The purpose of my research is to explore the type of models that can be developed for health and social services agencies and groups here in Campbell River to work together in a cohesive way to help implement the City of Campbell River’s new Sustainable Official Community Plan (SOCP). The project will focus specifically on the Plan’s social development section and, as appropriate to this focus, the City is my project’s client. Similar to the City’s previous invitations to provide input for the SOCP, whether or not you participate in this research project will not affect or influence your or your organization’s/group’s relationship with the City in any way.

If you may be interested in participating in this research I will send you the interview consent form for your review and some background information about the project that should take no more than ½ hour to read. If you accept and sign the consent form, I will follow up with you to schedule the interview at your office at your convenience during office hours, or as otherwise convenient, according to arrangements that you approve. The interview would take approximately 1½ hours to complete and I would be taking notes throughout the interview.

The purpose of my interview is to ask for your input on cooperation and collaboration approaches that may be relevant to our community. You are being asked to participate in this study because you are the Executive Director or senior staff member of a local health or social service agency, or a senior member of a community group addressing social development issues in Campbell River. Your participation would be entirely voluntary and you could decide to withdraw from participating at any time.

If you have been involved in my previous community development work as the Success by 6 Coordinator in Campbell River, or have been or may be involved in my current work providing workshops on strategic planning and improving workplaces, or in community groups and initiatives where I volunteer, I want to assure you that whether or not you decide to participate in this research will have no influence in any way on my current or future relationship with you. As well, all interviews for this research will be conducted in an objective, professional manner with no preferential or exceptional treatment given to any participant. I would also like to note that those interviewed for this research will be given information about the opportunity to participate in a subsequent focus group session to discuss and provide feedback on the outcomes of the research.

Would you be interested in receiving the interview consent form and background information for review?

[If the answer is yes] Thank you. I will provide that information to you shortly and will follow up with you to confirm whether or not you would like to participate. If any clarification is needed, I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have about the project, the interview or the research report.

[If the answer is no] Thank you very much for taking the time to talk with me today [to respond to my email].
Interview Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a study entitled Community Engagement in Implementing a Sustainable Official Community Plan that is being conducted by Brenda Wagman.

Brenda Wagman is a graduate student in the School of Public Administration at the University of Victoria and you may contact her if you have further questions by telephone at 250.286.6355 or by email at wagmania@telus.net.

As a graduate student, I am required to conduct research as part of the requirements for a Master of Arts degree in Community Development. It is being conducted under the supervision of Lynne Siemens, Assistant Professor, School of Public Administration, University of Victoria. You may contact my supervisor at siemensl@uvic.ca or 250.721.8069.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this research project is to determine whether a viable model can be developed for local health and social services agencies and groups to work together in a structured, cohesive manner to help implement the City of Campbell River’s new Sustainable Official Community Plan (SOCP). The project will focus specifically on the Plan’s social development section and, as appropriate to this focus, the City is my project’s client. Similar to the City’s previous invitations to provide input for the SOCP, whether or not you participate in this research project will not affect or influence your or your organization’s/group’s relationship with the City in any way.

Importance of this Research

The project’s intent is to leave the legacy of a viable model for successful cooperation and collaboration amongst local agencies and groups helping to implement a long-term Sustainable Official Community Plan in Campbell River, and ideally will be a model that can be replicated in cities in other locations.

Many of the social development strategies in Campbell River’s Plan will rely on community agencies and groups to progress. This project specifically aims to facilitate that process in a manner that enriches every aspect, from effective partnerships to value-added outcomes. Collaboration has inherent challenges that will benefit from the project’s focus on researching relevant practices and encouraging innovative synergy.

Participants Selection

You are being asked to participate in this study because you are the Executive Director or senior staff member of a local health or social service agency, or a senior member of a community group addressing social development issues in Campbell River.

What is Involved

If you agree to voluntarily participate in this research, your participation will include an interview at your convenience at your office, or as otherwise convenient. It is estimated that participation will require ½ hour to review some background information about the project at any time prior to the interview, and 1½ hours to complete the interview. Written notes will be taken by the researcher during the interview. Interview participants will be given information about the opportunity to participate in a subsequent focus group session to discuss and provide feedback on the outcomes of the research.
Inconvenience

It is not anticipated that participation in this study will cause inconvenience to you beyond the time involved in reviewing this consent form, reviewing some background information about the project, and participating in the interview.

Risks

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

Benefits

The benefits to participants in the research include the opportunity to have their expertise and mandates taken into account in the collaborative model developed through this project, and the opportunity to increase partnership relationships. General benefits to the community will include stronger working relationships between local agencies and groups with the municipal government to achieve community sustainability goals.

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 interview will only be used in the research if written, signed permission is provided by you to the researcher. Otherwise, the data from the interview will not be used in the research analysis and will be destroyed.

Researcher’s Relationship with Participants

The researcher may have a relationship to potential participants as colleagues from the researcher’s previous community development work in Campbell River, or who participate in the researcher’s current work providing workshops on strategic planning and improving workplaces, or who are involved in community groups and initiatives where the researcher volunteers. To prevent any possibility of coercion, you have the right to withdraw at any time, and all interviews for this research will be conducted in an objective, professional manner with no preferential or exceptional treatment given to any participant. As well, whether or not you decide to participate in this research will have no influence in any way on any current or future relationship the researcher has with you.

On-going Consent

Should there be a need to complete the interview in two sessions rather than one, I will ask you at the beginning of the second session if you consent to the same conditions that you agree to at this time in order to make sure that you continue to consent to participate in this research.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

To protect your anonymity, data will be presented as aggregate findings or will be presented without identifying the data source. However, if you would permit your organization/group, with or without your name, to be listed in the research report’s appendices section as having participated in the interviews, you can give that permission at the end of this form and you would not be anonymous in that aspect.

The size of the health and social services sector in Campbell River may inadvertently affect anonymity without being the result of any action.

Dissemination of Results

It is anticipated that the results of this study will be shared with others in the following ways: a research report provided to the City of Campbell River and research participants; the executive summary from the research report and possibly a summary fact sheet made generally available; in presentations and information
sessions. The City of Campbell River may wish to make the report, executive summary and fact sheet generally accessible on its website or as hardcopies. The researcher may wish to provide the report, executive summary and fact sheet to local groups or groups in other cities in consultation with the City of Campbell River, and to have the report as part of the researcher’s professional portfolio.

Storage and Disposal of Data
Hardcopy research documents and data will be stored at the researcher’s home office in a locked cabinet. Electronic research documents and data will be stored on the researcher’s home office computer with password protected access. One year after completion of the research report, hardcopy data from this study will be destroyed using a shredding machine and electronic data will be permanently deleted on the researcher’s computer.

Contacts
Individuals that may be contacted regarding this study are the researcher and supervisor identified at the beginning of the consent form where contact information is provided. 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 by telephone at 250.472.4545 or by email at ethics@uvic.ca.

Your signature below 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 researcher.

I agree to have my organization/group listed as a participant in the interviews for this study in the appendices section of the study’s final report: _________ (Participant’s initials)

I agree to have my name and position listed as a participant in the interviews for this study in the appendices section of the study’s final report: _________ (Participant’s initials)

Name of Participant ____________________________ Signature ____________________________

Position ____________________________

Agency or Group ____________________________

Date ____________________________

Thank you.
A copy of this consent will be left with you, and the original will be taken by the researcher.
Focus Group Recruitment Script

[Note: Focus group participants will already have participated in the interview component of the research.]

Hello/Dear [name of potential focus group participant]. [Identify myself for telephone and in-person recruitment.] I would like to thank you for being interviewed for the research project I am completing for my Master of Arts degree in Community Development at the University of Victoria. I would like to ask whether you would be able to participate in a follow-up focus group session. [For telephone and in-person recruitment: Is this a convenient time to continue or would you like to arrange another time?]

If you accept and sign the consent form to participate in the focus group session, you will be included in arrangements for the session to be held during office hours at the convenience of participants to the extent possible. I am working with the City, as the client for my research project, to organize the focus group session. The session will take approximately 2 hours and there will be notes taken on the group discussion throughout the session. Similar to the City’s previous invitations to provide input for Campbell River’s Sustainable Official Community Plan, whether or not you participate in this research project will not affect or influence your relationship with the City in any way.

The purpose of the focus group session is to ask for feedback on two possible models for the health and social services sector in our community to work together to help implement the social development section of the new Sustainable Official Community Plan. Two models have been developed based on research of relevant approaches and the input provided in the interviews I conducted for this project, including my interview with you. Your participation in the focus group session would be entirely voluntary and you could decide to withdraw from participating in the focus group at any time during the session.

If you have been involved in my previous community development work as the Success by 6 Coordinator in Campbell River, or have been or may be involved in my current work providing workshops on strategic planning and improving workplaces, or in community groups and initiatives where I volunteer, I want to assure you that whether or not you decide to participate in this research will have no influence in any way on my current or future relationship with you. As well, the focus group session will be conducted in an objective, professional manner with no preferential or exceptional treatment given to any participant.

Would you be interested in receiving the focus group consent form for review?

[If the answer is yes] Thank you. I will provide that information to you shortly and follow up with you to confirm whether or not you would like to participate. If any clarification is needed, I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have about the project, the focus group session or the research report.

[If the answer is no] Thank you very much for taking the time to talk with me today [to respond to my email].
Focus Group Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a study entitled *Community Engagement in Implementing a Sustainable Official Community Plan* that is being conducted by Brenda Wagman.

Brenda Wagman is a graduate student in the School of Public Administration at the University of Victoria and you may contact her if you have further questions by telephone at 250.286.6355 or by email at wagmania@telus.net.

As a graduate student, I am required to conduct research as part of the requirements for a Master of Arts degree in Community Development. It is being conducted under the supervision of Lynne Siemens, Assistant Professor, School of Public Administration, University of Victoria. You may contact my supervisor at siemensl@uvic.ca or 250.721.8069.

**Purpose and Objectives**
The purpose of this research project is to explore the type of models that can be developed for local health and social services agencies and groups to work together in a cohesive manner to help implement the City of Campbell River’s new Sustainable Official Community Plan (SOCP). The project will focus specifically on the Plan’s social development section and, as appropriate to this focus, the City is my project’s client. Similar to the City’s previous invitations to provide input for the SOCP, whether or not you participate in this research project will not affect or influence your or your organization’s/group’s relationship with the City in any way.

**Importance of this Research**
The project’s intent is to leave the legacy of a model for collaboration amongst local agencies and groups helping to implement a long-term Sustainable Official Community Plan in Campbell River, and ideally will be a model that can be replicated in cities in other locations.

Many of the social development strategies in Campbell River’s Plan will rely on community agencies and groups to progress. This project specifically aims to facilitate that process in a manner that enriches every aspect, from effective partnerships to value-added outcomes. Collaboration has inherent challenges that will benefit from the project’s focus on researching relevant practices and encouraging innovative synergy.

**Participants Selection**
You are being asked to participate in this study because you are the Executive Director or senior staff member of a local health or social service agency, or a senior member of a community group addressing social development issues in Campbell River.

**What is involved**
If you agree to voluntarily participate in this research, your participation will involve a focus group session with other participants in this research. I am working with the City to organize the focus group session which will take approximately 2 hours. Notes will be taken on the group’s discussion throughout the session.

**Inconvenience**
It is not anticipated that participation in this study will cause inconvenience to you beyond the time involved in reviewing this consent form and participating in the focus group session.

**Risks**
There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research.
Benefits
The benefits to participants in the research include the opportunity to have their expertise and mandates taken into account in the collaborative model developed through this project, and the opportunity to increase partnership relationships. General benefits to the community will include stronger working relationships between local agencies and groups with the municipal government to achieve community sustainability goals.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this research must be completely voluntary. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw at any time without any consequences or any explanation. If you do withdraw from the study, your data provided during the focus group session will not be able to be extracted and therefore will still be used in the research. However all data will be presented as aggregate findings or will be presented without identifying the data source.

Researcher’s Relationship with Participants
The researcher may have a relationship to potential participants as colleagues from the researcher’s previous community development work in Campbell River, or who participate in the researcher’s current work providing workshops on strategic planning and improving workplaces, or who are involved in community groups and initiatives where the researcher volunteers. To prevent any possibility of coercion, you have the right to withdraw at any time, and the focus group session for this research will be conducted in an objective, professional manner with no preferential or exceptional treatment given to any participant. As well, whether or not you decide to participate in this research will have no influence in any way on any current or future relationship the researcher has with you.

Anonymity and Confidentiality
Due to the nature of group activities, the researcher will be unable to guarantee confidentiality of participants’ discussions in the focus group session and therefore participants in the session will be advised by the researcher not to share any information they wish to keep private. Moreover, the researcher will ask all participants in the focus group session to keep the information shared within the focus group confidential. To protect your anonymity, data will be presented as aggregate findings or will be presented without identifying the data source. However, if you would permit your organization/group, with or without your name, to be listed in the research report’s appendices section as having participated in the focus group session, you can give that permission at the end of this form and you would not be anonymous in that aspect. Also, the size of the health and social services sector in Campbell River may inadvertently affect anonymity without being the result of any action.

Dissemination of Results
It is anticipated that the results of this study will be shared with others in the following ways: a research report provided to the City of Campbell River and research participants; the executive summary from the research report and possibly a summary fact sheet made generally available; presentations; and information sessions. The City of Campbell River may wish to make the report, executive summary and fact sheet accessible on its website or as hardcopies. The researcher may wish to provide the report, executive summary and fact sheet to local groups or groups in other cities in consultation with the City of Campbell River, and to have the report as part of the researcher’s professional portfolio.

Storage and Disposal of Data
Hardcopy research documents and data will be stored at the researcher’s home office in a locked cabinet. Electronic research documents and data will be stored on the researcher’s home office computer with password protected access. One year after completion of the research report, hardcopy data from this study
will be destroyed using a shredding machine and electronic data will be permanently deleted on the researcher’s computer.

Contacts
Individuals that may be contacted regarding this study are the researcher and supervisor identified at the beginning of the consent form where contact information is provided. 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 by telephone at 250.472.4545 or by email at ethics@uvic.ca.

Your signature below 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 researcher.

I agree to have my organization/group listed as a participant in the focus group session for this study in the appendices section of the study’s final report: __________ (Participant’s initials)

I agree to have my name and position listed as a participant in the focus group session for this study in the appendices section of the study’s final report: __________ (Participant’s initials)

______________________________________________
Name of Participant                          Signature

______________________________________________
Position

______________________________________________
Agency or Group

______________________________________________
Date

Thank you.
A copy of this consent will be left with you, and the original will be taken by the researcher.
Withdrawal from Participation in Research Form

Name of participant:______________________________________________________________

Position:_______________________________________________________________________

Organization/Group:________________________________________________________________

Address:________________________________________________________________________

Telephone:_________________________ Fax:__________________________________________

Email:__________________________________________________________________________

Research interview session:
The participant was interviewed on______________________________________, 20______ by Brenda Wagman for her research project entitled *Community Engagement in Implementing a Sustainable Official Community Plan* as part of her requirements for completing a Master of Arts degree in Community Development at the University of Victoria in British Columbia.

The participant has elected to withdraw from the research and, as indicated by the participant’s initials, has decided of her or his own volition either:

_____ to give permission for Brenda Wagman to use the participant’s interview data in the research,

or

_____ to decline permission for Brenda Wagman to use the participant’s interview data in the research in which case the data will not be used, and Brenda Wagman will shred any hardcopy data provided by the participant in the interview and permanently delete any electronic data provided by the participant in the interview.

Research focus group session:
The participant acknowledges that use of any data provided by the participant in the research focus group session, when applicable, cannot be extracted from the research due to the nature of the group activity. The researcher has explained that all focus group data will be presented as aggregate findings or will be presented without identifying the data source.

________________________________________________________________________________

Name of Participant                                                                 Name of Researcher
________________________________________________________________________________

Signature of Participant                                                               Signature of Researcher
________________________________________________________________________________

Date                                                                                       Date
Appendix F

Interview and Focus Group Questions

Interview Questions

Community Engagement in Implementing a Sustainable Official Community Plan

**Researcher/Interviewer:** Brenda Wagman, Graduate Student, Masters of Arts in Community Development, School of Public Administration, University of Victoria

**Research Client:** City of Campbell River

Name of Participant:

Title:

Organization:

Address:

Telephone: Fax: Email:

Date of Interview:

Location of interview:

☐ The Interview Participant Consent Form, which was provided in advance to the participant, has been discussed and signed.

The interview session will start with a brief review of the research project’s purpose and objectives, and the social development section in Campbell River’s new Sustainable Official Community Plan (SOCP).

Let’s review four approaches for collaboration amongst local agencies and groups in the health and social services sector to help implement community plans.

**Considering this menu of approaches:**

1. Which approaches or combination of elements in the different approaches would you suggest for a Campbell River collaborative model and why?

2. Do you have suggestions on how to build on existing assets in the community in developing a collaborative model for Campbell River?

3. Do you have any thoughts or suggestions on how progress towards achieving the SOCP’s longer-term social development goals could be measured and reported back to the community?

4. Are there any other comments you would like to add or issues you would like to raise?
Focus Group Questions

Community Engagement in Implementing a Sustainable Official Community Plan

Researcher/Interviewer: Brenda Wagman, Graduate Student, Masters of Arts in Community Development, School of Public Administration, University of Victoria

Research Client: City of Campbell River

Name of Participant:

Title:

Organization:

Address:

Telephone: Fax: Email:

Date of Focus Group Session:

Location of Focus Group Session:

☐ The Focus Group Participant Consent Form, which was provided in advance to the participant, has been discussed and signed.

The focus group session will start with a brief review of the research project’s purpose and objectives, and the social development section in Campbell River’s new Sustainable Official Community Plan (SOCP).

Let’s review two possible models for collaboration amongst local Campbell River agencies and groups in the health and social services sector to help implement Campbell River’s Sustainable Official Community Plan. The two models have been developed based on research of relevant approaches that have been or could be used and input you provided as an interview participant in this research project.

Considering Model A, I would like to ask you to discuss the following question:

1. What changes to Model A – additions, modifications, deletions – would make Model A both viable and effective for Campbell River, and why?

Considering Model B, I would like to ask you to discuss the following question:

2. What changes to Model B – additions, modifications, deletions – would make Model B both viable and effective for Campbell River, and why?

Now, considering the revised Model A and the revised Model B:

3. Between the revised Model A and the revised Model B, which would you recommend for Campbell River?

4. Would you recommend a hybrid of the two revised Models and if yes, what would the hybrid be?

5. Are there any other ideas or comments you would like to add, or issues you would like to raise?
Appendix G

Focus Group Facilitator’s Protocol

- Welcome participants and facilitator introduction.
- Point out refreshments, location of washrooms, notes may be taken during the session, etc.
- “Before we begin”…confirm all participants’ consent forms have been read, understood (ask if there are any questions), signed and collected. Note that participants will be given a copy of their own signed consent form.
- Remind participants they can withdraw from the research project. Hold up withdrawal form.

Agenda item 1: Introductions and Introduction (PowerPoint assisted)

- Introductions: Round table.
- Remind participants of confidentiality regarding focus group discussion and identity of participants, and potential limitations of confidentiality in group activities as explained in the Focus Group Consent Form’s ‘Anonymity and Confidentiality’ section.
- Ensure all participants have a name tag and the agenda.
- Review agenda (speak to slide 2).
- Purpose of focus groups: Morgan (2008) quote in section 2.5 above (speak to slide 3).
- Focus group discussion etiquette (speak to slide 4).

Agenda item 2: Summary of research project’s purpose and objectives (PowerPoint assisted)

- Summarize the purpose and objectives outlined in section 1.2 above (speak to slide 5).
- Lead into agenda item 3 by asking: “Why is the project focusing on the SOCP?”

Agenda item 3: The SOCP and social development priorities (PowerPoint assisted)

- Read the SOCP/ICSP “Social Well-being” goal statement (slide 6).
- Short overview of the SOCP/ICSP social development priorities and indicators.
- Lead into agenda item 4 by asking: What will it take to get there?

Agenda item 4: Outcomes of interview sessions (PowerPoint assisted)

- Summarize interview questions (speak to slide 7).
- Lead into next slide: “The four models provided an array of options and elements to consider and generate discussion.”
- Very briefly recall the four collaboration models (speak to slides 8, 9, 10 and 11).
- Briefly summarize first outcome: None of the examples were considered ideal for Campbell River. However, the CAPP and NPRN examples were favoured by some of the interviewees as having elements of most interest for consideration (speak to slide 12).
- Briefly summarize second outcome: A majority collective goal emerged (read slide 13).
Briefly summarize third outcome: Seven priority collaboration issues emerged from the interviews in order of frequency (speak to slide 14).

Highlight remaining outcomes (slide 15) and refer to outcomes handout (from section 5.1).

**Agenda item 5: Feedback on two collaboration models** (section 4.1 Figure 6 as a wall chart and also a handout, coloured dots (green for “keep element”, yellow for “unsure whether to keep element”, and red for “remove element”, and post-it notes)

- Introduce the two collaboration models:
  
  “Let’s review two possible models for collaboration amongst local Campbell River agencies and groups in the health and social services sector to help implement Campbell River’s Sustainable Official Community Plan. The two models have been developed based on research of relevant approaches that have been, or could be, used and input you provided as an interview participant in this research project.”

- Describe online-centric model A and network-centric model B using the wall chart.

- “**Considering Model A, I would like to ask you to discuss the following question:**
  
  What changes to Model A – additions, modifications, deletions – would make Model A both viable and effective for Campbell River, and why?”

  - During discussion, use colour-coded dots and post-it notes on wall chart for points made by participants (slide 16).

- “**Considering Model B, I would like to ask you to discuss the following question:**
  
  What changes to Model B – additions, modifications, deletions – would make Model B both viable and effective for Campbell River, and why?”

  - During discussion, use colour-coded dots and post-it notes on wall chart for points made by participants (slide 16).

**Agenda item 6: Recommendations for Campbell River**

- “**Now, considering the revised Model A and the revised Model B:** Between the revised Model A and the revised Model B, which would you recommend for Campbell River? Would you recommend a hybrid of the two revised Models and if yes, what would the hybrid be?”

  - During discussion, use blue dots on wall chart to show top level choices of Model A or Model B or Hybrid.

  - If a Hybrid is favoured, use flip chart or take notes of discussion on what it would be.

**Agenda item 7: Other comments and/or issues**

- Record on flip chart or take notes.
Agenda item 8: Next steps for project

- Summarize next steps: complete the report, academic and client review, defence, finalizing report and presenting to City Council. Report will be given to client, published on University of Victoria’s library website. A copy of the report will be available to research project participants.

Conclude the session: Thank all participants. Remind participants about confidentiality.
Outcomes of Interview Sessions:

Majority Collective Goal

Increase our effectiveness and reduce fragmentation in the understanding, articulation and resolution of social development priorities in Campbell River, particularly for groups and individuals who experience being marginalized and/or underserved.

7 Priority Collaboration Issues

Suggestions for Moving Forward

• Suggestions for a Campbell River collaboration model
• Suggestions for building on existing assets
• Suggestions for measuring progress of SOCP longer-term goals and updating the community

Two Possible Models for Campbell River

Model A: Online-centric
Model B: Network-centric

- yes, keep this element
- unsure whether to keep this element
- no, remove this element

OR: Post-it notes to modify an element

Thank You!