

**Community Collaboration Project  
Year II Review  
2000 - 2001**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED.....</b>	<b>8</b>
PROJECT CONTINUITY .....	9
ROLE OF THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.....	10
AWARENESS AND SHARING OF LESSONS LEARNED .....	10
ISSUES UNIQUE TO THE SOUTHWEST REGIONAL ROUND TABLE .....	11
<b>PROJECT CHRONOLOGY .....</b>	<b>12</b>
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE .....	13
NORTHERN VISION REGIONAL ROUND TABLE .....	14
SOUTHWEST REGIONAL ROUND TABLE.....	16
FRANCO-MANITOBA.....	20
POTENTIAL NEW REGION – PARKLAND.....	23
POTENTIAL NEW REGION – BAYLINE.....	24
<b>DATA COLLECTION METHOD.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>PRE-MEASURE FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>27</b>
NORTHERN VISION REGIONAL ROUND TABLE .....	29
SOUTHWEST REGIONAL ROUND TABLE.....	34
FRANCO-MANITOBA.....	40
POTENTIAL NEW REGION – PARKLAND.....	42
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE .....	44
<b>NEXT STEPS.....</b>	<b>48</b>

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	<i>Community Collaboration Project Logic Model</i>
APPENDIX B	<i>Community Collaboration Project Review Framework</i>
APPENDIX C	<i>Community Collaboration Project Overview Chart</i>
APPENDIX D	<i>Pre-Measure Questionnaires and Key Informant Interview Tools</i>
APPENDIX E	<i>Regional Round Table Checklist/Diary</i>

## **Executive Summary**

This *Year II Review and Lessons Learned, Interim Report* documents the process, activities and lessons learned of the second year of the Community Collaboration Project (CCP) and covers the time period of April 2000 to February 2001. The project is a collaborative arrangement between the communities involved, Rural Development Institute (RDI) and the Federal and Provincial agencies that provide services to those communities. Agency partners of the project are Health Canada, Environment Canada, Rural Secretariat (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada), Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs and Community Futures Partners of Manitoba. The Community Collaboration Project is overseen by a management committee comprised of representatives from these various Provincial and Federal government agencies.

WESTARC Group Inc. conducted the review of Year II under the direction of the Rural Development Institute. Data for the interim review was collected through a file review, questionnaires and key informant interviews with members of the management committee, and members of the Northern Vision Regional Round Table, Southwest Regional Round Table and the Parkland Practitioners. WESTARC Group will conduct a post-measure of the Community Collaboration Project in the fall of 2001 and prepare a final report.

The overall goal of the Community Collaboration Project is to design and model a multi-agency cooperative approach to initiate joint planning and project development activities within an agreed upon process for a regional social, environmental and economic community development plan. Objectives of the project include looking at ways for governments to better serve rural and remote communities and facilitating collaboration between Federal and Provincial governments. Throughout the project, the aim is to build an understanding of sustainability, build capacity for community-based sustainability, identify and access information resources for community sustainability and build understanding of and improving access to government programs and services.

The Community Collaboration Project's multi-community approach is supported by the Community Animation Program (CAP), a jointly funded initiative of Health Canada and Environment Canada, with additional assistance provided through the Rural Dialogue component of the Canadian Rural Partnership Initiative. In-kind contributions were provided by Manitoba

Intergovernmental Affairs, including travel and accommodation costs, management committee involvement, assistance with facilitating the process and local resource support. Brandon University's Rural Development Institute provided coordination, facilitation, support and management for the Community Collaboration Project.

At the time of this Year II Interim report, three regions were engaged in the Community Collaboration Project process. The three regions are:

- ***Northern Vision Regional Round Table (RRT)*** – South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids and Granville Lake;
- ***Southwest Regional Round Table (RRT)*** – Boissevain, Deloraine, Killarney, Souris, Glenboro, Baldur and Wawanesa; and
- ***Franco-Manitoba*** – Somerset and St. Lazare.

Working together to deal with common issues and opportunities at the regional level was identified by participants to be the most important component of the CCP process. Another useful component is the introduction and sharing of information resources. “Teaming up” with the *Community Connections* program appears to have been beneficial.

The key lessons learned for Year II of the CCP included the importance of ensuring:

- ongoing funding and support for the CCP;
- ongoing support from Federal, Provincial and Rural Development Institute representatives;
- clarification of the role, mandate and responsibilities of management committee members;
- clear articulation of the overall goal of the CCP, federal and provincial roles within the CCP and of the overall process for government departments as well as the communities involved;
- clarification of the roles of the Westman Economic Development Association (WEDA) by the Provincial government in order to help the Southwest RRT in determining its long-term efforts;
- the development of an inventory of resources, partners and funding programs for regional use; and
- continued financial support for regional round table operations and the hiring of an individual who could look after the day-to-day coordination of the RRTs.

For further information about the Community Collaboration Project please contact:

- Pat Hope, Health Canada – Phone: 204-983-6574
- Rick Slasor, Environment Canada – Phone: 204-983-7048
- Darell Pack, Rural Secretariat – Phone: 204-984-6510
- Ross Thompson, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs – Phone: 204-785-5129
- Maurice Bouvier, Community Futures Partners of Manitoba – Phone: 204-943-2905
- Jim Bakken, Industry, Trade and Mines, Community Connections Initiative – Phone: 204-945-7808
- Dr. Robert Annis, Rural Development Institute – Phone: 204-571-8513

## Introduction

This *Year II Review and Lessons Learned, Interim Report* documents the process, activities and lessons learned of Year II of the Community Collaboration Project (CCP) for the time period of April 2000 to February 2001. The project is a collaborative arrangement between the communities involved, Rural Development Institute (RDI), and the Federal and Provincial agencies that provide services to those communities. Agency partners of the project are Health Canada, Environment Canada, Rural Secretariat (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada), Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs and Community Futures Partners of Manitoba. The Community Collaboration Project is overseen by a management committee comprised of representatives from these various Provincial and Federal government agencies.

The overall goal of the Community Collaboration Project is to design and model a multi-agency cooperative approach to initiate joint planning and project development activities within an agreed upon process for a regional social, environmental and economic community development plan. Objectives of the project include looking at ways for governments to better serve rural and remote communities, and facilitating collaboration between Federal and Provincial governments. Throughout the project, the aim is to build an understanding of sustainability, build capacity for community-based sustainability, identify and access information resources for community sustainability, and build understanding of and improving access to government programs and services.

The proposal for Year II (2000-2001) outlined the main objectives for the Community Collaboration Project as follows:

1. Engage new communities in CCP activities;
2. Continue to support community development activities for existing CCP communities;
3. Continue introducing and fostering the use of technology as a community capacity building tool(s); and
4. Design and implement an ongoing monitoring and review process within the CCP.

The Community Collaboration Project's multi-community approach is supported by the Community Animation Program (CAP), a jointly funded initiative of Health Canada and Environment Canada (<http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hppb/healthyenvironment/communit.htm>), with additional assistance provided through the Rural Dialogue component of the Canadian Rural Partnership Initiative ([http://www.rural.gc.ca/dialogue\\_e.html](http://www.rural.gc.ca/dialogue_e.html)). To assist with the Community Collaboration Project, in-kind contributions were provided from Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs, including travel and accommodation costs, management committee involvement, assistance with facilitating the process and local resource support. Brandon University's Rural Development Institute provided coordination, facilitation, support and management for the Community Collaboration Project.

At the time of this Year II Interim report, three regions were engaged in the Community Collaboration Project process. The three regions are:

- ***Northern Vision Regional Round Table*** (RRT) – South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids and Granville Lake;
- ***Southwest Regional Round Table*** (RRT) – Boissevain, Deloraine, Killarney, Souris, Glenboro, Baldur and Wawanesa; and
- ***Franco-Manitoba*** – Somerset and St. Lazare.

WESTARC Group Inc. conducted the review of Year II under the direction of Dr. Robert Annis, Director, Rural Development Institute (RDI). Continuing to build upon the *Year I Review and Lessons Learned*, a more comprehensive and ongoing monitoring system was implemented for Year II of the CCP. As part of the development of this review document, WESTARC summarized the Community Collaboration Project activities, partners involved and anticipated results in a CCP logic model. The updated logic model for Year II of the project is attached as Appendix A. From the CCP logic model, a review framework was developed including:

- the process goals to be examined;
- the review questions and measures;
- the corresponding indicators; and
- the data collection techniques to be employed.

The updated review framework for the Year II review is attached as Appendix B. Data for the interim review report was collected through file review, questionnaires and key informant interviews with members of the management committee, and members of the Northern Vision Regional Round Table, Southwest Regional Round Table and the Parkland Practitioners.

It is anticipated that WESTARC Group will conduct a post-measure of the Community Collaboration Project in the fall of 2001. This post-measure will be summarized and shared with the management committee. WESTARC will continue to capture “the story” of the process during this time period and include it with the post-measure results and lessons learned in a final review report.

## Lessons Learned

The original intention behind the Community Collaboration Project was to bring communities and government personnel together to discuss common issues. “A Conversation About Community Development” from the Centre for the Study of Co-operatives at the University of Saskatchewan identified the following as essentials of the collaboration process:

*Communities need valid reasons to become partners.*

*All partners must recognize the value and benefits of partnership.*

*Adequate time must be given for orientation, planning and implementation. Don't be too results oriented; be patient; allow time for things to happen; thrive on small successes early; build them in for positive reinforcement.*

Working together to deal with common issues and opportunities at the regional level was identified by most of the participants in the CCP to be the most important component of the CCP process. This recognition of the value of communities working together is borne out by the inclusion of new communities in the CCP process during Year II.

A useful component of the CCP process is the introduction and sharing of information resources. “Teaming up” with the *Community Connections* program appears to have been beneficial. Rural Development Institute with the assistance of the Sustainable Resource Management Information System (SRMIS) has continued to share information resources with both the Northern Vision and Southwest RRTs. Through separate funding, the development and refinement of the Northern Vision website appears to be progressing. SRMIS has met several times with the Southwest RRT to examine and discuss the possibility of a regional website.

The work conducted by SRMIS within the RRTs was expanded because of the relationship developed with the *Community Connections* program. *Community Connections* provides technological resources to develop the info-structure and connectedness of the CCP communities/regions. Equipment and software support through this project has been confirmed for the Northern Vision communities.

## ***Project Continuity***

A key lesson learned for Year II of the CCP is the need to identify, in a timely fashion, ongoing funding and support for the Community Collaboration Project for Year III. The findings of the pre-measure point to the approximately six month lag time in confirmed continuing funding for Year II of the Community Collaboration Project as a recurring issue. One of the objectives for Year II was the engagement of two new regions in the CCP project. Discussions with Parkland and Bayline have been ongoing; however, to date, the potential new regions do not have a fully articulated regional round table process nor have they received direct funding supports from the CCP.

Funding for the RRT's was also seen as an important component of the CCP. RRT members have identified the need for ongoing support and resources as essential to their process. Specifically, Northern Vision RRT members have identified continued financial support for RRT operation as important in assisting their members with travel costs associated with RRT meetings. Another resource identified that could improve the process was the hiring of an individual who could look after the day-to-day coordination of the RRT. It was felt that there was limited volunteer time available, as most members of the RRT had other responsibilities. Specifically, Northern Vision RRT members encountered difficulty in pursuing grants and other types of funding due to lack of time. This finding is supported by "A Conversation About Community Development" in which essentials of the collaboration process include the following principles:

*You need to establish a sound funding base, and make clear what it is as well.*

*Provide adequate staff support.*

(Source: *A Conversation About Community Development*, Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, University of Saskatchewan, August 1997, Page 5 and 6, <http://coop-studies.usask.ca/books/pdfpubs.html>)

The need for ongoing support and assistance from provincial, federal and RDI representatives is another important lesson learned of the Community Collaboration Project. Some continued support in the way of a commitment of funds, time and expertise were provided to the Northern Vision RRT, Southwest RRT and Franco communities during Year II. Members of the

management committee, resource personnel (representatives of government agencies and departments) and Economic Development Council for Manitoba Bilingual Municipalities / Conseil de Développement Économique des Municipalités Bilingues du Manitoba (CDEM) provided these supports.

An issue arising from Year I of the CCP that has not been formally dealt with is the development of an inventory of resources, partners and funding programs for regional use. Most RRT and management committee members felt that the development of a better understanding of funding, partnerships and resources was progressing within the CCP and the communities/regions. However, most felt that access to funding programs in particular had been limited, thus far. An inventory of resources, partners and funding programs should be developed and shared with the regions involved in the project.

### ***Role of the Management Committee***

One of the next steps suggested in the Year I Review was to clarify the role, mandate and responsibilities within the management committee. Management committee respondents indicated that the clarification of roles, mandates and responsibilities within the committee did not occur. Some respondents felt that the lack of clarity with respect to roles had been a “problem” and some commented that the role of the Province was unclear within the project. In addition, RDI’s dual role as contracted project manager/facilitator and as a member of the management committee appears to have raised some questions as to when and how they should participate in the process in light of the lag in confirmed funding for the CCP.

### ***Awareness and Sharing of Lessons Learned***

Another lesson learned is the need to clearly articulate the process for new and existing regions. The management committee should proceed with the development of a formalized framework that would enable them to document the CCP process and disseminate the lessons learned for communities and government departments.

Findings of the pre-measure suggest a number of issues that emerged in Year I and continue into Year II of the Community Collaboration Project. One ongoing issue is that Provincial and Federal roles within the Community Collaboration Project have not been clarified for the regions involved. Both management committee and RRT members mentioned uncertainty around the

role of the management committee as well as the overall aim of the project. Some RRT respondents indicated that the goals and objectives of the program were not communicated. Members of both the Northern Vision and Southwest RRTs were concerned that the process had been “forgotten” by the Federal and Provincial representatives. Findings from the pre-measure suggest that most management committee members were not directly involved with or aware of some of the progress of the Northern Vision RRT, Southwest RRT and Franco communities. In general, most management committee members have not attended RRT meetings on a continued basis. Members of the management committee need to make themselves aware of what is occurring within the Northern Vision RRT, Southwest RRT and Franco communities.

### ***Issues Unique to the Southwest Regional Round Table***

The Southwest RRT members identified unresolved issues with their local Regional Development Corporation (Westman Economic Development Association, WEDA) as an impediment to their success. Many members of the Southwest RRT felt that there was a “duplication” of the roles of the RRT and WEDA. Southwest RRT members suggest that if the roles of WEDA could be clarified by the Provincial government, that clarification would help the RRT in determining its long-term efforts.

## Project Chronology

The chronology of events and activities that follows was conducted through a content analysis of existing files and documents of the project, including minutes of meetings, correspondence, etc. The chronology covers the time period of April 2000 to January 2001. The chronology was supplemented by discussions with:

- Dr. Robert Annis, Rural Development Institute;
- Mariette Mulaire, Economic Development Council for Manitoba Bilingual Municipalities/Conseil de Développement Économique des Municipalités Bilingues du Manitoba (CDEM);
- Bruce Hardy, Sustainable Resource Management Information System, and
- various members of the Northern Vision and Southwest RRTs.

The three regions currently involved in Year II of the project – Northern Vision RRT, Southwest RRT and Franco-Manitoba – form the main basis of this chronology. WESTARC has also reported on the efforts to date with regards to entering a new grouping of communities in the Parkland region.

The Community Collaboration Project is overseen by a management committee comprised of representatives of the various Provincial and Federal government agencies involved. The Northern Vision and Southwest RRTs also have an advisory group comprised of local government representatives who act as resource personnel to the RRT members. CDEM acts in this capacity for the Franco communities involved in the Community Collaboration Project. An overview chart of the CCP and participants within it is attached as Appendix C.

## **Management Committee**

Members of the management committee include the following representatives of Federal and Provincial government departments:

- Darell Pack, Rural Secretariat, Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada;
- Pat Hope, Population and Public Health Branch (Health Canada);
- Rick Slasor, Environment Canada;
- Ross Thompson, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs;
- Maurice Bouvier, Community Futures Partners of Manitoba; and
- Dr. Robert Annis, Department of Rural Development, Brandon University.

From April 2000 to January 2001, the management committee held several meetings. However, due to other commitments and schedule conflicts, there was never a meeting where every member of the management committee was able to attend. Many informal discussions and meetings took place via the telephone or email.

The main topic of discussion at management committee meetings was the need to “finalize the agreement and formalize the contractual relationships”. Discussions around continuation of the CCP and what level of support for existing communities was required took the majority of the management committee’s meeting time. As the project was unfunded for several months (April to December 2000), these next steps and funding were the top priority of the committee.

Discussions at the management committee meetings also included updates of the process being undertaken within the three RRTs, as well as the efforts towards engaging new communities/regions. New communities and regions discussed at the meetings included Parkland and Bayline communities, as well as involving First Nations communities. Specifically, Rick Slasor of Environment Canada indicated that the CCP has been discussed at habitat stewardship meetings involving Environment Canada and Parks Canada at Riding Mountain National Park. Management committee member Maurice Bouvier received some show of interest from the Snow Lake, Flin Flon, and Cranberry Portage area through the Greenstone Community Futures Development Corporation.

As the contracted project manager for the CCP, Dr. Robert Annis of the RDI requested documentation, from both the Northern Vision and Southwest RRTs, to support their request for additional financial support for Year II (\$5,000 per RRT). As of the writing of this report, both the Northern Vision and Southwest RRT have made their requests. An invoice has also been received by RDI from CDEM requesting the balance of funds (\$25,000) for the Franco-Manitoba process.

### ***Northern Vision Regional Round Table***

The South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids (SLL) Regional Round Table has grown to include the village of Granville Lake. With the addition of a new community to the RRT, the members have chosen a new name – Northern Vision RRT. The Northern Vision RRT has also invited a First Nations group to join the RRT. As of the writing of this report, this group has not participated in the process.

### **RRT Meetings**

The Northern Vision RRT has met several times in Year II. The first Regional Round Table Meeting for Year II was held on June 16, 2000 in Leaf Rapids. There were representatives from each of the four communities, as well as Provincial representatives from the departments of Intergovernmental Affairs and Aboriginal and Northern Affairs in attendance.

The major activities discussed throughout the meeting were the Youth Initiative, Regional Radio Programming, Fishing Industry, Website, Treatment Centre, MTS Same Calling Area, Northern University and Tourism. Each of these items have action plans for moving forward, and for most of the projects, resources and appropriate partners have been identified.

Also discussed at this meeting were organizational issues of the RRT, including operational guidelines and the development of a Regional Vision Statement. The presentations made at Brandon Rural Forum and the Canada Rural Forum were reviewed with the members.

The next meeting of the RRT was held in Lynn Lake on September 15, 2000. Once again, representatives from the four communities were present. Also in attendance were Provincial representatives from the departments of Intergovernmental Affairs, Aboriginal and Northern Affairs and Highways. A representative of RDI (SRMIS) was also in attendance. The main projects — the Youth Initiative, Regional Radio Programming, Fishing Industry, Website,

Treatment Centre, MTS Same Calling Area, Northern University and Tourism — were updated and discussed by members.

The group also discussed goal setting for future success-failure indicators, and it was decided that this would be discussed further at a two-day strategic planning session.

The next meeting was held on November 23, 2000 in Leaf Rapids. Craig Hanley of Intergovernmental Affairs was in attendance as well as representatives of South Indian Lake and Leaf Rapids. The Youth Initiative, Regional Radio Programming, Fishing Industry, Website, Treatment Centre, Tourism, Community Access Program, Sustainable Communities Initiative and Roads were all discussed during the meeting. Craig Hanley of Intergovernmental Affairs provided members of the RRT with copies of the Sustainable Development Innovations fund for their review.

The next meeting of the Northern Vision RRT is scheduled for February 22, 2001.

### **Presentations**

During the September 2000 meeting of the Northern Vision RRT, a representative from the Department of Highways was in attendance to answer questions and provide information on projects being undertaken.

Also at the September 2000 meeting, a RDI (SRMIS) representative gave a presentation on behalf of *Community Connections*. In addition, SRMIS discussed the Sustainable Communities Initiative with members of the RRT.

In October 2000, RRT members participated in a session with Dr. David Darling, Community Development Economist, Kansas State University and Dr. Robert Annis, RDI, Brandon University in South Indian Lake. The one day workshop on community development led participants through topics covering local assets, understanding the forces of change, building a healthy community and becoming a learning community. Also during the visit, two masters students and a professor from the Department of Rural Development at Brandon University met with several local members of the RRT as well as representatives of Intergovernmental Affairs. The intention over time is that a Brandon University, Rural Development masters student may be interested in undertaking thesis work within the region.

## Website

The Northern Vision RRT continues to expand and add content to its website. With the adoption of a new name for the RRT, the website is now located at [www.northernvision.ca](http://www.northernvision.ca).

It was reported that a RRT representative had traveled to Brandon University to meet with representatives of the Sustainable Resource Management Information System (SRMIS) for a one-day course on inputting information onto the website. Ideas for using the website capabilities to the fullest were discussed. The Northern Vision RRT continues to refine the contents to ensure the site reflects the needs of the region.

## **Southwest Regional Round Table**

Initially the Southwest RRT was comprised of more than 30 representatives from the communities of Boissevain, Deloraine, Killarney and Souris. Southwest has now grown to include Baldur, Glenboro and Wawanesa.

Southwest RRT held regular monthly meetings from April 2000 to January 2001, adjourning only for the summer months and for Christmas. Meeting locations were rotated between Deloraine, Souris, Killarney and Boissevain. The Southwest RRT has formed an executive committee that has also met to discuss RRT issues throughout this time period. The executive committee is comprised of representatives from each of the communities involved.

## RRT Meetings

The Southwest RRT met on April 12, 2000 with 21 individuals in attendance. Representatives from the rural municipalities of Morton and Winchester, and the towns of Souris, Killarney and Deloraine attended, as well as representatives of Westman Economic Development Association (WEDA), Turtle Mountain Community Development Corporation (CDC), South Westman Regional Health Authority, Souris-Glenwood CDC and Prairie Skills Employment Services Project. Intergovernmental Affairs, Health Canada, Community Futures Partners of Manitoba, Environment Canada, Rural Secretariat and Rural Development Institute were also represented at this meeting. Meeting facilitation was provided by Intergovernmental Affairs.

The purpose of the meeting was introductory, to provide background to the concept of regional round tables, including an overview of the regional round table process as it has been progressing in two other regions, SLL and Franco-Manitoba. There was discussion around making the

Southwest RRT inclusive by issuing invitations for participation to a large part of southwestern Manitoba.

Initial discussion of regional priorities and goals also took place at this inaugural meeting. Other items under discussion included a regional website that would build on existing community websites and federal/provincial websites. Rural Development Institute representative Dr. Robert Annis committed some funding and facilitation resources to help move the regional round table process forward.

### Goals

At its May 15, 2000 meeting, Southwest RRT finalized a number of goals for the regional round table process. The three primary goals include:

1. To identify a regional vision to guide in the development of regional actions, projects and initiatives and to identify the organizations/agencies to implement projects;
2. To identify the boundaries of the region; and
3. To coordinate regional and other organizations to implement goals.

Additional goals include the following:

- Improve communication
- Implementation of Community Round Table visions
- Provide streamlining and efficiency (avoid duplication)
- Provide partnerships in programs and dollars
- Promote healthy community development
- Coordinate and improve community and regional databases
- Identify strengths and opportunities for the region
- Guide, support and assist regional organizations in implementation of goals and projects

## Regional Priorities

Southwest RRT members also identified issues and concerns common to the region at the meeting on June 15, 2000. They are:

- Highway upgrades
- Housing
- Attracting industry / trade fairs
- Fibre optic links
- Identifying investment partners, government funding programs, etc. for business opportunities

In September 2000, the Southwest RRT met to focus their attention on these five regional issues and to develop action plans to enable them to implement activities to address these issues.

## Mission Statement

Southwest RRT adopted the following mission statement on June 15, 2000:

*Enlisting committed, community-based stakeholders, the Southwest Regional Round Table will use a creative, coordinated and cooperative approach to developing a regional vision which identifies issues, strengths and opportunities.*

*We will provide guidance and support to regional organizations and groups for the implementation of these goals and strategies and are committed to assisting in the communication, coordination and support of healthy communities for our region.*

## Presentations

In May 2000, a representative of the Souris Valley School Division (SVSD) made a presentation to a meeting of the Southwest RRT. The SVSD was looking for partnership support for a project proposal for Youth Entrepreneurship and value-added processing for recycled materials. The SVSD had already secured support from Wheatbelt Community Futures but was in need of expertise in economic development. The Southwest RRT was of great interest to the SVSD, which would like to participate in the regional round table process. The SVSD, in partnership with three other school divisions, would like to coordinate and facilitate student integrated projects that can be shared with all school divisions, and the development of business plans which could be accessed by all community development corporations.

RDI supported a presentation by Darren Ottaway of the SLL Regional Round Table. He presented an overview of the SLL RRT process to the Southwest members at the June 2000 meeting held in Killarney. He emphasized that prior to the formation of the SLL RRT, there had been no communication between the three communities of South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids. Now the three communities have identified and begun to implement several regional initiatives, and SRMIS has developed a regional Website for SLL.

After the regular meeting of the RRT in November 2000, RRT members participated in a session with Dr. David Darling, Community Development Economist, Kansas State University. The session was arranged by RDI, Brandon University, as Dr. Darling was a visiting professor in the department. The three hour presentation called *Building A Healthy Economy* led participants through topics covering local assets, a community and economic development change model, understanding community's economic function and combining the vision with action planning. Dr. Darling provided members of the RRT with a number of handouts and worksheets.

Bob Grodzik, Intergovernmental Affairs, presented information about Manitoba Marketplace and Manitoba Community Profiles to the members of the RRT at the January 2001 meeting.

Also presenting at the January 2001 meeting was Jim Slobozian, Manager of Marketing for Manitoba Trade and Investment, Industry Trade and Mines. His presentation focused on using the Internet as a networking and marketing tool for communities and regions.

### Technology Sharing

On May 15, 2000 at the meeting held in Souris, RDI via Bruce Hardy of SRMIS provided some information about the options available for electronic communication within the communities of the Southwest RRT. He provided examples of community/regional websites and offered to develop a similar regional site for Southwest. The SLL website, for example, is used for the communication of RRT minutes, a contact list and unique information about each of the three communities.

Bruce Hardy also attended the January 11, 2001 meeting in Killarney to further clarify for the Southwest RRT what services and resources could be provided to the RRT with regards to developing websites. Examples of maps, pictures and other information were shared with participants.

## **Franco-Manitoba**

The Economic Development Council for Manitoba Bilingual Municipalities/Conseil de Développement Économique des Municipalités Bilingues du Manitoba (CDEM) was formed to act as the spark for renewed financial prosperity in the member communities of the Manitoba Association of Bilingual Municipalities (<http://www.cdem.com>). CDEM is built around the understanding that Manitoba's bilingual communities are an important asset, one to be nurtured and preserved for the province's cultural and economic well being.

During Year I, RDI sub-contracted with CDEM to coordinate the Franco-Manitoba activities and as a result of this successful relationship, it was determined that CDEM would be the most appropriate vehicle for continuing to deliver the CCP activities to Franco-Manitoba communities. This partnership provides for a unique opportunity to better understand how communities of interest (Franco-Manitoba/CDEM member municipalities – Somerset and St. Lazare) can use a common, bilingual process in order to initiate joint planning and development activities. The intent of the CCP and the partnership with RDI and CDEM is to provide an accurate provincial representation through bilingualism combined with rural and remote components.

A Letter of Understanding (LOU) was signed between RDI and CDEM establishing their respective roles within this partnership arrangement. The LOU establishes that all activity in Franco-Manitoba will be initiated and conducted by CDEM.

CDEM originally served 10 member municipalities. All of these groups undertook a visioning process with consultants retained by CDEM. CDEM is now starting to see the results of this Vision Project. For example, one Franco community identified the need for a local industrial park during their visioning process. Now, they have officially opened their industrial park and a tenant has moved in.

CDEM grew to include 5 new member municipalities, and CDEM sought additional funding in order to have these new members undergo the established Vision Project. Through conversations with Health Canada, the connection to the Community Collaboration Project was identified. A portion of the monies available through the CCP was distributed to CDEM to provide for a continuation of CDEM's Vision Project with new members. The director of CDEM pooled these

resources with other sources of funding in order to provide two francophone communities with the visioning process. The communities involved include Somerset and St. Lazare.

CDEM works in conjunction with Gaboury Préfontaine Perry (consultants retained by CDEM to assist with their Vision Project) when initiating the Vision Project with member communities.

Gaboury Préfontaine Perry (GPP) co-facilitates the process with CDEM in order to:

Prepare groundwork for sound social and economic development of the community;

Reinforce and highlight the unique French and bilingual character of the community;

Reinforce, highlight and protect the unique natural character of the area; and

Search for the most suitable lands that can adequately sustain human activities without jeopardizing the quality of nature and wildlife.

GPP works with the communities involved to identify existing land use and on-going projects; existing capacity for development; most appropriate types of development; community leadership in the region; links to other Francophone centres; village settlement and its associated waste disposal; rural residential development; agricultural and related practices; industrial development; recreational activities and control of protected lands.

## Somerset

The process with Somerset was initiated by CDEM in spring 2000. There have been ongoing discussions with the community development corporation, municipal representatives, business groups, chamber of commerce, and other representatives of Somerset. The preparatory work completed to date included a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis and an identification of priorities.

Some of the items identified during the SWOT analysis include:

**Strengths:** bilinguism; available housing; affordable houses; modern school; medical clinic; central location;

**Opportunities:** youth centre; Internet access; natural gas; daycare;

**Weaknesses:** condition of the arena; gender imbalance; small population base; attracting tourists;

**Threats:** declining population; youth migration; loss of grain elevator; competition with local communities; growing size of farms.

The priorities identified by Somerset participants included the identification of marketing, infrastructure, planning and tourism project priorities. Marketing projects included: promotion of the Somerset Community Development Corporation; main street beautification and attractive entrance signs. Infrastructure priorities included: attracting natural gas, daycare, development of extra units in the manor and villa, paving of the airport strip and a youth centre. Planning priorities included: funding for the Somerset Economic Development Officer position, funds for the work loans program, zoning, CDC budget, and encouragement of home-based business expansion. The Trans Canada Trail and festival ideas were identified as tourism project priorities.

Upon completion of these initial steps, Somerset identified the need to hire an Economic Development Officer as their first priority. As of March 2001, this officer has been hired. CDEM will be meeting with Somerset in April 2001 to move the Vision Project to the next step and engage GPP consultants in the process.

#### **St. Lazare/Ellice**

CDEM initiated the vision process with St. Lazare/Ellice in Year II of the CCP. There have been two public meetings held in St. Lazare over 20 people in attendance at each meeting. The public meetings held were open to all members of the community and rural municipality. Attendees at these public meetings included town and rural municipality officials, representatives of various community interest groups (i.e., seniors groups, 4-H groups, sports clubs, Manitoba Metis Federation representatives, etc.) and the CDEM representative.

The Gaboury Préfontaine Perry architect firm presented to the community a schematic development concept for the community. Feedback was given regarding the scheme and additional comments, opportunities and constraints were discussed. GPP will be presenting the final document and development scheme to St. Lazare/Ellice once the community has a chance to review it and make additional comments. It is anticipated that the final GPP report will be completed by fall 2001.

### ***Potential New Region – Parkland***

The Parkland request originated with a group called the Parkland Practitioners. The Parkland Practitioners are an informal group comprised of resource personnel from the region. In a letter addressed to management committee member Ross Thompson, Intergovernmental Affairs, dated April 18, 2000, the group indicated their desire to facilitate a Regional Round Table with representatives from the numerous municipalities within the regions and requested assistance in undertaking the initiative. Ross Thompson met several times with the Parkland Practitioners in order to discuss the potential for a regional round table process.

WESTARC staff attended a meeting of the Parkland Practitioners on January 29, 2001 in Dauphin to observe the session, which was facilitated by Dr. Robert Annis of the Rural Development Institute. Nineteen members of the Parkland Practitioners group were in attendance, including practitioners from regional economic development offices, Community Development Corporations, Conservation Districts, the Parkland Regional Health Authority, Community Futures Development Corporation, Manitoba Industry, Trade and Mines, Assiniboine Community College, Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Tourism, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs and Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration (PFRA). Pat Hope from Health Canada and Bruce Hardy of SRMIS were also in attendance.

The session ran from 10:30 am to 4:30 pm, and the agenda included a presentation on the Community Collaboration Project and discussion about the concepts of Regional Round Tables and available funding. Dr. Robert Annis shared the history of the RRT with participants and discussed how the process has unfolded in other regions. A handout of the South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids “story” was shared with the Practitioners. The funding available for a new RRT was also discussed with the group.

The Practitioners also undertook an information sharing discussion of the resources available within their association. Parkland Practitioners shared the geographic scope of their services, nature of their services and the human resource capabilities of their individual offices with the large group. It was determined that a package would be compiled of this information.

The participants also identified regional issues and opportunities and prioritized what they felt were the top three. The top three issues identified were commitment to community and regional

planning, demographics (aging, depopulation) and lack of communication. The top three opportunities identified were agriculture (value-added, diversification), infrastructure and tourism.

As the Parkland region is geographically quite large, some discussion ensued about potential “sub-regions” within the larger region, but it was felt that municipal stakeholders would have to develop their own “boundaries”. The Practitioners also conducted some preliminary planning for a second workshop in February involving municipal leaders. Discussion around how to plan for the subsequent session led to the creation of a sub-committee, which will ascertain what is required for the session, who to invite, how to invite them and what should be on the agenda for discussion.

### ***Potential New Region – Bayline***

During Year I, the management committee received a request of interest in the CCP / RRT process from the Northern Bayline communities via the telephone. The potential four communities that could be involved include Wabouden, Ilford, Thicket Portage and Pikwitonei. Several other government departments and groups have also expressed an interest in participating, including Intergovernmental Affairs, Industry, Trade and Mines, Health Canada, Environment Canada, North Central Community Futures, and Omnitrack.

Discussions with the Bayline communities are ongoing with management committee member Ross Thompson of Intergovernmental Affairs. It is anticipated that this process could move forward in April 2001.

## **Data Collection Method**

The framework for this review emerged from the CCP logic model that was developed for this project (see Appendix A). The review framework established the process goals to be examined; the review questions and measures; the corresponding indicators; and the data collection techniques to be employed. The updated review framework for the Year II review is attached as Appendix B. The data collection method for the review of Year II of the Community Collaboration Project includes a file review, questionnaires, key informant interviews, observational visit(s) and a regional checklist/diary.

The file review included examining a number of documents and Internet websites supplemented by discussions with Dr. Robert Annis of Rural Development Institute, Bruce Hardy of SRMIS, Mariette Mulaire of CDEM as well as various members of the RRTs and members of the management committee. The information reviewed by WESTARC included background information about the Community Animation Program, Rural Dialogue, RDI and the Community Choices Program. WESTARC also reviewed meeting minutes and agendas from the RRTs including:

- a) *Northern Vision RRT***
  - i) June 16, 2000
  - ii) September 15, 2000
  - iii) November 23, 2000
  - iv) Web site – [www.northernvision.ca](http://www.northernvision.ca)
- b) *Southwest RRT***
  - i) April 12, 2000
  - ii) May 15, 2000
  - iii) June 15, 2000
  - iv) September 14, 2000
  - v) October 25, 2000
  - vi) November 16, 2000
  - vii) January 11, 2001

From mid-December 2000 to February 2001, WESTARC shared drafts of the logic model, review framework and the review tools with Dr. Robert Annis, RDI and management committee members in order to elicit their feedback and input. The pre-measure tools are attached as Appendix D.

Pre-measure questionnaires were conducted with Parkland Practitioners via the telephone on January 25 and 26, 2001. Questionnaires for the Northern Vision and Southwest RRT were conducted from February 8 to 20, 2001 and key informant interviews from February 20 to 27, 2001. Management committee key informant interviews were conducted February 16 to March 2, 2001.

On February 23, 2001, the regional checklist/diary (see Appendix E) was sent to the Northern Vision and Southwest RRTs. The checklist is intended to provide the RRTs with a guide for collecting the necessary information and documentation to satisfy those who need to know (e.g., funders) as well as a record of the successes for celebration and spreading the word. This checklist is seen as an ongoing tool for use by the RRT. WESTARC requested that the RRTs forward any applicable items indicated on the checklist regularly to WESTARC Group.

## Pre-Measure Findings

The review process for Year II has been set up to include a pre-measure, ongoing monitoring and a post-measure. The findings of the pre-measure are presented in this interim report.

Pre-measure Questionnaire			
WITH WHOM	METHOD	SAMPLE SIZE	COMPLETED
<i>Northern Vision RRT members</i>	Questionnaires were emailed, faxed and/or mailed to selected members of South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids and Granville Lake.	12*	4 (33%)
<i>Southwest RRT members</i>	Questionnaires were faxed to selected members of Killarney, Deloraine, Boissevain, Souris, Baldur and Glenboro.	11	4 (36%)
<i>Parkland Practitioners</i>	Questions were asked via the telephone of a random sample of participants (25 potential names).	10	9 (90%)

- \* One member felt that he/she had not been with the RRT long enough to comment and declined to participate.

<b>Pre-measure Key Informant Interviews</b>			
<b>WITH WHOM</b>	<b>METHOD</b>	<b>SAMPLE SIZE</b>	<b>COMPLETED</b>
<i>Northern Vision RRT members</i>	Four key informants were selected from the member list. One key informant was chosen from South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids as well as a government resource person. All key informants were conducted via the telephone.	4	4 (100%)
<i>Southwest RRT members</i>	Six key informants were selected from the member list. One key informant was chosen from Boissevain, Killarney, Deloraine, Souris, Glenboro, Baldur as well as a government resource person. All key informants were conducted via the telephone.	6*	5 (83%)
<i>Management committee members</i>	All six management committee members were contacted via telephone in order to conduct their key informant interviews.	6	6 (100%)

\* One key informant declined to participate indicating that he/she had attended only one meeting of the RRT to date.

In addition to questionnaires and key informant interviews, WESTARC also conducted one observational visit of a meeting of the Parkland Practitioners in January 2001.

### **Northern Vision Regional Round Table**

#### **Provincial, Federal and Rural Development Institute Support and Assistance**

Members of the Northern Vision RRT were asked to indicate to what extent support and assistance was provided to the RRT by the Provincial, Federal and Rural Development Institute representatives. Respondents were asked to provide their feedback for each of the 3 phases of the process to date – formation, development, continuance. Formation refers to the initial start-up and first few meetings of the RRT. Development refers to the visioning and priority setting activities of the RRT. Continuance refers to the ongoing meetings and activities of the established RRT. The pre-measure results are presented in the following table.

	Formation				Development				Continuance			
	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Not sure	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Not sure	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Not sure
Provincial			6	1		2	4	1		6	1	
Federal		2	4	1		2	4	1		6	1	
RDI			6	1			6	1		3	4	

n = 7

All RRT respondents commented that the assistance received from Provincial, Federal and RDI representatives was “helpful”. Provincial representative, Craig Hanley, was specifically mentioned by RRT members as being a “consistent” support to the group. Some respondents mentioned that Federal representatives had not been to RRT meetings since the initial formation and development. The initial funding of \$ 5,000 was mentioned as being very important in assisting the RRT with expenses like travel. With all representatives, Northern Vision members felt that they would be there if requested by the RRT.

#### **Regional Awareness and Utilization of Partners/Resources and Funding Programs**

Members of the Northern Vision RRT were asked to what extent they had been able to identify partners and/or resources to assist with responding to community challenges and needs.

Members were also asked to what extent they have been able to identify funding programs.

Management committee member key informants were also asked to provide their perceptions on the Northern Vision RRT and their ability to identify partners/resources and funding programs.

Of the 13 respondents, 3 rated Northern Vision's ability to identify partners and resources "to some extent" and 8 rated it "to a great extent". One respondent rated identification of partners/resources as "not at all" and one respondent was "not sure".

For identification of funding programs, 7 respondents indicated that the Northern Vision RRT has done this "to some extent", 3 said "to a great extent" and 3 were "not sure".

RRT members commented that the "people around the table" were the first resource and partners accessed by Northern Vision. One member mentioned the development of a partnership with St. Norbert Institute in order to move the Treatment Centre for addictions project forward. RRT members felt that identification of funding programs had occurred but that accessing those funds was an "ongoing" process. Concerns over the ability of the RRT to access funds were raised including lack of time of RRT members and the "tough time" they faced in trying to convince various government departments to provide funding. One RRT member commented:

*Sometimes SLL does not have the manpower to respond to grants – some grants have passed by due to a lack of time to respond.*

Several members of the management committee indicated that they had a limited involvement with the RRT during Year II of the CCP and were therefore unsure as to whether or not resources and funding programs had been identified or accessed. Several RRT and Management committee members indicated that the Northern Vision group had identified a number of resources in order to assist with accomplishing projects. Some Management committee and RRT respondents also indicated that the region had accessed funding through *Community Connections*. This funding supports computer equipment for South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids.

## Website

RRT members were asked about the website and to what extent it has been useful to the Northern Vision RRT. RRT key informants felt that the website was useful. Of the three respondents, 2 indicated that the website had been useful "to some extent" and the other respondent indicated "to a great extent". The website was seen as an "ongoing" part of the process and that it had provided easier access for the region to information such as tourism. RRT respondents felt that the website should be used to a greater extent both within and external to the region.

## Determinants of Success

Members of the Northern Vision RRT were asked to rate progress towards achieving their determinants of success. The determinants of success for the RRT were established during Year I of the project.

<i>Rating</i>	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Not sure
Infrastructure and community resources <i>(identified and working towards improving)</i>		5	3	
Local, regional decision-making		4	4	
Utilization of government programs and services <i>(improved understanding of and access to)</i>		7	1	
Proactive forum for regional development		2	6	
n=8				
Used regions resources efficiently		4		
“Healthy Community”	1	3		
n=4				

Overall, most respondents felt that the Northern Vision RRT was progressing “to some extent” with their determinants of success. Respondents mentioned specific projects such as, the Youth Initiative, Tourism and a Regional Radio Station as assisting in moving towards their determinants of success. Some RRT members commented that the realization that the four communities were stronger when speaking with one common voice was important. One member commented:

*[Northern Vision RRT] has become somewhat like a lobby group regarding regional development.*

Management committee respondents felt that the Northern Vision RRT members had an appreciation of what constitutes a “healthy community”. Management committee respondents felt that members of the RRT had an appreciation of environmental, social and economic issues as evidenced by their projects, i.e., treatment centre for addictions.

## Regional Awareness of Sustainability Issues

All respondents to the key informant interviews and questionnaires indicated that the RRT process had increased the understanding of sustainable community development for their region. One Northern Vision RRT respondent commented:

*By working together [towards] sustainable development, it extends to all of the communities. If one community should fail, it will definitely affect the others.*

A member of the Management committee commented:

*Some active participants have this understanding [of sustainable development] and come to the table with it. What they [Northern Vision RRT members] didn't have was a formal process and discussion group to access projects and conduct activities.*

## Improved Use of Government Programs and Services

When asked if there would be an improved understanding of and access to government programs and services for the Northern Vision RRT as a result of the process, Management committee members responded anywhere from “not at all” to “to a great extent”. Comments indicated that it was felt that this would be an “ongoing” and “evolving” part of the Community Collaboration Project.

## Regional Round Table Process

Northern Vision RRT questionnaire and key informants were asked what was most helpful about the RRT process. Most respondents indicated the bringing together of the four communities as the most helpful aspect of the RRT. The four communities coming together at one time to discuss common issues and exchange ideas was seen as a key element of the RRT. A member of the RRT commented:

*This Round Table is the first venue where neighboring communities sit down, pool local resources, set priorities and develop an action plan.*

RRT members were also asked to identify what was least helpful about the process. Some respondents commented that sometimes “personal agendas” or communities placing their own concerns over others have been a drawback to the RRT process. However, most respondents commented that the process was progressing quite well.

The most frequently mentioned area for improvement suggested by RRT respondents was the need for more resources and ongoing support for the Northern Vision process. Some RRT

respondents mentioned the desire for more regular attendance of Provincial and Federal representatives at the meetings; others suggested the need for specific resources for the RRT. One of the resources identified that could improve the process was perhaps an individual who could look after the day-to-day coordination of the RRT. Several respondents felt that there was limited volunteer time available, as most members of the RRT had other responsibilities. The comment was made that sometimes the RRT members could not pursue grants and other types of funding due to lack of time. One respondent suggested that resources for specific projects needed to be identified. Another felt that there needed to be “better coordination” of the projects. One respondent felt that the membership of the RRT should be “open” and allow for people of the general population to participate. Some of the specific comments made by RRT members were:

*It's like they [Federal and Provincial representatives] have cut the umbilical cord and left town.*

*Too little, too late – I hope this isn't going to be forgotten about by the Federal and Provincial governments. I hope this is a long-term initiative. The budget for the RRT needs to be looked at; [the members] need to have an ongoing operating budget to cover such things as travel. Travel is a real issue for members [of the Northern Vision RRT]. If travel is not covered from RRT dollars, then individual communities or individuals themselves would have to bear the costs of travel.*

*Volunteer time is limited – we [Northern Vision RRT] may have to look at employing someone. [This could also] resolve how we get projects off the ground.*

**Southwest Regional Round Table**

**Provincial, Federal and Rural Development Institute Support and Assistance**

Members of the Southwest RRT were asked to indicate to what extent Provincial, Federal and Rural Development Institute representatives provided support and assistance to the RRT. RRT respondents were asked to provide their feedback for each of the 3 phases of the process to date – formation, development, and continuance. Formation refers to the initial start up and first few meetings of the RRT. Development refers to the visioning and priority setting activities of the RRT. Continuance refers to the ongoing meetings and activities of the established RRT.

	Formation				Development				Continuance			
	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Not sure	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Not sure	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Not sure
Provincial		2	4	3		6	1	2	1	7	1	
Federal	1	3	2	3	2	4		3	7	1		1
RDI		1	5	3		2	4	3	2	2	2	3

n = 9

Most Southwest respondents felt that the assistance and support received from Provincial, Federal and RDI representatives was helpful. Respondents mentioned specifically assistance from Marshall Paxton of Intergovernmental Affairs, Dr. Robert Annis of RDI and Bruce Hardy of SRMIS.

**Regional Awareness and Utilization of Partners/Resources and Funding Programs**

Members of the Southwest RRT were asked to what extent they had been able to identify partners and/or resources to assist with responding to community challenges and needs. RRT members were also asked to what extent they have been able to identify funding programs. Management committee member key informants were also asked to provide their perceptions on the Southwest RRT and their ability to identify partners/resources and funding programs.

Of the 15 respondents, 8 indicated that Southwest had identified “to some extent” partners and resources. Four respondents rated identification of partners/resources “to a great extent” while one respondent said “not at all” and two were “not sure”.

Eight of the 15 respondents indicated that Southwest had identified “to some extent” funding programs. Four respondents indicated that they were “not sure” whether funding programs had been identified by the RRT. Three respondents felt that Southwest had “not” identified funding programs to date.

RRT respondents mentioned several of their key projects as involving identification of partners, resources and potential funding. The projects mentioned included Housing, highways and Tourism. Respondents indicated that they had accessed local funding from groups like the Chamber and Conservation District to assist with developing a regional tourism display.

Most of the management committee members indicated that they had a limited involvement with the Southwest RRT and were therefore unsure as to whether or not resources and funding programs had been identified or accessed. Some Management committee members commented that there could have been some improvements with regards to the committee’s role with the Southwest RRT. Comments included:

*[The Management committee] is just developing a working relationship with the Southwest RRT - not much of a federal-provincial coordinated effort.*

*[The Management committee] should have created an inventory of programs and services and taken that to the communities at the beginning [of the process].*

## Regional Goals

Members of the Southwest RRT were asked to rate their progress towards their regional goals (established at the May/June 2000 meetings).

<i>Rating</i>	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Not sure
Improved communication	1	3	6	
Reduced duplication as a result of streamlining and efficiency	3	3	1	3
Provided partnerships in programs and funding	2	5	3	
Assisted in the communication, coordination and support of healthy communities for the region	2	6	1	1
Coordinated and improved community and regional databases	1	8		1
Developed a regional vision that identifies issues, strengths and opportunities	1	5	2	2
Provided guidance and support to regional organizations and groups for the implementation for the region's goals and strategies	1	5	2	2
n=10				
Is aware of what constitutes a "healthy community"		3	3	
n=6				

Most RRT respondents indicated that they had progressed "to some extent" towards their regional goals. Several projects such as Housing, were identified by respondents as assisting with moving towards achievement of the RRT goals. The improvement of communication and sharing of information within the region was seen as very important in assisting with moving forward on the goals of the RRT. Several respondents shared a concern that potential duplication of WEDA roles was hampering achievement of the goals of the Southwest RRT.

Most Management committee respondents felt that the Southwest RRT members had an appreciation of what constitutes a “healthy community”. However, they felt that this was an “evolving” part of the Southwest RRT process. As some of the committee members were unfamiliar with the Southwest RRT process, they were unsure as to the level of understanding around healthy communities within the region. Comments included:

*Yes, Southwest is aware because they are part of the Healthy Communities Program. Up until now, the region only focused on economic issues; however, they are evolving and are grappling with the two [economic and other issues].*

*Different depths of understanding with different members. Some members have a very clear understanding.*

### Regional Awareness of Sustainability Issues

Most respondents to the key informant interviews and questionnaires indicated that the RRT process had increased the understanding of sustainable community development for their region. They felt it has supplied a great opportunity to communicate visions and issues in the region. However, several respondents indicated that the process had not increased the understanding of sustainable community development. Some felt the process has only been internal and has not increased the understanding of sustainable development in the community and region at large.

### Improved Use of Government Programs and Services

When asked if there would be an improved understanding of and access to government programs and services for the Southwest RRT as a result of the process, most management committee members responded either “not at all” or “to some extent”. They indicated that this would be an “evolving” part of the Community Collaboration Project. Committee members commented that:

*[The Southwest RRT] process still hasn't been sorted out.*

*The process is premature [in Southwest].*

*An inventory of programs and services was needed.*

### Regional Round Table Process

Members of the management committee were asked how the RRT process was progressing within the Southwest RRT. Most management committee respondents indicated that the RRT was progressing “to some extent”. A couple of committee members felt that certain

“personalities” were impacting the progress of the Southwest RRT. Committee members’ comments include:

*Do not think that they fully understand what they [Southwest RRT] are about. Turf wars and personalities [at the table] have been an issue.*

*Processes are hard to get established. It is a little early to know, but Southwest has the potential to be a strong group.*

RRT members were asked what was most helpful about the RRT process. Most respondents indicated the bringing together of the communities was the most helpful aspect of the RRT process. A key element of the RRT is when the communities meet at one time to discuss common issues and opportunities on a regional level. RRT members’ comments included:

*[A most helpful element is] the opportunity to meet folks from other communities and discuss current problems, ideas and opportunities. As we are quite diverse and each community has a different agenda and timetable, there is little common ground. I feel the group is attempting to deal with issues that are universal and in that way find a basis of common ground from which to move forward.*

*Networking process – has provided communication between communities, sharing ideas, providing support and sharing resources.*

*This process has created the opportunity for new and expanded partnerships . . . this is a wonderful opportunity for us to exchange our vision, mission and ends and to collaborate on common issues. This is invaluable for us.*

Participants in the pre-measure were also asked to identify what was least helpful about the process. Some respondents commented on lack of cooperation by some parties, and sometimes priority was given to individual communities instead of the region. Some respondents felt that the transition from idea and discussion to action and implementation is not occurring. RRT members commented:

*The lack of clear mandate and function is detrimental to any success that may be hoped for. We should not be attempting to be a Rural Development Corporation [WEDA] with no operating funds nor staff.*

*There is not a common set of principles to guide how people treat each other. There is a range of knowledge, skills and attitudes regarding working collaboratively and how to work with change!*

The most frequently mentioned area for improvement suggested by respondents was the need to have appropriate representation from the region and to communicate effectively with the region.

Some respondents felt the RRT fulfilled the community needs that WEDA was not. However, others felt the RRT was simply a duplication of WEDA. Some representatives felt the mandate was unclear and that the RRT needs a narrower focus. One respondent felt that constant change in membership of the RRT limited the continuity of the project and the actions taken. Several RRT respondents indicated concerns over Provincial and Federal governments' "ongoing" role within the project, as well as with the way goals of the program were communicated. One RRT member commented:

*Concerned that the Federal and Provincial governments have dropped in and left and are now expecting big results. What is the real goal of these programs? The goals and objectives have not been communicated – program is not clear. The Provincial and Federal governments need to tell us what they are up to and we [rural communities/regions] will buy in or we won't.*

## **Franco-Manitoba**

Management committee members were asked for their perceptions of the Franco process during the pre-measure key informant interviews. Most Management committee members felt that the process was progressing at least “to some extent” in the Franco communities. Two members were not sure about the process due to lack of information. Comments about the Franco process included:

*[The Franco communities] not being quite ready has made the process more challenging; however, they are progressing.*

*[The Franco process] is really different [from the other RRTs] because the vision process was done at the municipal level – not tied by place.*

### **Awareness and Utilization of Partners/Resources and Funding Programs**

Management committee member key informants were asked to provide their perceptions on the Franco-Manitoba process and their ability to identify partners/resources and funding programs. Of the six respondents, four indicated they were “not sure” as to whether or not Franco communities were able to identify partners/resources or funding programs. One respondent indicated that Franco communities did “not” identify partners and resources. One respondent felt that identification of partners and resources had occurred “to some extent”. One respondent felt that Franco communities had identified funding programs “to some extent”. Another respondent felt that it was “to a great extent”.

Most management committee members indicated that they were “not sure” about the activities of the Franco communities as they were not informed as to what was happening with the communities. With regards to funding programs, two management committee members commented that the Franco communities were able to access funding programs to conduct visioning and dialoguing activities.

### **Awareness of Healthy Communities and Sustainable Development Concepts**

Most management committee members felt that the Franco communities had an appreciation of what constitutes a “healthy community”. One committee member indicated that they were “not sure” due to lack of shared information, another felt that the Franco group was “not there yet”, but that they were moving towards an understanding. One committee member commented:

*[Franco communities] understand that issues are broader than economic (population health model and sustainable community model). They don't actually have indicators, but a growing understanding.*

Three members of the management committee felt that the Franco communities had an increased understanding of sustainable community development as a result of the process undertaken with them by CDEM. One member was “not sure”. Two members felt that the Franco-Manitoba process was focused more on economics. Comments included:

*[The Franco process] is much more economic [than the other RRTs]. They do not seem to pull all three together – economic, social and environmental.*

*[The Franco process] is driven by social and cultural perspectives, not by a geographical perspective.*

### Improved Use of Government Programs and Services

When asked if there would be an improved understanding of and access to government programs and services for the Franco-Manitoba communities as a result of the process, one management committee member responded “not at all”, one responded “to some extent”, two felt “to a great extent” and two members were “not sure”. One committee member commented:

*CDEM already has a great understanding. They are very connected and successful at accessing resources.*

### **Potential New Region – Parkland**

As a pre-measure for potential newcomers to the Community Collaboration Project, WESTARC contacted several of the Parkland Practitioners prior to their January 2001 meeting to collect some baseline information and opinions. The Practitioners were asked what issues they felt were currently faced by their community/region, what opportunities they saw for their community/region and what they hoped to see happen should the regional round table process proceed in the Parkland region. As some of the Practitioners represented the region or parts of it through their respective positions, most respondents gave their feedback from a regional perspective.

#### **Community/Regional Issues and Opportunities**

With respect to community issues, one respondent felt that their community needed to get community members “on-side” before seeking investment and bringing partners together. This same respondent indicated that the “establishment of a community call or contact centre and the potential to expand secondary agricultural processing activities” were key opportunities for their community.

Most respondents, when asked what they saw as the main issues facing the Parkland region, indicated rural depopulation, a need for more economic and business development as well as a lack of communication and cooperation within the region. Also mentioned by some respondents were issues around youth, a need to recognize “healthy communities” and agriculture.

When asked what they viewed as the top opportunities for Parkland, most respondents indicated Tourism. Several respondents also mentioned diversification and value-added agriculture as an important opportunity for the region.

#### **RRT Perceptions**

Most respondents indicated communication and information sharing between the communities within the Parkland region as the main outcome they would hope for should the regional round table process move forward within the region. Some respondents also hoped that the process could drive development initiatives on a regional basis by identifying regional priorities and developing a strategic plan.

The pre-measure with Parkland Practitioners was confirmed during the observational visit to the January 2001 session. During the session, the group echoed many of the same comments made by questionnaire respondents. It is important to note that during the observational visit WESTARC noted considerable frustration from some of the participants. The frustration appeared to arise from a different understanding about what the session was intended to accomplish.

It appeared as though some Parkland Practitioners wished that they could access funding in order to design and initiate a process in order to engage municipal leaders. During the presentation when CCP criteria were elucidated, what scope of regional planning (“boundaries”) became a stumbling block/dilemma to the planning. The Practitioners saw this quandary coming – i.e., large group could be cumbersome.

There have been no further meetings set for the Parkland group to date. However, it is anticipated that the process will proceed in the next few months and a formal request may come forward from some of the communities in the Parkland region.

## **Management Committee**

### **Roles and Responsibilities**

For the Year I Review of the Community Collaboration Project, key informants indicated that they felt the role of the management committee was “to oversee the community collaboration process, provide advice and information as needed and make suggestions where appropriate.” Most members of the management committee indicated that this continued to be their main role in Year II of the project. One member felt that the role of the management committee had changed from Year I. He/she commented:

*Management committee role has evolved into looking for new opportunities, engaging other regions, trying to bandwagon other provincial and federal agencies on board; finding some long-term security and support for existing and new RRTs.*

Another respondent also commented that the role is “evolving” towards a longer-term strategy involving the “operationalizing and institutionalization” of the process within both the provincial and federal governments. One respondent commented about the somewhat “ambiguous” role of RDI within the management committee:

*Other members are there on an ongoing way. RDI has a contract with the management committee. [There was a] 9 month gap in the contract. What is RDI’s role during those 9 months with the community - with the management committee? When a contract isn’t signed, maybe RDI isn’t a member of management committee - but cannot walk away once program is started, so [RDI] continued communication and facilitation efforts.*

One of the next steps suggested in the Year I Review was to clarify the role, mandate and responsibilities within the management committee. Management committee key informants were asked if this took place and if they felt that the roles of the various players involved were clear. Management committee respondents indicated that the clarification of roles, mandates and responsibilities within the committee did not occur. Some respondents felt that the lack of clarity with respect to roles had been a “problem” and some commented that the role of the Province was unclear within the project. Comments included:

*Province’s role is unclear; there was a change in government [which may have impacted their role]. Province does not seem to be taking as strong a role, not working with committee in the same way.*

*Intergovernmental Affairs seems to feel okay with in-kind [contributions] – [however they] need to come to the plate to do more.*

Other respondents raised concerns about the “ad hoc” nature of the management committee and suggested that the issue needs to be dealt with by the group. Comments included:

*The management committee has not developed terms of reference or a strategic plan (physician heal thyself).*

*Federal, RDI, Province—each knows their own role—but amongst group not clear. The Committee needs to discuss this issue as a group and review Year I and Year II [of the CCP] and decide how to move forward. The committee has not made the effort to discuss review information.*

*RDI not under contract for 9 months – how can clarification occur?*

All management committee respondents felt that the various representatives of the committee have been “quite effective” with respect to overall support of the project. It was noted that the role of RDI was different from that of the rest of the management committee members in that RDI’s role and obligations are laid out contractually.

### Provincial and Federal Collaboration

For the Year I Review, management committee members indicated that they felt the committee was “quite effective” in working together. Some management committee respondents felt that the committee had continued to be “effective” in working together in Year II of the project. However, others felt that the management committee had “not been very effective” with respect to working together. Some respondents felt that their ability to work together had been hampered by the fact that where the CCP is going seems to be “unclear”. Comments included:

*Not being able to get together and having a common understanding of where we are at and where we need to go next has created problems [for the management committee].*

*Where are we at contractually, in terms of obligations? With the contract unsigned for a 9 month period uncertainty was created. [With the] Province – positions changed, department changed, etc. Formal reporting responsibilities uncertain.*

### Support and Assistance to CCP Communities/Regions

With the project not being funded from April to December 2000, management committee members were asked what obligations they felt they had to the CCP and to communities. All

committee members responded that despite the lack of funding all continued to be committed to the process and to the communities. Comments included:

*Recognition of RDI's commitment to process - used resources to attend meetings and to keep it going.*

*We started this, we don't just walk out.*

*No finite obligations to new communities, but a commitment to promote within own ranks and within new communities to generate new meetings with new regions.*

*No legal obligation. However, operationally other monies were found through Community Connections (hardware, etc.). [Management committee] found other ways to keep some contact going.*

*Owed it to communities to be more clear about our expectations. [Management committee should] kick start projects and pathfind (assist with projects); identify resources and sources of funding.*

All management committee respondents indicated that there had been a sharing of information and resources when CCP communities/regions had identified a concern or interest. The sharing of information and resources were pooled from different departments and across government levels according to key informant respondents. Most management committee respondents indicated that nearly all of the information and resources shared with CCP communities/regions were human or information based. Some of the information and resources shared with the CCP communities and regions were the *Community Connections* program, physical environment information sets from Environment Canada, web page design/development, attendance at meetings when requested, presentations/workshops, facilitation, contact information and funding program information.

### CCP Process

Overall, management committee respondents felt the process was important and were pleased with the progress made within the CCP communities/regions. One respondent commented:

*The process is important. Collaboration amongst government agencies and groups such as RDI are very crucial to sending a unified message to communities. I would like to celebrate successes and share information [from the CCP].*

Management committee members were asked what they found to be most helpful about the Community Collaboration process. As with the RRT members, most committee members felt

that Provincial and Federal agencies working together, as well as working with round tables was the key to the project. Committee member comments included:

*All [members of the committee are] committed to process and sustainable communities.*

*Working with existing round tables to help them implement visions; helps them think on a broader range; facilitates government departments working together collaboratively; good teamwork and relationships (community to community, community to government, government to government).*

*Bringing together multiple departments from various levels of government and non-government to strategize around community processes and engage them in effective community-based decision making.*

When asked what they find to be least helpful about the Community Collaboration process most committee members mentioned the uncertainty of whether the project could continue over the long-term. One member felt that process was “quite positive”. Another was struggling with what the Provincial role was within the committee and felt that there was a “need for a stronger commitment” from the province. Comments included:

*Lack of assurance of annual funding; uncertainty over whether funding will continue over the long-term.*

*Difficult to pull management team together on a regular basis.*

The least helpful aspects identified by committee members led in to the question of how the Community Collaboration Project could be improved. Again, members felt that a need for ongoing support for the process was vital. Another area for improvement suggested by several respondents was the need for an “inventory” and “framework” that could better articulate the resources available as well as the process for communities/regions. One member felt that more participation by other government agencies such as Aboriginal and Northern Affairs would improve the process. Management committee comments included:

*Inventory to be done for communities - this was not done. We need to tell the story of community animation - there is a need for a framework. Explain what sustainable communities are.*

*Ability of all information providers to better organize information to make it available to communities in this planning process.*

*[The CCP] can't have gaps, needs to be ongoing. Communities are expecting the project to continue. Need a longer-term commitment from government up front.*

*Multi-year funding allotment. Do more long-term planning knowing that a pre-determined amount of money is available each year. Not a clear picture of where we are at. This is especially true at the management committee level – we [committee members] need to be on top of what is going on.*

*Demand has been created in other regions and a whole new client group is First Nations – the challenge is to get this long-term plan or strategy in place, which includes financing.*

## **Next Steps**

Based upon this review, some suggestions regarding the next steps of the project are presented here for management committee consideration and discussion. These suggestions include:

- Identify and obtain ongoing support and funding for Year III of the CCP;
- Clarify Provincial, Federal and RDI roles within the project, including roles, mandates, and responsibilities within the management committee;
- Develop a formalized framework that will clearly articulate the process for communities and government departments;
- Continue to support the Northern Vision, Southwest and Franco-Manitoba processes through commitment of funds, time and expertise;
- Develop an inventory of resources, partners, and funding programs for regional use;
- Engage new communities in CCP activities (Bayline and Parkland); and
- Continue introducing and fostering the use of information resources for community participants.

From these suggested next steps, the management committee would be in position to identify the implications for Federal and Provincial government departments in terms of formal responsibilities (time commitments, financial obligations, human resource issues, etc.) as they arise.

WESTARC Group will conduct a post-measure of the Community Collaboration Project in the fall of 2001. This post-measure will be summarized and shared with the management committee. It is anticipated that WESTARC will continue to capture “the story” of the process during this time period and include it with the post-measure results and lessons learned in a final review report.