



Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework

Prepared for the City of Guelph | JUNE 21, 2010



Prepared by: Sean Meagher, Tony Boston,
Heather Fussell, and Alex Goss

Public Interest Strategy and Communications
340 Harbord Street, Toronto, ON M6G 1H4
416 531 5192 | www.publicinterest.ca

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	11
Vision	15
Principles	16
1. Inclusive	17
2. Engaging	17
3. Responsive	17
4. Building a Sense of Belonging	17
Activities	18
Neighbourhood Support Coalition (NSC) Structure	21
Roles and Responsibilities	25
Resources and Supports	26
Allocation of Funding	30
Criteria	32
Appendix A: Implementation Road Map	36
Appendix B: Effective Partnerships	40
Successes and Challenges of Partnerships	40
Partnerships Phases	42
Appendix C: Literature Review	43
Appendix D: Environmental Scan	55
Appendix E: Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement	
Framework Advisory Committee	97
Appendix F: Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement	
Framework Consultation	98



Executive Summary



In 2009, the City of Guelph Community Services Department initiated the Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework process, an operational review of how the City engages and partners with Guelph neighbourhood groups and the Guelph Neighbourhood Support Coalition (NSC). The review also examined how the potential elimination of Community Development Worker positions would affect neighbourhood groups. Working with an advisory committee of key stakeholders, the process involved a review of existing literature on community development, grassroots service delivery, and effective organizational development, as well as an environmental scan of City of Guelph policies, neighbourhood group reports and statistical data that inform the City's role and current contexts of neighbourhood groups. Also, an extensive consultation process that included key informant interviews and focus groups was undertaken with a range of stakeholders from neighbourhood group leaders, City staff, frontline workers, partners and elected officials.

The consultation findings have informed this draft Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework. There is widespread agreement that neighbourhood groups are a significant asset and provide invaluable benefit to the City of Guelph. The Framework articulates a new overall structure for moving forward and building on those assets. Within this new structure, the NSC has an expanded role as an independent organization that acts as a bridge between neighbourhood groups and other partners including the City. As well, the Framework clarifies what the City hopes to achieve through this work.

The Framework contains seven key elements, with four guiding principles. Each element addresses a different aspect of the neighbourhood group system.





Engaged neighbourhoods make a positive difference to the health and well-being of the people who live in them. Every neighbourhood in Guelph should be a welcoming, inclusive place that engages its residents and involves them, in large ways and in small ways, in the shared activities that impact the circumstances, aspirations and opportunities of all who live there, and raise the quality of life for Guelph as a whole.

Vision

The Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework is guided by the City of Guelph's vision, shared by communities and partners, of neighbourhoods in Guelph and the role that neighbourhood groups can play in achieving that vision. This vision is based on an understanding about the valuable contribution neighbourhood groups make to the quality of life in Guelph and what can be achieved by continuing to support this work.

Engaged neighbourhoods make a positive difference to the health and well-being of the people who live in them. Every neighbourhood in Guelph should be a welcoming, inclusive place that engages its residents and involves them, in large ways and in small ways, in the shared activities that impact the circumstances, aspirations and opportunities of all who live there, and raise the quality of life for Guelph as a whole.

Principles

The Framework provides four common principles that all neighbourhood groups are expected to use to guide their actions in order to receive supports and resources from the City of Guelph. These principles are based on a shared understanding of the most effective model of community development and engagement – that grassroots and community initiatives are most successful when they build on the strengths and assets of the whole community, including those already involved and those beyond current membership and participants, to build the organization around shared community priorities.

Four common principles describe the current work and underlying goals of neighbourhood groups, which are more effective and successful when they are:

- 1. INCLUSIVE:** Neighbourhood groups create programs, provide spaces and make decisions in ways that can include everyone in the community. People from diverse backgrounds feel comfortable participating and neighbourhood groups actively work to break down barriers that stop people from getting involved.
- 2. ENGAGING:** Neighbourhood groups actively reach out and get people involved in decision-making as well as local activities.
- 3. RESPONSIVE:** Neighbourhood groups respond to the needs and priorities of the community, making changes, setting new goals and adjusting processes to accommodate the whole range of residents they serve.
- 4. BUILDING A SENSE OF BELONGING:** Neighbourhood groups work to create a sense of belonging and community for all the people in the area they serve and help everyone see their shared interest in the community.

By articulating these principles, the Framework identifies the unique characteristics and goals of neighbourhood groups and helps to distinguish them from other area-based organizations.

Activities

A number of the activities carried out by neighbourhood groups help to fulfill the principles. Neighbourhood groups must do at least one of these types of activities to be actively involved in engagement and eligible to receive supports and resources from the City of Guelph. The framework provides five categories of activities that help achieve the vision and strengthen neighbourhoods. The following table outlines the five activity categories. The list is not intended to be prescriptive, but rather serve as a guide to neighbourhood groups as they plan out their activities and reflect on how those activities will support the vision and principles.

CATEGORIES OF ACTIVITIES	INDICATORS
DELIVERING ACCESSIBLE SERVICES (ECONOMIC, PHYSICAL, SOCIAL)	<p>Services are delivered by the neighbourhood group and differ from other similar services in one or more of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • located closer to users or in physically more accessible settings • less expensive • programs are more flexible and adjust to user needs • programs are linked to social and cultural structures or activities that make them more inviting, familiar or comfortable for users in ways that increase participation
DELIVERING RESPONSIVE SERVICES (RELEVANT, APPROPRIATE)	<p>Services are delivered by the neighbourhood group and differ from other similar services in one or more of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • programs are geared to the specific needs of the neighbourhood rather than broader goals • programs planners consult community members and design services to reflect local priorities • planning actively includes users • program operations actively include users as leaders in the management and delivery of services
BASIC ENGAGEMENT (DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES, FOSTERING DIALOGUE WITH NEIGHBOURHOOD GROUPS, COMMUNITIES AND PARTNERS)	<p>Neighbourhood groups engage in activities designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase awareness of and contact with others • bring neighbours in contact with each other in ways that bridge typical gaps in social networks • bring neighbours together to encourage new discussion on shared ideas and concerns • demonstrate the ability of residents to make constructive changes in their community
CREATING A SENSE OF BELONGING (INVOLVEMENT, OUTREACH, AWARENESS, LEADERSHIP)	<p>Neighbourhood groups engage in activities designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate mutual interest and respect • celebrate the value of belonging to a community • make residents feel welcome in settings outside their established social networks
PROVIDING A VOICE FOR THE COMMUNITY ON ISSUES (POLICY PROCESS, ADVOCACY, COMMUNITY ISSUES)	<p>Neighbourhood groups engage in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • arranging opportunities for community members to express their views on issues • creating and managing community decision making processes • speaking out for the community on issues • pursuing advocacy efforts on behalf of the community





A large part of what makes neighbourhood groups so effective is their close connection to the communities they serve as well as their flexibility and responsiveness to the needs of neighbourhoods. That flexibility is hard to achieve when groups are not supported with a network and with capacity building.

Neighbourhood groups are volunteer run organizations with varying capacities. Funders and partners of neighbourhood groups, including the City, recognize the benefits of having neighbourhood-based organizations serving communities. A large part of what makes neighbourhood groups so effective is their close connection to the communities they serve as well as their flexibility and responsiveness to the needs of neighbourhoods. That flexibility is hard to achieve when groups are not supported with a network and with capacity building. The support structures currently in place, most notably the Neighbourhood Support Coalition and the City of Guelph's community engagement staff, struggle to meet these needs without imposing demanding administrative requirements as well. The Framework recommends that the NSC expand to become an autonomous organization that acts as a bridge between individual neighbourhood groups, the City and other partner organizations that work with neighbourhood groups.

An expanded NSC would continue to support neighbourhood groups through information sharing, resource and partner development and resource allocation. A Partner Panel (of external organizations) and a Neighbourhood Panel (of neighbourhood group representatives) would serve as advisory bodies within the NSC. Both panels would elect representatives to a Steering Committee.

Within the new structure, the NSC will need increased capacity to support the neighbourhood groups and marshal resources. One of the initial responsibilities of the NSC would be to work with partner organizations to secure funding from a range of diverse sources for NSC staff to deliver more supports to groups.

In order to support the transition to an expanded NSC a host organization will be required. After the transition period, the NSC may choose to continue to work with a host organization on a more permanent basis or become a stand-alone, incorporated, non-profit organization.

Resources and Supports

Currently the City and other partners provide a number of key resources to neighbourhood groups. Some of these are provided through formal agreements while others are provided informally. The framework provides a list of all the non-financial resources that should be provided consistently to assist neighbourhood groups in the work they do and clarifies the roles of the NSC and its partners. The list includes:

- Access to City Hall;
- Permits/fast track for municipal services;
- Staff support;
- Human resources supports;
- Hosting;
- Auditing, book-keeping and other financial services;
- Templates and guidelines to use in planning and managing various projects;
- Training and mentoring;
- Research and information;
- Communications; and
- Other special projects.

Three resources are highlighted as priority resources for neighbourhood groups. These priority resources include:

- Space acquisition:
 - Assistance in acquiring office space, meeting space, program space and storage space
- Insurance:
 - Liability insurance for neighbourhood groups
 - Coverage for staff and programs
- Organizational development:
 - Includes allocation of Community Development Worker staff to support NGs with specific challenges or development strategies
 - Skills development for volunteers (program and governance), staff and neighbourhood groups overall

The arrangements for accessing these resources and supports identified should be formalized into written agreements.





Allocation of Funding

Currently, the NSC Finance Committee allocates funds to neighbourhood groups through a participatory budgeting process. The process was seen by most of those involved in it as important and reflective of the core values of the NSC and neighbourhood groups in Guelph. However, significant challenges with the process were also identified. The framework outlines a similar allocation process but with additional transparency through clearer annual and public reporting. The allocation process will be managed by the Neighbourhood Panel of the NSC with neighbourhood group representatives, under the auspices of the NSC Steering Committee.

Neighbourhood groups will be asked to prepare and publicly share reports on their finances, previous year's activities and upcoming annual plans. Reporting will include accounting for the number of programs, participants and volunteer hours of the group in the previous year, a summary of current accounts, a budget for the year to come, action and inclusion plans, justifications for resources and stories of the benefits of neighbourhood groups. In light of the varying capacities of neighbourhood groups, the NSC will provide support to neighbourhood groups in preparing for the new process. Underlying this model is an expectation that neighbourhood groups will work towards developing and improving their activities in accordance with the Framework principles.

Criteria

Neighbourhood groups that are working towards the principles will also have to be members of the NSC in order to be included in the allocation process. The criteria for membership is laid out and includes specific requirements including action plans, inclusion plans, annual reports, annual financial reports, neighbourhood group governance structures and participation in the NSC to ensure clarity, transparency and accountability.

The Framework recognizes that neighbourhood groups have varying capacities. The criteria should not be so burdensome that it discourages new groups from forming or takes away from important on-the-ground work. The NSC will support neighbourhood groups in meeting these criteria by providing templates and assistance in developing the plans and reports.

Moving Forward

The Framework also includes an Implementation Road Map. Some elements of the Framework are more readily adoptable by the City of Guelph, neighbourhood groups and partners. Other changes proposed in the Framework require long term planning, and the development of stable structures and a multi-year transition period is expected.

Introduction



Within Guelph there is a unique system of geographically based neighbourhood groups that have emerged gradually across the city, contributing to Guelph's effort to build stronger, healthier neighbourhoods. Over time these grassroots organizations have evolved and grown as a result of the hard work of dedicated volunteers, combined with resources and support from the City and other partner organizations.

Since 1997, the City of Guelph has been working with, and providing support and funding to, individual neighbourhood groups as well as the network of neighbourhood groups known as the Neighbourhood Support Coalition (NSC). The City provides funding and dedicated staff to support the activities of neighbourhood groups and often provides the supports normally associated with a trustee for these unincorporated neighbourhood groups. This role has evolved and changed naturally over the years without specific policies in place to guide it. In 2009, the City initiated an operational review of its role in neighbourhood group activities in an effort to create a clear framework for long-term decision making.

The review was undertaken in close consultation with City staff, neighbourhood groups, elected officials, frontline workers and other partners and stakeholders. The review was carried out in collaboration with an advisory committee of stakeholders, including neighbourhood group members, funders, partners and City staff. The review addresses key questions about the impact of neighbourhood groups, their challenges, the City's role in supporting them and how it could be improved and funded in a sustainable fashion.



Throughout the consultation process it was clear that residents and stakeholders across Guelph place a great value in Guelph's neighbourhood group system and the consistent contribution these groups make to community life in the city.

The Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework (the Framework) is the result of that review. It outlines a strategy for supporting neighbourhood groups in a sustainable and effective way for the future. It is based on the input of all participants in the consultation process and reflects the shared perspectives and priorities of the stakeholders.

Throughout the consultation process it was clear that residents and stakeholders across Guelph place a great value in Guelph's neighbourhood group system and the consistent contribution these groups make to community life in the city. Guelph is a growing and changing city and neighbourhood groups contribute to the health and well-being of communities in Guelph in fundamental and unique ways. As flexible, responsive and well-connected organizations, neighbourhood groups play an important role in the city by providing needed services and offering opportunities for residents to participate in their communities. Through partnerships with external organizations such as schools, faith groups, and local NGOs, neighbourhood groups access space, staff and other resources that help to ensure that external services are delivered in appropriate and effective ways. As communities in Guelph continue to transform, the functions of neighbourhood groups will only become more important because they are uniquely placed to identify emerging issues and appreciate the context of these changes, as well as to find innovative, responsive and appropriate ways of addressing them.

However, it was also clear that the neighbourhood group system is facing some fundamental challenges that need to be addressed if it is to continue. Participation in neighbourhood groups has grown much more quickly than the resources to support these groups. The demands on the volunteers who lead neighbourhood groups has increased, but the ability of their support network, the NSC, to provide assistance and build their capacity is limited. The scarcity of resources has created tensions and raised questions about the relative priorities of the functions of neighbourhood groups but there is little guidance available to address those concerns. A lack of formal agreements about process and transparency have increased those challenges. At the same time, the demand for very formal administrative activities to reflect the

City's operational guidelines (including human resource policies and freedom of information regulations) have placed a heavy administrative burden on these volunteer-led neighbourhood groups.

The Framework addresses the need to sustain the advantages of neighborhood groups while addressing these challenges. The Framework also addresses the role of the City of Guelph in the neighbourhood group system, outlining how the City can continue to work with neighbourhood groups and the NSC in the future. The Framework builds on the important work already happening throughout Guelph's neighbourhoods and clarifies the roles, responsibilities and expectations of the City, other partners and funders, the NSC and individual neighbourhood groups. As a framework, these issues are addressed by providing strategic outlines, not detailed operational plans. It should be noted that continued development of specific plans for implementation will be critical to the success of the sustainable neighbourhood engagement project as a whole.

The Framework contains seven key elements that collectively define the strategy for sustainable neighbourhood engagement and an Implementation Road Map that outlines the steps toward achieving it.

The seven elements of the Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework are:

1) VISION

Successfully reaching its goals in neighbourhood engagement requires a vision of what the City hopes to achieve in its relationship with the NSC and neighbourhood groups. The Framework includes a vision, shared by communities and partners, which describes the desired future of Guelph's neighbourhood system as a whole.

2) PRINCIPLES

The Framework includes four overarching principles that contribute to this vision and will guide the work of all neighbourhood groups. These principles are based on the roles neighbourhood groups currently play in the City of Guelph, and reflect the best research on what guidelines are most effective in steering community engagement toward optimal outcomes. These principles provide neighbourhood groups tools for decision making and provide clarity around the types of work the City is seeking to support. The principles serve as a test of whether or not a group is actually pursuing an approach consistent with the shared objectives of a recognized neighbourhood group.

3) ACTIVITIES

The Framework sets out a range of activities that neighbourhood groups could undertake to meet the overarching principles. Neighbourhood groups will not be required to undertake every activity, but the funds they receive as part of City-supported neighbourhood engagement should provide for at least one of these activities to take place in the neighbourhood.

4) NEIGHBOURHOOD SUPPORT COALITION STRUCTURE

To support neighbourhood groups in meeting the vision and principles and carrying out identified activities, the Framework envisions an expanded NSC that acts as a bridge between partners and neighbourhood groups. The new,

expanded NSC includes partner organizations, the City and neighbourhood groups in its governance. Partner organizations recognize the benefit of having neighbourhood groups in Guelph and many have mutually beneficial relationships with individual neighbourhood groups. The governance structure of the expanded NSC formalizes the role of partners with the introduction of a Partner Panel and by having partners sit on the Steering Committee (the main decision-making body of the NSC). The Framework also explores the long term autonomy of the NSC, recognizing the need for an organization to host the NSC during a transition period. After the transition period, the NSC may choose to continue working with a host organization or become a completely independent, stand-alone, incorporated non-profit organization. The NSC will be supported by internal NSC staff, led by a coordinator position. The increased internal resources will better enable the NSC to provide capacity building supports. Community Development Workers could be included among the staff of the NSC. This provides a viable venue for these staff, formerly employed by Family and Children's Services, and the NSC will work with other partners to seek funding for these roles.

5) RESOURCES

The Framework outlines the resources and supports that the NSC and individual neighbourhood groups will require, and which partners, such as the City, may be able to provide separate from funding. Establishing the resource contributions of partners and the expectations of neighbourhood groups will improve the stability and effectiveness of groups.

6) FUNDING

City funding is distributed to neighbourhood groups through a participatory budgeting process. The framework proposes changes to how funding is allocated. The allocation process outlined continues to employ a participatory budgeting process but allows for multiple streams of funding for funders with specific objectives. Funding that is not specifically targeted should be allocated in ways that reflect the four common principles outlined in the framework. The allocation process also includes requirements for greater disclosure from groups throughout the process.

7) CRITERIA

The Framework outlines the criteria that the City and NSC would expect funded neighbourhood groups to meet. The criteria reflect a need for more transparency about the work and achievements of neighbourhood groups and how they are contributing to the vision and principles. These criteria will help groups become more accountable organizations while also improving access to funding and enhancing their responsiveness.

Together, these seven elements provide the City of Guelph a Framework for supporting neighbourhood groups in a sustainable way that is pragmatic about the challenges involved but continues to realize the benefits of engaged grassroots neighbourhood-based groups. Under this framework, neighbourhood groups can successfully operate as geographically-based grassroots organizations that facilitate engagement among residents towards improving quality of life.

Vision

Engaged neighbourhoods make a positive difference to the health and well-being of the people who live in them. Every neighbourhood in Guelph should be a welcoming, inclusive place that engages its residents and involves them, in large ways and in small ways, in the shared activities that impact the circumstances, aspirations and opportunities of all who live there, and raise the quality of life for Guelph as a whole.

The Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework is guided by the City of Guelph's vision, shared by communities and partners, for healthy and strong neighbourhoods in Guelph, and the role that neighbourhood groups can play in achieving that vision. This vision is based on an understanding of the valuable contribution neighbourhood groups make to quality of life in Guelph and what can be achieved by continuing to support this work. It reflects the values articulated by residents and stakeholders during the consultations and research on the processes most effective in supporting successful neighbourhoods.

Engaged neighbourhoods make a positive difference to the health and well-being of the people who live in them. Every neighbourhood in Guelph should be a welcoming, inclusive place that engages its residents and involves them, in large ways and in small ways, in the shared activities that impact the circumstances, aspirations and opportunities of all who live there, and raise the quality of life for Guelph as a whole.



Principles



By “bonding” and “bridging,” by strengthening connections and reaching out, groups grow stronger. They build membership and increase their ability to link with, understand and respond to the composition and diverse needs of their neighbourhood over time.

The Framework provides four common principles that support the achievement of the vision. Within this Framework, all neighbourhood groups are expected to use these principles to guide their actions. The principles can also be thought of as tests for determining if groups actually fulfill the requirements of being a recognized neighbourhood group. These principles are based on the shared understanding of the various participating organizations – neighbourhood groups, partner organizations and City staff – the understanding that grassroots and community initiatives are most successful when they:

1. Strengthen and build on the connections, interests and skills of people who are already involved.
2. Reach beyond the existing members and participants to connect with and include other individuals and groups both inside and outside of their neighbourhood. This way, both the individuals and the group gain the benefit of new skills, ideas and opportunities.

These principles also reflect the research on neighbourhood engagement that emphasizes the development of “social capital”. Social capital is the resource made up of the networks and shared interests and skills of a community that is so critical to the success of communities. Social capital works best when the “bonding” capital, which brings people together around a shared goal and encourages them to contribute their time and capacities, is paired with “bridging” capital, which links together ever-widening circles of relationships to build broader, stronger, more effective networks.

By “bonding” and “bridging,” by strengthening connections and reaching out, groups grow stronger. They build membership and increase their ability to link with, understand and respond to the composition and diverse needs of their neighbourhood over time. They are able to build links that extend beyond the people they already connect to in the neighbourhood to engage a broader range of participants, increase understanding and to create new partnerships.

The four principles guide the actions of neighbourhood groups in ways that facilitate bridging and bonding. In order to receive resources and supports from the City of Guelph, neighbourhood groups will need to agree to, and act in accordance with, the four common principles. However, the ways in which neighbourhood groups carry out the principles will be shaped by each group’s unique characteristics and the context of the neighbourhood.

Neighbourhood groups are expected to be guided by the principles and show that they are:

- 1. INCLUSIVE:** Neighbourhood groups create programs and activities that are designed to make sure that everyone can participate. This includes the people facing the greatest barriers, as well as the people who are most isolated or face barriers accessing similar activities elsewhere. People from the full diversity of backgrounds in the neighbourhood should feel comfortable attending these programs. Neighbourhood groups should work actively towards reducing barriers that might otherwise prevent residents from participating. The neighbourhood group governance structure (the board, its committees and the bylaws) should also be designed to give everyone who participates the opportunity to help shape decisions about how the group is run and how it decides its future. Again, this involves careful planning to remove barriers to participation such as language, culture, age and experience.
- 2. ENGAGING:** Neighbourhood groups should find ways to reach out continually to all of the communities within the neighbourhood, and undertake activities that encourage broad participation among residents. This is tied to and supports the “Inclusive” principle in that without continual outreach, engagement and meaningful invitations to participate, participation will depend on who is already part of the group and their networks. Engagement is about going beyond who is already involved.
- 3. RESPONSIVE:** By engaging with new people and including them in programs, activities and planning, groups must constantly adapt and respond to the needs, interests and wishes of their growing range of participants. They need to be prepared to adapt and respond to the changing composition, priorities, interests and issues of the neighbourhood, and to developing new programs and modifying existing ones.
- 4. BUILDING A SENSE OF BELONGING:** Neighbourhoods will be better places for everyone if every resident (and others who spend time there) feel a sense of belonging. If people feel connected to each other in positive ways and feel positive about the neighbourhood where they live, they are more likely to make positive choices for themselves and more likely to take an interest in supporting and reaching out to their fellow residents. With these changes, the more healthy and positive the neighbourhood becomes. If people feel a sense of belonging, the more likely they are to work together to resolve issues and challenges.

Each neighbourhood group will demonstrate their commitment to these principles in their own Annual Action Plan and Inclusion and Engagement Plan. Each group’s plans will reflect its membership, its neighbourhood and its resources and capacities. The common strand among all of the groups will be that the activities, and their plans overall, will apply and support the four principles. If neighbourhood groups are not in compliance with the principles, the NSC Steering Committee will work with them to support their efforts to develop strategies that enable them to apply the principles more effectively. (see NSC Structure for more details on the role of the NSC).

While some group activities may not achieve the full objectives of the principles (for example some may not yet engage the full community) and others may have projects that target a specific population in the neighbourhood, neighbourhood groups will be required to demonstrate to the NSC, through their Annual Plans, that they are working steadily toward fulfilling the principles and carrying out even targeted projects in accordance with them.

Activities

One of the features of neighbourhood groups that makes them so successful is their flexibility and ability to respond and relate to the contexts of the neighbourhoods they serve.



Neighbourhood groups currently undertake a wide range of activities. Many of those meet the above principles and vision by building community. Other activities, though beneficial, may not contribute to the social cohesion and social capital of the neighbourhood. The Framework identifies the range of activities that research and consultation indicate are directly related to the broad community building goals of neighbourhood groups. Neighbourhood groups should be encouraged to participate in the NSC and benefit from access to City resources insofar as they are engaged in activities that further these goals and carry them out in accordance with the principles outlined above.

The Framework categorizes relevant activities to serve as a guide for neighbourhood groups, cataloguing many of their existing activities and providing some clarity about expectations for new neighbourhood groups. This list of activities outlined below identifies potential resources that may be provided to assist neighbourhood groups as they undertake these activities.

One of the features of neighbourhood groups that makes them so successful is their flexibility and ability to respond and relate to the contexts of the neighbourhoods they serve. Categorizing activities is not intended to limit that responsiveness, nor to encourage the homogenization of programs and plans across groups. Neighbourhoods in Guelph have different demographics,

different community needs and different assets and capacities. Their activities should reflect those realities. Neighbourhood groups should also decide for themselves which activities they are best suited for and best able to undertake.

The NSC will continuously work to support and build the capacity of groups as they pursue the activities most appropriate to the local needs and priorities of their neighbourhoods. Some of the limiting and encouraging factors that may affect a neighbourhood group's decision about which activities to undertake may include:

- Current context of the neighbourhood
- Changes in neighbourhood
- Capacity to respond to issues and needs
- Skills and experience of group members
- Leadership skills of group members
- Energy, creativity and abilities of volunteers
- Changing volunteer support
- Access to appropriate space (whether a gym or a kitchen)
- Available supportive partnerships
- Changing funding

Neighbourhood groups may choose to undertake only one or multiple types of activities. For example, some groups may hold annual community barbeques and apply to receive supports for that activity, while other groups may undertake multiple activity types. Over time, neighbourhood groups may choose to increase or reduce the number and types of activities offered.

The range of activities outlined should be seen not as prescribing activities, but rather as a menu of options that neighbourhood groups can consider and explore. There are no mandatory elements; neighbourhood groups can pursue any combination of activities. The only restriction is that neighbourhood groups must be engaged in some form of community building activity, drawing on the list of identified community building activities, and must do so in accordance with the recognized principles.

The Framework provides indicators and examples to assist neighbourhood groups in determining how activities they are pursuing, or that they wish to pursue, fall into these categories. Neighbourhood groups are encouraged to identify which activities best suit their capacities, local needs and priorities and to develop their plans based on these.

CATEGORIES OF ACTIVITIES	INDICATORS	EXAMPLES	POTENTIAL SUPPORTS
DELIVERING ACCESSIBLE SERVICES (ECONOMIC, PHYSICAL, SOCIAL)	<p>Services are delivered by the neighbourhood group and differ from other similar services in one or more of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • located closer to users or in physically more accessible settings • less expensive • programs are more flexible and adjust to user needs • programs are linked to social and cultural structures or activities that make them more inviting, familiar or comfortable for users in ways that increase participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rec programs with fee subsidies • After school programs in a local school • Programs that allow irregular attendance • Programs for different ethno-cultural groups • Cross-referrals with other services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds for fee subsidies • Appropriate space selection and negotiation • Training for culturally appropriate service provision • Program support staff (i.e. Program Coordinators)
DELIVERING RESPONSIVE SERVICES (RELEVANT, APPROPRIATE)	<p>Services are delivered by the neighbourhood group and differ from other similar services in one or more of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • programs are geared to the specific needs of the neighbourhood rather than broader goals • programs planners consult community members and design services to reflect local priorities • planning actively includes users • program operations actively include users as leaders in the management and delivery of services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food cupboard program • Adjusting programs and services based on need • Soliciting feedback from the community • Integrating users into leadership roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional resources to support social need (i.e. CDWs) • Program support staff (i.e. Program Coordinators) • Community feedback training • Collaboration training
BASIC ENGAGEMENT (DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES, FOSTERING DIALOGUE WITH LOCAL COMMUNITY GROUPS, COMMUNITIES AND PARTNERS)	<p>Neighbourhood groups engage in activities designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase awareness of and contact with others • bring neighbours in contact with each other in ways that bridge typical gaps in social networks • bring neighbours together to encourage new discussion on shared ideas and concerns • demonstrate the ability of residents to make constructive changes in their community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newsletter, flyers • Community-wide activities including BBQs, festivals • Community cleanups • Town hall meetings • Active recruitment of neighbourhood leaders • Capacity building workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on how to host a community meeting • Office supply resources • Outreach and inclusion guidance
CREATING A SENSE OF BELONGING (INVOLVEMENT, OUTREACH, AWARENESS, LEADERSHIP)	<p>Neighbourhood groups engage in activities designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate mutual interest and respect • celebrate the value of belonging to a community • make residents feel welcome in settings outside their established social networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newsletter, flyers • Community-wide activities including BBQs, festivals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources to deliver events and social programs • Capacity, volunteer and leadership training
PROVIDING A VOICE FOR THE COMMUNITY ON ISSUES (POLICY PROCESS, ADVOCACY, COMMUNITY ISSUES)	<p>Neighbourhood groups engage in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • arranging opportunities for community members to express their views on issues • creating and managing community decision making processes • speaking out for the community on issues • pursuing advocacy efforts on behalf of the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community meetings on issues • Information sessions with government staff • Community organizing • Lobbying 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic activism training • Facilitation training

Neighbourhood Support Coalition (NSC) Structure



An expanded NSC will help to ensure that the neighbourhood group system in Guelph is not only providing supports to individual neighbourhood groups, but also supporting the development of overall well-being across neighbourhoods and throughout Guelph as a whole.

Through the consultation process, it became clear that the City, as a highly formal institution, was ill-suited to directly hosting flexible, grassroots neighbourhood groups in such a heavily interconnected way. Currently neighbourhood groups are required to comply with City human resource policies, municipal freedom of information regulations, and a host of other requirements that stretch their capacity to manage large administrative workloads. The highly regulated nature of municipal governments and the extent to which they are obliged to minimize risk are difficult for volunteer-driven organizations to accommodate. This challenge is found in Guelph and has been identified in similar circumstances in jurisdictions around the world.

Under this Framework the Neighbourhood Support Coalition (NSC) would expand to become an independent organization that brings together individual neighbourhood groups, the City and other partner organizations. The success of the neighbourhood group system depends in large part on the ability of an expanded NSC to build relationships with multiple partner organizations. Under the proposed structure of the NSC, partner organizations would be encouraged to participate directly in the NSC. The City, as a key partner, would continue in its ongoing role as a critical support, but in a more arms-length relationship.

An expanded NSC will help to ensure that the neighbourhood group system in Guelph is not only providing supports to individual neighbourhood groups, but also supporting the development of overall well-being across neighbourhoods and throughout Guelph as a whole. Organizational development and capacity building with individual neighbourhood groups, especially those facing particular challenges, will be a key function of the NSC. The NSC will also support the emergence of new groups where there is a demand and where the criteria is either being met or worked towards.

An expanded NSC will provide the organizational structure needed to implement accountability mechanisms. These accountability mechanisms will make the system stronger as a whole. The NSC will be held accountable for resources and funds distributed to neighbourhood groups. Neighbourhood groups, in turn, will be accountable to each other through the NSC. The NSC will support neighbourhood groups to meet accountability requirements to each other as well as to funders and partners.



In order to achieve this, the NSC would need greater internal resources than it currently has and will need to be supported by an internal staff team led by a full-time coordinator.

The NSC will facilitate access to resources for neighbourhood groups. In most cases resources would not be directly provided by the NSC, but rather the NSC would work with partners to coordinate the delivery of these resources. Individual staff of neighbourhood groups, including front-line staff such as neighbourhood coordinators and program coordinators would be employees of the NSC, but could, if necessary, receive support from other partners, especially in cases where staff require specific training.


Governance Structure

The NSC would be composed of three bodies: a Neighbourhood Panel, a Partner Panel and a Steering Committee.

The Neighbourhood Panel is composed of representatives from every neighbourhood group. All neighbourhood groups are required to be members of the Neighbourhood Panel and have representatives that sit on the Panel. Newly forming groups will be welcome to attend Neighbourhood Panel meetings as well. Representatives from neighbourhood groups will participate in the allocation process through the Neighbourhood Panel.

The Partner Panel is composed of representatives of partner organizations. Partner organizations include the City, Family and Children’s Services, and other organizations that have a partnership agreement with multiple neighbourhood groups or the NSC. The Partner Panel will advise the NSC Steering Committee and will seek ways to expand partnerships to facilitate the growth of neighbourhood groups.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD SUPPORT COALITION



Each panel will elect five representatives to sit on the NSC Steering Committee, the main decision-making body of the NSC. The Steering Committee will meet monthly and have a double quorum. Quorum for the Steering Committee will consist of at least two representatives from each panel, and a minimum of five members. As representatives of their panels, committee members must report back to, and seek advice from, their respective panels on an ongoing basis.

The Steering Committee will be responsible for shaping the NSC and developing and refining policies and procedures. Other responsibilities include overseeing the operations of the NSC, developing and approving the NSC's operating budget, working with and directing the Coordinator, determining logistics of the allocation process, ensuring transparent reporting, and building the funding pool of the NSC. The Committee can initiate sub-committees (such as an executive committee or finance committee) to manage some of its responsibilities, as needed. Sub-committees will include members of the Steering Committee and may also include individuals or organizations with expertise in the areas to be addressed.

In order to support the transition to an expanded NSC, a host organization will be required to support that transition. The host organization would chair the Partner Panel and have a seat at the Steering Committee as one of the five partners. The role of the host organization may include providing administrative resources, acting as a trustee of funds for the NSC and neighbourhood groups, and providing office space as well as other resources.

The long term status of the NSC should remain a matter for consideration as the development of the organizations proceeds. The NSC could operate as an independent, incorporated not-for-profit organization after a transition period, or it could operate on a long-term basis with a host organization that trustees, funds and provides key supports.

Should the NSC establish itself as an independent incorporated organization, it may choose to continue to work with a host organization on a more permanent basis. For example, a host organization may be able to provide some back-end office support to the NSC, such as human resources, IT and book-keeping support.

If the NSC chooses to pursue a long-term hosted structure it would be best to select the host using guidelines and criteria that help to identify a highly compatible organization. A host organization would be best suited if it is pursuing a similar mandate, has financial stability and the ability to offer neighbourhood groups flexibility in their operational style. A permanent host organization would become the chair of the Partner Panel and have a seat on the Steering Committee. If the NSC decides not to seek a permanent host organization, the City of Guelph, with its long historic relationship to the NSC and its profound interest in the well-being of neighbourhoods, is the logical candidate to chair the Partner Panel.



Community Development Workers

Many have recognized the importance of Community Development Workers (currently supported by Family and Children's Services) in capacity building, leadership development, outreach, program development, crisis management, conflict resolution, and trust building activities of the neighbourhood groups. The expanded NSC could become the best setting for these staff and will work with partner organizations to secure funding from a diverse range of sources to sustain those positions. Reporting to the NSC Coordinator, the new Community Development Workers (CDWs) would be staff of the NSC and able to work with those neighbourhoods in greatest need to develop capacity. However, developing the NSC, and arranging or funding and hosting arrangement will be time consuming and the current funding for these positions will end in January 2011. Strategies to sustain this resource until a realistic opportunity to transfer them to the NSC would be beneficial.

Transition and Founding

The new NSC will have a founding constitution that defines its mandate and clarifies its structure and processes during the transition period. The initial constitution will build on the recently defined NSC Terms of Reference to ensure a clearer transition. The Terms of Reference have been identified as being compatible with the other elements in the Framework and both documents will support the functions of the NSC in transition. It is important that during this time there are clear guidelines that allow the NSC to act as an information sharing network and build its membership, and for the allocation process to continue with accountability to the City for funds and other resources that the City and other partner organizations provide.

Amendments to the constitution and by-laws will require two-thirds approval by the NSC board and ratification by the Neighbourhood Panel and Partner Panel. As well, major policy changes will also need to be ratified by the Panels.

Roles and Responsibilities

ROLES	STEERING COMMITTEE	NEIGHBOURHOOD PANEL	PARTNER PANEL
INFORMATION SHARING / MENTORING	All information gets shared back to Panels	Neighbourhood Groups on the panel have the responsibility to mentor other groups when called upon	Partners can be called upon by the Board in an advisory role to provide expertise and information
RESOURCES AND PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT	Determine areas of funding and partnership gaps to pursue; work with Partner Panel to source funding for CDWs	Identify local sources of funding and potential partners	Support the sourcing of new funds and partners
RESOURCE ALLOCATION	Guide allocation process, logistics; ensure accountability mechanisms provided by funders are adhered to	Make decisions on funding allocation through the participatory budgeting process	Can sit at allocation process as observers
STABLE STAFFING	Neighbourhood group staff reports to and receives feedback from the Coordinator		
CONFLICT RESOLUTION	Steering Committee acts as a conflict resolution body for disputes for both panels	Conflicts are resolved through the Steering Committee	Conflicts are resolved through the Steering Committee
ADVOCACY	Advocates for the interests of neighbourhood groups to varying levels of government; mobilizes with partners jointly	Responds to the advocacy directions of the Steering Committee; works jointly with the Board when called upon	Responds to the advocacy directions of the Steering Committee; works jointly with the Committee when called upon



Resources and Supports

The formalizing of resources and supports through written agreements and policies or procedures will facilitate the reliable, ongoing provision of resources and supports.



The Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework is based on the understanding that the City, neighbourhood groups and partner organizations, all have a part to play in supporting the neighbourhood group system, and all can be more successful through collaboration. The pathway to success is most effectively paved by ensuring that each participating group, agency or institution secures the resources and support required to fulfill its piece of the Framework. In tandem with this, each must be prepared to contribute by supporting other members.

The following table provides a list of the kinds of resources and supports that are helpful to neighbourhood groups, and indicates the roles that the City and other stakeholders must play in order to provide them. Many of these resources are already in place, offered informally or on an ad hoc basis, and would benefit from being formalized as options in the Framework.

The formalizing of resources and supports through written agreements and policies or procedures will facilitate the reliable, ongoing provision of resources and supports (see Appendix B for information on effective partnerships). The clarity of vision, principles and activity types that ground the Framework will lead to more focused use of current staff supports in a more consistent and predictable way, allowing the City to offer more support with the same amount of staff resources because the decision-making process is simplified. Also, the Neighbourhood Support Coalition, with its proposed expanded role, is well positioned to deliver or coordinate the flow of resources and supports (particularly where they would be distributed across, and relevant to, several neighbourhoods).

Many resources are listed in the table below. However, some resources were identified as being more important to the functions of the NSC and neighbourhood groups than others. Organizational development, insurance and access to space were identified as high-priority resources. The funds allocated to NSC for distribution through the participatory budgeting process are not included in this section, and are dealt with in the following section.

RESOURCE	DETAILS	ROLE OF NSC	ROLE OF CITY AND OTHER PARTNERS
ACCESS TO CITY HALL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring that NGs face minimal barriers accessing appropriate departments/staff/systems and services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSC would act as contact point for continuity (NG contacts NSC – NSC contacts City) NSC would act as an advocate for NG interests to the City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City identifies staff to assist NGs with system access/navigation within City depts. City staff contacts act as problem solvers
PERMITS/FAST TRACK FOR MUNICIPAL SERVICES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Related to above – City provides permits for community events, fast track for safety audits and other service requests from NGs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSC would act as contact point for continuity (NG contacts NSC – NSC contacts City) NSC would act as an advocate of NG interests to the City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City helps to identify staff to assist NGs with system access/navigation
SPACE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office space Meeting space Program space Storage space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSC would provide common meeting space at NSC office to be used by NGs NSC would work with NGs to define appropriate space. NSC would broker deals around space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners provide and/or negotiate appropriate space for NGs to use as required Partners seek new partners to support NGs in terms of space
INSURANCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For staff and programs Covers liability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSC would purchase group insurance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners explore the possibility of providing insurance to NGs under a partner’s liability insurance
STAFF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For questions and clarification For programming To assist with organizational development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSC could provide “staff/resource-sharing” function across groups/partners NSC has independent staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners assist in the sourcing of additional resources for NSC internal staff Partners provide resources to support NG programming staff Host provides staff resources to assist with the transition of the NSC
HUMAN RESOURCES SUPPORTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hiring committees Policies and procedures Conflict resolution Problem solving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSC would act as resource centre to share information and resources across groups NSC would engage in capacity building with NGs as needed NSC would act as mediator in conflicts and problems between NGs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners sit on hiring committee Partners advise on conflicts and problem solving when called upon Partners share information and resources with NSC
HOST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To allow individual NGs to apply for/operate grants In transition to incorporation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSC would seek out an appropriate and independent host during transition to incorporation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners support the sourcing of an independent host
AUDITING, BOOKKEEPING/ OTHER FINANCIAL SERVICES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Related to above Supports to NGs to develop capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSC could contract for services NSC could explore other economies of scale such as mass purchasing and resource sharing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners provide capacity building to NSC Partners provide templates and tools Partners advise on financial matters through the Partner Panel and NSC Steering Committee

RESOURCE	DETAILS	ROLE OF NSC	ROLE OF CITY AND OTHER PARTNERS
TEMPLATES/ GUIDELINES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear, short but thorough tools to use in planning and managing projects and funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Budgeting/financial management tools ◦ Inclusion ◦ Program Planning and Evaluation ◦ By-laws 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC could coordinate the templates and distribute to NGs • NSC could identify areas where new tools are needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners provide advisory support and templates
TRAINING/ MENTORING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills development for volunteers (program and governance), for staff, for NG overall, cultural competency, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC could be broker • NSC could have own staff as mentors • NGs mentor each other within NSC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners assist in the sourcing of trainers and mentors as needed
ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes short-term allocation of CDW/Health Promotion staff to support NGs with specific challenges and development strategies (outreach/ engagement/ board/committee development etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC could play a mentoring role • NSC could source funding for CDW work – including capacity building – to continue at NSC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners assists in sourcing additional resources for NSC CDW staff
RESEARCH/ INFORMATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic information on changing populations • Service inventories • System navigation info 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC could act as a resource centre for a collection of information • NSC could share information on web site • NSC could conduct additional research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners provide demographic data to NSC and NG on a regular basis • Partners provide other research relevant to NGs and the NSC
COMMUNICATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newsletters/flyers/Translation • Web site development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC could have one central web site • Economies of scale purchasing for materials and translation 	
SPECIAL PROJECTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint fundraising¹ • Engagement with city-wide initiatives • Communications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC could play a central role in leading NGs in special projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners seek NSC support for consultations (planning and development etc)

¹ Also see Federation of Calgary Communities Special Projects page at http://www.calgarycommunities.com/FCCServices/fccs_specialprojects.php



Allocation of Funding



It is anticipated that the NSC will acquire multiple sources of funding beyond the City of Guelph. For this purpose, funding will be allocated using multiple funding streams that reflect differences in funder objectives.

The current allocation process for financial resources has faced challenges in the past, but most participants in the consultation continued to see it as a good example of grassroots democratic practice and a tool for distributing funds to the neighbourhood groups in ways that can adjust quickly to changing needs and priorities.

The allocation process within the Framework maintains the values and benefits of a participatory budgeting process while addressing some of the current challenges of the process, in particular challenges around accountability and transparency. In the Framework, all NSC member neighbourhood groups must also sit on the Neighbourhood Panel. This Panel is responsible for making decisions during the allocation process and only those groups at the allocation table are able to receive funding.

It is anticipated that the NSC will acquire multiple sources of funding beyond the City of Guelph. For this purpose, funding will be allocated using multiple funding streams that reflect differences in funder objectives.

All neighbourhood groups are expected to comply with the vision and principles (outlined above) in order to undertake at least one of the activities indicated in the Framework and meet the operational criteria (outlined below) to receive City funding, or any other general funds allocated through the NSC.

Some funders, however, may have specific criteria that guide the allocation funding they provide. Health organizations, for example, may require that activities supported by funding from their contributions demonstrate a positive impact on health outcomes. Funding from such a group would also be allocated using participatory budgeting in the allocation process. Neighbourhood groups seeking those funds would have to make specific proposals relevant to that stream of funding and its objectives. Proposals for these funding streams would be assessed on the basis of their ability to meet the full range of relevant criteria and would be assessed relative to other neighbourhood groups seeking funding from that same stream.

Using multiple funding streams allows the NSC to use the participatory budgeting process in targeted ways that allows it to access other sources of funding and remain accountable to a variety of funders.

The revised allocation process will include greater disclosure of information from each group. Prioritization will be based on how the resources sought through the allocation process would serve the vision and principles outlined in the Framework, and meet any additional criteria applied by funders. To ensure that allocation respects these objectives, and is focused on the areas of greatest need and benefit, and to generate a greater sense of transparency and fairness, the neighbourhood groups will be required to disclose a variety of information prior to allocation including:

- An Annual Report that outlines:
 - Number of programs
 - Number of participants served
 - Number of volunteer hours
 - Membership and development of the group
 - Stories that highlight the success of neighbourhood groups and how they contribute to the principles
 - Community impact activities that the neighbourhood group undertook
- A Financial Report that includes:
 - Information about how the previous year's funds were spent
 - Report on any fundraising activities
 - Summary of current accounts, including amounts in each
- An Action Plan that describes:
 - Activities that the neighbourhood group plans on undertaking
 - Description of how these activities relate to the principles
 - Upcoming year's budget (costs and functions)
- Inclusion and Outreach Plan that outlines:
 - How the group will involve members of the neighbourhood
 - What approaches to engagement the group will be pursuing
- Size and boundaries of the group's catchment area

All groups will be given the opportunity to describe and explain their funding requests, allowing all groups to make informed and collective decisions about the relative merits of each proposal and the extent to which they fulfill the principles and criteria they are funded to pursue. To this end, neighbourhood groups will be permitted to ask budget related questions before and during allocation. Some individuals and groups may have more experience or may be more skilled at making the case for their programs, writing clear and convincing budgets, or telling stories. Among their duties, the NSC staff is to support groups to fully participate in the process, including providing training and capacity building to facilitate a level playing field at allocation. In order to avoid onerous demands on neighbourhood groups, NSC staff should also work to develop simple reporting tools and templates for proposals, action plans, financial reports and annual reports, to minimize administrative workloads and help to make presentations for different groups more commensurable.

Criteria

Neighbourhood groups will need to be able to demonstrate to the City, and other partners how the work they are doing contributes to broader external mandates.



The work of neighbourhood groups already furthers the goals and objectives of partner organizations including the City of Guelph. However, during the consultations there was widespread uncertainty about the reporting requirements of neighbourhood groups. Neighbourhood groups will need to be able to demonstrate to the City, and other partners how the work they are doing contributes to broader external mandates. The table below lists key criteria the City expects neighbourhood groups to meet. The criteria are essentially accountability mechanisms, designed to ensure that partner organizations, funders and residents have a clear understanding of the work neighbourhood groups do and how they contribute to quality of life in Guelph.

In order to be members of the NSC, neighbourhood groups will be required to meet these criteria. At the same time, the NSC will actively support neighbourhood groups in meeting them.

1. Following the Principles

On an annual basis, neighbourhood groups will be required to show how their activities further the core principles.

CRITERIA	WHAT IT INCLUDES	POTENTIAL SUPPORTS
REPRESENTATION ON NEIGHBOURHOOD PANEL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every neighbourhood group elects one representative to sit on NSC Neighbourhood Panel • Attendance requirements. • Voluntary representation on task forces and ad hoc committees • Fundraising collaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel meetings will provide an opportunity for neighbourhood groups to share and receive information about activities and events • NSC Panel meetings will deal with high level issues of concern to the NSC, as opposed to the day-to-day operations of the NSC and NGs • Childcare and transportation supports will be provided for attendance

2. Participation in the NSC

The effectiveness of the NSC as an organization depends on the participation of neighbourhood groups. Neighbourhood groups will be required to participate in the NSC via the Neighbourhood Panel and work with each other to provide support and mentorship.

CRITERIA	WHAT IT INCLUDES	POTENTIAL SUPPORTS
ACTION PLAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities that the NG will undertake (i.e. special events, programming, services, etc.) • Description of how these activities relate to the core principles • Upcoming year's budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC assistance in developing plans. • Templates
INCLUSION AND OUTREACH PLAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach activities that the NG plans to undertake to involve members of the neighbourhoods • Description of how the NG will ensure that its activities and operations are inclusive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC assistance in developing plans • Templates • Demographic information about the neighbourhood



3. Developing and Maintaining a Governance and Membership Structure

In order to remain accountable to their residents, neighbourhood groups will operate under a not-for-profit governance model.



CRITERIA	WHAT IT INCLUDES	POTENTIAL SUPPORTS
ELECTED BOARD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual elections • Outreach and inclusion to build membership • Open eligibility requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC assistance in holding elections • Mentorship around good governance • Templates (membership forms, agendas etc)
BYLAWS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bylaws filed with the NSC and available on group websites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC assistance in developing bylaws • Mentorship around good governance • Templates
MINUTES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups will make publicly available the minutes of their meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Templates
BOUNDARIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups will define the geographic areas they serve in their bylaws • When new groups form, they will work with the NSC to establish the boundaries of the area they will serve • The NSC Steering Committee will have final approval over boundaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC assistance determining boundaries when new groups are proposed and when existing groups propose changes to their boundaries • NSC guidelines about establishing boundaries. These guidelines might include rules around overlapping boundaries as well as minimum size requirements (in terms of both population and area).

4. Ongoing Reporting

Neighbourhood groups make real contributions to the well-being and quality of life in their neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood groups will produce annual reports about the types of activities they offered and some of the successes of these programs. As well, neighbourhood groups will make available information about their finances. Both reports will be made publicly available by a specified date determined by the NSC Board. It is expected that the deadline will take into account the allocation process dates so that these reports can be used during the process.

CRITERIA	WHAT IT INCLUDES	POTENTIAL SUPPORTS
ANNUAL REPORT MADE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of programs • Number of participants served • Number of volunteer hours • Membership and development of the group • Stories that highlight the success how the neighbourhood group contributes to the principles • Community impact activities that the NG undertook 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC assistance in writing the report • Reporting templates
ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT MADE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about how previous year funds were spent or saved • Report on any fundraising activities • Summary of current accounts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSC assistance in writing reports • Templates



Appendix A: Implementation Road Map

This document outlines some of the key strategies required for a transition to a sustainable process for neighbourhood engagement, including the establishment of the NSC as an autonomous organization capable of coordinating and supporting new and existing neighbourhood groups in Guelph.

The transition to an autonomous organization will take time and effort. It's important that neighbourhood groups continue to function during this period. Until the new NSC is fully established and is able to coordinate resources to groups including insurance, space and HR, the neighbourhood groups should continue to receive supports directly from the City and other partners.

The Implementation Road Map envisions two areas of action that will be implemented concurrently. In one area the NSC structure is built. In the other area, neighbourhood groups, working through the Neighbourhood Panel, work towards meeting the criteria laid out in the framework.

Building the NSC Structure

The following actions will support the establishment of an expanded NSC and identifies who will likely be responsible for carrying them out.

BRINGING PANELS TOGETHER

APPROXIMATE TIMELINE: JUNE 2010 TO FEBRUARY 2011

Actions:

- Current NSC Board becomes the Neighbourhood Panel
- Establish the Partnership Panel
- Elect representatives from the panels to sit on the NSC Steering Committee
- Host a founding meeting to elect members to the NSC Steering Committee
- NSC Terms of Reference becomes the basis of the constitution

Who:

- The City will take a lead role in bringing together the Partner Panel and developing its Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference should include protocols around electing representatives to the NSC Steering Committee.
 - The current NSC Board will become the Neighbourhood Panel.
 - It may be useful to set up a small task force of reps from both the Partner and Neighbourhood Panels which will establish the Terms of Reference for the NSC Steering Committee. Both Panels will have an opportunity to ratify the Terms of Reference.
-

FINDING A HOST ORGANIZATION

APPROXIMATE TIMELINE: JUNE 2010 TO FEBRUARY 2011

Actions:

- Secure resource commitments from City and other partners
- Develop criteria to guide decision-making around selecting a host organization
- Identify candidate organizations to host the NSC
- Engage in discussions between the Steering Committee and potential hosts to identify a suitable, willing candidate
- Develop a written agreement with the identified host organization

Who:

- Steering Committee with input from Panels
-

NEW NSC FUNCTIONS

APPROXIMATE TIMELINE: FEBRUARY 2011 TO FEBRUARY 2012

Actions:

- Revise implementation plan as needed for first two years of NSC in conjunction with the host organization
- Develop an operating budget for the NSC in conjunction with the host organization
- Start to flow financial resources to the host organization for the NSC's operating budget
- Transfer City's role as transfer agent of resources to the host organization
- Hire the NSC Coordinator
- Identify opportunities to bring on CDW staff as early staff team

Who:

- Steering Committee with input from Panels
-

PLANNING THE NSC

APPROXIMATE TIMELINE: DECEMBER 2010 TO JANUARY 2011

Actions:

- Resources continue to flow from the City and other partners
 - Take over insurance provision to neighbourhood groups
 - Hire CEC and CDW-like positions as appropriate
 - Enter into partnership agreements with various partners for resources to neighbourhood groups (i.e. space)
 - Implement and oversee allocation process
 - Support new and existing neighbourhood groups in their ability to meet the criteria
 - Mentor new neighbourhood groups and decide when and if they are able to become members
 - Make a decision about NSC becoming a stand-alone organization or entering into a more permanent relationship with a host organization
 - Establish new Terms of Reference for Panels and Steering Committee
-

Who:

- Steering Committee with input from Panels and NSC Coordinator
-



Neighbourhood Groups Meet the New Criteria

Concurrent with the development of the NSC structure, neighbourhood groups will work towards meeting the membership criteria outlined in the Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework. Until the NSC has fully established the Steering Committee, the Neighbourhood Panel will be responsible for ensuring that neighbourhood groups are working towards meeting the membership criteria. This means that the Neighbourhood Panel will have to work with partners to refine the details for meeting the criteria. As well, until the NSC is established, the Neighbourhood Panel will oversee and implement the funding allocation process. The Neighbourhood Panel may choose to establish committees to undertake aspects of this work.

CECs employed by the City will work with the Neighbourhood Panel (or established committee) to design templates and support new and existing neighbourhood groups in meeting the criteria. When the NSC is operational and has hired a coordinator, it will begin to deliver this assistance to neighbourhood groups. The NSC Steering Committee will also oversee and implement the funding allocation process once it is established

It is expected that neighbourhood groups will require a fairly robust level of support in meeting the criteria and that they will also have ample opportunity to provide feedback about the criteria.

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA

Actions: Participate on the Neighbourhood Panel

- Determine benchmarks of participation and attendance to continue to sit on Neighbourhood Panel and receive NSC supports and resources
- Elect representatives to the Steering Committee once established

Who:

- CECs develop tools, procedures and templates for these activities with the support of neighbourhood group representatives as members of the Neighbourhood Panel

Actions: Develop and maintain a governance and membership structure

- Develop templates and guidelines to support neighbourhood group governance including:
 - Elected Board Guidelines
 - Bylaws Templates
 - Minutes Templates
 - Boundaries Guidelines
- CECs will assist in the filling out of guidelines and templates
- Develop criteria for boundary negotiation
- Negotiate conflicting boundaries with Neighbourhood Panel (or Steering Committee if established)

Who:

- CECs develop tools, procedures and templates for these activities with the support of the Neighbourhood Panel or a designated committee will develop templates and guidelines around putting these structures in place
- Neighbourhood Panel will resolve boundary conflicts until the establishment of the Steering Committee

PAST ACTIVITY REPORTS (TO BE USED IN THE ALLOCATION PROCESS)

Actions: Annual reporting of past activities that is publicly available

- Develop templates based on existing activity reporting mechanisms to include:
 - Number of Programs
 - Number of Participants
 - Number of Volunteer Hours
 - Membership and Group Development Activities
 - Stories that highlight successes
- Develop templates based on existing financial reporting mechanisms to include:
 - Information about how previous year funds were spent or saved
 - Report on any fundraising activity
 - Summary of current accounts including amounts in each
- Develop tools for gathering the above information
- CECs will assist in the completion of the annual reports
- Neighbourhood panel will determine whether new reporting system is able to be used for the 2011 allocation process
- Allocation will include the opportunity to question and defend all aspects of the reports

Who:

- CECs develop tools, procedures and templates for these reports with the support of the Neighbourhood Panel or a designated committee. This will include tools for collecting data.
- CECs will provide direct assistance to groups in producing these reports
- The Neighbourhood Panel will determine when the first reports need to be prepared

UPCOMING ACTIVITY REPORTS (TO BE USED IN THE ALLOCATION PROCESS)

Actions: Action, Inclusion and Outreach Plans for activities in the upcoming year

- Develop Action Plan template that include:
 - Activities that the neighbourhood group plans to undertake in the upcoming year
 - Description of how these activities relate to the core principles
 - Estimated costs of offering these activities including staff resources and operating funds
- Develop Inclusion and Outreach Plan template that include:
 - Description of how the NG will ensure that its activities and operations are inclusive
 - Outreach activities that the NG plans to undertake
 - Estimated costs of offering these activities including staff resources and operational funds
- CECs will assist in the completion of the annual reports
- The City and other partners will develop a plan for providing demographic information to neighbourhoods
- Determine whether new reporting system is able to be used for the 2011 allocation process
- Allocation will include the opportunity to question and defend all aspects of the reports

Who:

- CECs, with the support of the Neighbourhood Panel or a designated committee, will develop templates and guidelines around producing these plans
- CECs will provide direct assistance to groups in producing these reports.
- The Neighbourhood Panel will determine when the first report needs to be prepared
- The City and other partners will provide research to neighbourhood groups around demographics in their neighbourhoods



Appendix B: Effective Partnerships

The Neighbourhood Engagement Framework is based on sound partnership principles focused on sustainable, reliable processes that support long-term successful partnerships.

Partnerships are an increasingly vital part of the public sector and of community development in particular. Partnerships enable participants to leverage their strengths and draw on the capacities of others. That leveraging can simply reflect the benefit of added participants with new resources, but can also draw on contrasting characteristics of organizations to enable them to apply a broader range of skills and assets and undertake actions neither could pursue alone.

The experience of neighbourhood groups in partnerships most closely resembles that of non-profits. Those partnerships often involve links to much larger, more formal organizations and the contrast in size, approach and power can be barriers to success. Particular efforts should be undertaken to ensure partnerships of this kind are sensitive to differences and keenly focused on shared goals and objectives. When they are well structured, these partnerships can combine the strengths, stability and resources of large organizations with the flexibility and responsiveness of small ones to produce exceptional benefits to communities. To help with the structuring of partnerships, it is proposed that neighbourhood groups develop brief partnership policies that outline some of the potential challenges that can arise.

Successes and Challenges of Partnerships

Literature on partnership development amongst non-profit organizations shows good partnership work is about clarity of expectations and roles, and mutual trust.

Many organizations face common challenges that strain partnerships and relationships. Partnerships sometimes break down in earlier stages if the commitments are unmet, if conflicts cannot be resolved or if organizations are not transparent about their reasons for participating. Some of the common problems identified can be condensed within the following general areas:

- Lack of clear communication between partners
- Conflict around goals and processes
- Lack of clarity around roles and decision-making
- Lack of adequate resources (time and money)
- Lack of motivation or organizational buy-in

The many challenges in the development of partnerships are overcome through a better understanding of the elements of successful partnerships. Some of the key elements of successful partnerships include the following factors:

- Creating shared vision, principles, expectations and processes
 - There is extensive evidence in the literature on partnerships based on general agreements that mask specific, critical areas of objectives and expectations. Knowing specifically what each party wants from the partnership, what each party believes it is designed to produce and what processes will be used to achieve those goals helps avoid those conflicts and determine with more certainty, up front, whether a partnership is appropriate.
- Respecting the needs, interests and constraints of both partners
 - Every partner has constraints. Some are non-negotiable. Successful partners accept each other's limitations and respect them, no matter how inconvenient they are.
- Building trust
 - Clarity and respect help to build trust. Most partnerships encounter difficulty. Planning for that occasion is helpful. Building confidence in the good will and commitment of each partner is also valuable in supporting efforts to navigate through difficult situations and facilitate the articulation of potential conflicts.
- Clear and consistent communication
 - Communications should be clear and frequent, and the person responsible for communication for all parties in the partnership, should be clearly identified. Vague communications produce divergent expectations and long silences allow those misunderstandings to broaden without being identified. Communications delivered to the wrong person can go astray in an organization and all parties become frustrated by the breakdown.
- Clarity around roles and responsibilities
 - Shared objectives are important but a clear understanding of the role and responsibility of each partner in achieving that goal is also critical. Shared duties should be avoided, making each partner wholly and specifically responsible for definable deliverables. The inconvenience of this level of rigour is more than offset by the conflicts and confusion avoided.
- Dedicated and appropriate resources
 - Obligations that lack the needed supports to meet them are counterproductive. If the available resources do not meet the objective, the objective has been poorly selected for that partnership. Partnerships rarely succeed if the plan cannot be resourced or the resources cannot support the plan.
- Accountability and transparency
 - Partnerships are more successful when problems are identified early and addressed. The more easily partners can assess the work of other parties and identify concerns the more effective that process is. The more willing all parties are to be accountable for those problems and to support their identification and discussion, the more readily they will be flagged and fixed.
- Evaluation and reporting systems
 - Systematic efforts to assess progress support accountability and transparency, but are more achievable and reliable when supported by clearly established record keeping and reporting.
- Acknowledgement and celebration
 - Partnerships are hard work. Acknowledging and celebrating the efforts of all partners rewards that effort. It also builds trust and encourages openness.

Partnerships Phases

START UP

At the beginning of any partnership, the participants should agree clearly on goals and objectives, expected outcomes and the processes to be used. Commitments of resources should be clearly provided. Specific responsibilities, including communication, monitoring and reporting should be assigned. While these agreements need not be long or formal, they should be clear and specific and should be written down and approached formally by both parties.

CONSOLIDATION

Partnership agreements are not, and should not be, immutable. The start up agreement should lay out specific expectations but these expectations may change with time and experience in the partnership. It is appropriate and desirable to adjust the agreement to reflect changing priorities once the partners can agree on appropriate changes.

CONTINUATION

Renewal and confirmation should happen regularly. Without a regular review, incremental changes that should affect the agreement can be overlooked and the agreement can become outdated and ill-suited to the current state of the partnership.

WRAP UP

Not all partnerships should go on forever. Regular reviews should include an assessment of whether or not the partnership is still relevant and the goals remain a sufficiently high priority for the partners to justify the commitment of resources.

Appendix C: Literature Review

LITERATURE REVIEW

“New Governance,” “Coproduction” and “CCIs”

Recently, public policy in Canada, the UK and the US has begun to emphasize the importance of neighbourhood level representation for encouraging participation in the planning and delivery of services and connecting residents to local government. In some cases, local governments may choose to officially recognize already existing neighbourhood-based organizations such as neighbourhood associations or develop new structures and organizations for facilitating resident participation. In other cases, local governments may not officially recognize neighbourhood-based groups, but may consult with them as representatives of neighbourhood interests.

In part, this shift can be understood as a component of “new governance” and a shift away from bureaucratic models of service delivery (Fagotto & Fung 2006).

These efforts are the most recent expression of public policies dating back decades that focus on neighbourhood-led service delivery, including “coproduction” and “comprehensive community initiatives” (CCIs).

Coproduction is defined as a model of service delivery in which current or potential users of existing or planned services actively participate in the planning and delivery of those services (Kathi & Cooper 2005).

Coproduction usually occurs through collaboration or partnership between community members and/or community associations and local service agencies and/or government bodies. It can also include community leaders and other who have networks and relationships with potential service users.

Coproduction is found in a number of areas, from prevention programs that target families, to recreation and leisure services, to crime prevention and neighbourhood revitalization.

When the idea and practice of coproduction first emerged, it was thought that the involvement of citizens in the planning and delivery of services would lead to reduced service costs and/or increased levels of services provided for no extra spending. From a cost-benefit perspective, either one or both would have made municipalities more productive (Thomas 1987). For example, if coproduction enabled municipalities to replace paid staff labour in the delivery of recreation programs with volunteer labour, then the municipality should be able to save money.

Comprehensive community initiatives (CCIs) are undertaken in specific neighbourhoods and



attempt to address widespread social issues such as poverty. CCIs take a broad, multi-sectoral approach to these issues and attempt to create social change by empowering local community members. CCIs strategies tend to be focused on building community capacity so that long-term social change can be sustained (Leviten-Reid 2006).

Well established in the 70s, loss of funding eroded their role and presence. Recently, the Government of Canada and philanthropic organizations such as the United Way in Canada are exploring resident-led models of community development through programs such as Action for Neighbourhood Change.

Coproduction and Neighbourhood-led Strategies as Direct Cost Saving Measures

John Clayton Thomas (1987) examined coproduction between neighbourhood organizations and the City of Cincinnati, Ohio. Neighbourhood groups organized volunteers to do occasional cleanup and maintenance. In a few instances, neighbourhood associations were also responsible for administering specific services including recreation centers and neighbourhood health clinics. However, Thomas (1987) found that coproduction was, for the most part limited to services that did not require professional expertise and were not considered 'essential' (i.e. sanitation, fire and police protection).

Because coproduction was limited to peripheral municipal services it did not lead to overall savings for the city, but rather was used to augment core functions.

In fact, the new role of neighbourhood associations led the city to increase spending to support the associations. While costs did not go down, observers found that service levels did increase through coproduction.

There is some evidence that coproduction in some services may lead to a better use of resources. Goldstein estimated that an increase in the involvement of community members in crime prevention of 5 to 10 per cent could be more successful than a 50 to 60 per cent increase in police officers. (Goldstein 1977 cited in Brudney 1984).

Other Benefits of Neighbourhood-led Service Delivery

SERVICE RELEVANCE, EFFECTIVENESS AND PARTICIPATION

Perhaps more significantly, coproduction has been found to increase the effectiveness of services.

Thomas and Brudney found that increased neighbourhood involvement led services to becoming better tailored and more responsive to neighbourhood needs, without imposing greater costs (Thomas 1987, Brudney 1991, 1984).

Marschall and Berry et al. (1993) point out that by encouraging the participation of residents in the planning and delivery of services, municipalities may be able to deliver services that are better attuned to the needs and realities of communities (see also Marschall 2004). Through resident participation service providers can gain a better understanding of the neighbourhood, its particular issues and needs and then hopefully tailor services to address local issues (Marschall 2004).

In Ontario, the Better Beginning and Better Future Project has also demonstrated that significant benefits can be produced through community-based universal projects that involve local residents in project development and planning. Peters et al., (2003) found significant improvements in children's

social-emotional functioning and physical health, parenting behaviours, and neighbourhood and school characteristics. As well, through the program, locally developed organizations were formed, which in turn facilitated resident participation as well as partnerships with other organizations.

Efforts to produce services that engage residents and reflect their priorities are seen as more likely to enhance participation. Frisby and Millar (2002) argue that seeking to better attune services to resident needs increased participation in planning and organizing services.

Broader Benefits

COMMUNITY, SOCIAL CAPITAL AND COLLECTIVE EFFICACY

The growth of community organizations as responsive service providers not only improves the services provided but can have broader and more significant effects.

Neighbourhood-based organizations geared toward improving the quality of life in their neighbourhoods may offer services and activities, but also provide information to residents, alert residents to plans and decisions that will affect their neighbourhood and generally attempt to build a sense of community by bringing residents together (Donnelly & Kimble 2006).

Neighbourhood-based organizations are also expected to increase social interaction and sense of community among residents (Chaskin 2005).

In their examination of a healthy communities initiative in South Western Ontario, Arai and Pedlar (1997) found that participation led to the development of community. Participants reported that through their involvement they received the opportunity for shared learning, developed camaraderie with others, received the opportunity to contribute to community and that their knowledge about the community and their fellow community members was enhanced.

Chavis and Wandersman (1990) point out that the relationship between participation and a sense of community works in both directions and that a sense of community can “be both a cause and effect of local action” (73). When residents have a sense of community, they have more incentive to participate in local action. (Chavis & Wandersman 1990).

In their extensively cited work on neighbourhood participation, Berry et al. (1993) argued that neighbourhoods with strong organizations tend to have higher levels of participation.

As a by-product of their work, neighbourhood organizations can provide a venue for the development of trusting relationships among community members and build the capacity of social networks by sharing information, mobilizing residents and encouraging participation (Fagotto & Fung 2006).

Neighbourhood organizations can provide a forum for developing positive relationships among community members (Derksen & Nelson 1995).

For Fagotto and Fung (2006)– strong organizations are especially important in neighbourhoods with low socio-economic status because they can offset other barriers to participation.

According to Chaskin (2001), a sense of community “reflects a degree of connectedness among members and a recognition of mutuality of circumstance...” (296). This connectedness can contribute to community confidence and social capital – networks of trust relationships within the community.

In neighbourhoods where there is mutual trust and solidarity, there may also be a willingness to deal with issues of common concern through informal means.

In their groundbreaking studies of Chicago neighbourhoods, Robert Sampson et al. (1997) focused on this combination of social cohesion and a willingness to act, referring to it as “collective efficacy”. Sampson et al. (1997) were able to show that neighbourhoods with high levels of collective efficacy had lower levels of violent crime.

But as Sampson et al.’s research suggests, organizations trying to reach out to neighbourhoods with concentrated disadvantage and residential instability will face more challenges. It will be harder for these organizations to tap into existing networks, primarily because they won’t be as prevalent. These organizations will have to carefully consider their strategies for creating a sense of community and building social capital.

Collective efficacy is closely related to community resiliency. Resiliency refers to a neighbourhood’s ability to cope with stress or crisis. When collective efficacy is present it follows that residents are more equipped to deal with pressure. However, resilient communities are characterized by more than the presence of collective efficacy. In her work on resilient communities, Sherri Torjman (2007) unpacks the concept and contends that resiliency is contingent on actions and interventions carried out in four linked domains: sustenance, adaptation, engagement and opportunity. In the sustenance domain basic needs such as housing and food are fulfilled. Activities and interventions in the adaptation domain focus on skills, capacities and resources that are needed to adapt. These can include literacy skills and social capital. In the engagement domain, interventions and actions remove the barriers to and create opportunities for participation in the social life of communities. In the opportunity domain, individuals have the ability to participate and benefit from economic opportunities. Neighbourhood-based organizations often work within and across these domains.

In the recent trend towards establishing neighbourhood-based governance structures, the coproduction model is still present but with an emphasis on increasing participation by creating new structures for residents to organize themselves and participate in the design and delivery of services as well as the policy process.

Again though, it’s important to emphasize that simply creating these structures and organizations will not increase participation, and as the literature demonstrates, a number of organizations struggle to ensure broad participation, work with other organizations, work with municipalities and secure the resources they need to sustain themselves. Neighbourhood organizations have to be intentional in the ways they try to encourage participation and pay attention to barriers.

Public Sector Economic Benefits

The literature has also found that paying attention to the needs of the community in service delivery and design can yield benefits for the public purse.

In the literature on community health, economic and social factors are regarded as important determinants of health. Economic and social factors are also correlated with social capital, and in at least one study those with social and community ties have been found to be at less risk for death (Roussos & Fawcett 2000). As well, Frankish et al. (1992) cite a number of sources that point to the key influence social support and social relationships have on a person’s health.

After 10 years of research, Browne et al. (2001a) have been able to show that community-based services that address some of the inequalities that can determine health outcomes pay for themselves in a year in terms of savings to the health care system. These services don’t have to be specific health care services to produce this effect, but are also be found in recreations services, volunteer centres or schools.

In another study by Browne et al. (2001b) sole support parents on social assistance were offered a range of services. One group received recreational services (for children), one received employment services, one received health promotion and one received a comprehensive suite of all three. In the group that received the comprehensive care package, there were 15 per cent more exits from social assistance than groups that did not receive any additional services. As well the group that received the recreation services was 10 per cent more likely to exit social assistance and was more likely to stay in the program over longer period than those who received only health promotion supports.

Challenges Faced by Neighbourhood-based Organizations and Guidance Offered in the Literature

Almost universally, literature on benefits from neighbourhood-led services, community organizations and social capital recognize that simply establishing structures does not inevitably lead to the formation of social capital nor the growth and health of the community.

The development of effective, beneficial community groups requires attention to both the challenge inherent in that effort and the goals being pursued through that effort.

NEIGHBOURHOOD CONTEXT

Neighbourhood context refers to the broad social and economic factors that can impact the existence of networks of trust and solidarity.

For example – resident instability (characterized by high rates of mobility, low rates of home ownership) can make it difficult to establish social ties among neighbours. (Chaskin 2001, Marschall 2004 citing Sampson 1988).

For a neighbourhood organization that is trying to increase participation and build community capacity, neighbourhood context is an important factor that can not only influence what the goals and strategies of the association are going to be, but can also impact an association's ability to reach out to residents.

Since the factors affecting the formation of networks (i.e. structure of the regional economy, migration and unequal distribution of resources to communities) are a product of broader systems, they may not be easily changed by neighbourhood -level interventions (Chaskin 2001). Community groups are often poorly positioned to address those barriers directly.

Similarly, as Chaskin (2001) points out, efforts explicitly directed at creating networks and social capital are unlikely to succeed because “one cannot legislate friendship” (319). However, neighbourhood-based organizations can direct their efforts at some of the barriers to social capital and network formation, which also address explicit community concerns, such as safety and physical revitalization efforts. By working on these issues, neighbourhood-based organizations may be able to indirectly foster the formation of networks by linking residents around issues that motivate them and applying their efforts to barriers that inhibit greater engagement.

Put simply, one way to get people to engage is by making sure they address issues of importance to them. Being responsive to neighbourhood context is therefore critical to the success of community organizations – one size does not fit all.

Researchers have recognized the potential of recreation and leisure services to connect to community need and aspiration and to foster group relationships, participation and generally contribute to life satisfaction (Arai & Pedlar 1997 citing Allen 1991).

PARTICIPATION

Fagotto and Fung's (2006) case study of a neighbourhood revitalization program in Minneapolis highlights the issue of participation. Though neighbourhood groups created an opportunity for residents to get involved in planning their communities, they tended to mostly attract homeowners. There was a lack of broad participation.

Fagotto and Fung (2006) found four possible explanations for this:

- The aim of the program – to improve neighbourhood quality – affected homeowners most directly.
- The way in which people were expected to participate (hold office, attend meetings) limited participation.
- There were cultural and linguistic barriers to participation.
- Not everyone had the time and resources to allow them to participate.

Lack of participation or uneven participation can have a negative impact on the ability of organizations to establish themselves as credible representations of communities when dealing with external organizations.

Even where credibility is assured through formal recognition by the city, a lack of participation could threaten the organization's legitimacy in the eyes of its constituents reducing public confidence and limiting the capacity for renewal, causing leaders to become entrenched.

These challenges are often addressed by intentional focus on growing participation through active engagement and a concentrated effort to focus on matters relevant to all constituencies. Fagotto and Fung (2006) suggest that organizations develop agendas that are relevant to a broad range of community members (i.e. schools and crime) – not just issues affecting narrow groups such as homeowners.

Chaskin (2003) notes that organizations that are focused broadly on relevant issues should go out and actively organize around them. Chaskin's (2003) study of three different systems of neighbourhood governance revealed that a common weakness was incomplete representation. Though these organizations considered civic engagement a strength and saw themselves providing an opportunity for participation, in the absence of active efforts to increase engagement, participation remained narrow.

Chaskin (2003) describes three characteristics of an effective process that seeks to address some of the barriers to participation:

- Broad, ongoing and active communication
- Needs to be perceived as accessible by those wishing to participate
- Allow for meaningful input

Fagotto and Fung (2006) explore the use of formal "Participation Agreements" with funders and sponsors to encourage active engagement by requiring groups to specify how the community group would encourage diverse participation.

Frisby and Millar (2002) point out that encouraging participation of marginalized residents meant paying particular attention to establishing a relationship of trust in the process, as a precursor to engagement.

It is worth noting that even where participation issues remain unresolved, broadly applicable community benefits can be achieved. In their examination of Minneapolis community groups, Fagotto and Fung (2006) note that, although participation was predominately homeowners, expenditures did actually respond to broader neighbourhood need.

PERSONAL BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION

There are a number of reasons why individuals may not participate. Common barriers include unfamiliarity with established decision-making processes as well as cultural barriers or those related to social class (Derksen & Nelson 1995). These kinds of barriers can sometimes be exacerbated in situations where there is a power imbalance, and authority figures are not actively seeking to overcome it.

In Frisby and Millar (2004), engaging women with low incomes in a collaborative planning process meant addressing issues like asymmetrical power relations, different and sometimes competing agendas, tensions between municipal demands and unfamiliarity on the part of staff, with their new role as facilitator.

In these settings, leadership often works better in this context when it is not provided in a traditional top down model but is shared and focuses on supporting members to allow them to work together effectively (Vail 2007).

RELATIONSHIPS WITH MUNICIPALITIES AND SPONSORING AGENCIES

The relationship of a municipality to neighbourhood based organizations can take a number of forms. In some cases, neighbourhood-based organizations may be officially recognized and supported by the city. In other cases, neighbourhood-based organizations simply exist on their own without any municipal recognition or funding.

In Fagotto and Fung (2006), even though groups were officially recognized and funded by the City of Minneapolis, groups still struggled to develop relationships with various City departments. In fact, the authors found that whether or not a neighbourhood group had a relationship with a City department depended more on whether an individual in that department had a propensity to work with groups.

Frisby et al. (2004) examined leisure service departments in ten Canadian cities. They found that while leisure service departments were expected to form partnerships with both non-profit and for-profit entities in order to save money – many lacked the capacity to successfully manage these partnerships.

These tensions are not exclusively the result of the actions and approaches of municipal staff. In certain situations, neighbourhood organizations may see the municipalities as allies, in others they may be perceived as opponents to the changes neighbourhood organizations advocate for (Logan & Robravic 1990). This same tension could exist with any funding agency.

As well, where governments actively establish neighbourhood based organizations, there is a danger that the rules set out by the government will constrain the ability of these organizations (Taylor 2003).

Some research has noted a lack of clear municipal policies relating to partnership and collaboration (Fagotto & Fung 2006).

Staff and community members can work together to overcome some of the individual barriers to participation, but must focus on working with communities using a collaborative approach.

In Powell and Nelson (1997) and Derksen and Nelson (1995) the authors examined the lifecycles of four neighbourhood centres that were all created by a single agency. Derksen and Nelson found throughout the development of these centres, different phases were marked by similar tensions between staff and community members.

In the initial stages, it was common for community members to feel that staff were exerting too much control. At the same time, though, community members also appreciated the support provided by staff (Derksen & Nelson 1995) and found that staff had played a crucial role in bringing people together and helping them work collaboratively (Powell & Nelson 1997).

Over time, staff began to develop more of an awareness about potential barriers to participation. Staff began to more consciously adjust to residents needs by changing the language they used, and their dress and jargon. As well they started to address some of the structural barriers to participation such as childcare costs and other costs (Derksen and Nelson 1995). This research suggests that despite some conflicts, internal stable staff resources may be a necessary resource for initiating neighbourhood based organizations.

Other research has also highlighted the important role that external staff play for neighbourhood-based organizations. In looking at citywide neighbourhood governance systems and their ability to engage residents, Berry et al. (1993) found the presence of city staff that assist groups to be a key resource. In cases where the neighbourhood group/sponsor relationship is structured as a partnership, research has also shown that having “the right people in place” is critical (Stoney & Elgersma 2007). Frequent staff turnovers as well as staff not having enough dedicated time to work on partnerships can make it difficult to build relationships (Leviton-Reid 2006).

Successful accommodation of the collaborative decision making and inclusive, supportive models required for community work are used by staff in many communities but a conscious effort to ensure that approach is often required. Appropriate policies and training to support collaborative approaches by city staff is needed.

ACCOUNTABILITY

The relationship between sponsoring agencies and neighbourhood groups may be stymied by different ideas about accountability.

Frisby and Millar (2002) noted that one of the challenges in developing networks of trust between a marginalized populations and service professionals was coming to terms with multiple accountabilities. Professionals faced pressures from their departments or agencies to account for money spent. Working with residents requires a shift in focus away from the bottom line towards thinking about intangible benefits that one might get out of a different process.

Chaskin (2003) points out that community group accountability runs in two directions:

- Formal accountability to funders/sponsors to be answerable for how funds were spent.
- Accountability to the community.

In terms of accountability to the community, Chaskin (2003) recommends that while organizations need to recognize the time it takes to create a sense of ownership and build engagement, they should also try to focus on short term successes that will help to establish trust in the organization and spur accountability.

BRIDGING AND BONDING

Larsen et al (2004) note that community capacity is sometimes isolating. Narrow groups focused on their own needs can amass social capital in ways that are not beneficial to the community broadly.

The establishment of broad networks of accountability is critical to the long term success of groups in supporting the community,

The connection to networks is often referred to in the literature as “bridging social capital”, which connects groups to those outside their ranks, and contrasts with the “bonding social capital” that holds groups together.

Chaskin (2003) also notes that neighbourhood-based organizations “operate within a local ecology of organizations and inter-organizational relationships that help define and condition their work and influence” (163).

Neighbourhood governance can't be confined to one organization – instead it can operate through a number of structures and organizations that may collaborate or may compete. Effective community development requires inter-organizational capacity, and an accountability to legitimate representative groups in the area, by working with partners as well as funders and patrons.

CONCLUSION

Neighbourhood-led service delivery has taken many forms over the years. While there is an ongoing attraction to the model, it is not a panacea. Neighbourhood-led service delivery is not an effective tool for reducing municipal spending on services. The cost of supporting and developing community groups, the need for more flexible models of municipal staff engagement with groups and the impact of potential increases in use are likely to mitigate direct fiscal benefits from community-led service delivery.

However, neighbourhood-led services do have the capacity to improve service quality and effectiveness. In particular, neighbourhood-led services have the capacity to be more attuned to community needs, more relevant, more responsive and more welcoming than services provided by professional staff.

These service improvements can and often do enhance participation and engagement of community members as well, providing more opportunities to create social networks and develop social capital.

Increased social capital can lead to stronger, healthier communities. Social capital formation is linked to lower crime rates and improved health outcomes.

These outcomes do have a fiscal impact, offsetting health costs and costs associated with the justice system. Neighbourhood-led services can also have a positive impact on public finance through reduced use of benefits and social services resulting from improved health and stability of households benefiting from more relevant, responsive and appropriate services.

These benefits can be significant, but are not reliably produced by the introduction of neighbourhood-led service delivery.

Effective neighbourhood-led service delivery is complex and often elusive. A wide variety of barriers obstruct the growth of participation, successful relations with funders and supporting organizations and the stability of the organizations themselves.

Even the establishment of stable sustainable organizations does not ensure the benefits associated with community development, social capital and collective efficacy.

Neighbourhood-led services must be designed and operated in ways that deliberately pursue those benefits in tandem with the delivery of the primary service area. Successfully combining those functions in a conscious fashion is likely to increase the effectiveness of both functions – ensuring that the services are more relevant and better utilized and the community development functions are attractive and engaging rather than abstract.

Achieving these goals requires attention to several challenges common to community oriented programming.

The strategy for neighbourhood-led services, including the community development components, must be responsive to the context. The specific challenges and assets present and relevant to the community should be the focal point. These priorities will shift over time and will vary among sub-groups within the community, often forcing an “opportunity driven” approach.

Efforts to respond to the community context must be rooted in an active effort to reach out and engage the broad range of community members. Social capital that bonds groups together should be combined with “bridging social capital” to link groups to those beyond their membership and ensure accountability to the broader community.

Outreach and engagement of the broader community is likely to be more successful for community groups that recognize a range of community assets, build on those assets and generate a variety of short term successes to sustain engagement and confirm for participants that meaningful benefits are achievable through community process.

Bridging social capital and efforts to include the broad range of community members requires a conscious effort at shared leadership and supportive collaboration on the part of community leaders and especially municipal staff and funders.

REFERENCES

- Arai, S. M. & Pedlar, A. M. (1997). Building community through leisure: Citizen participation in a Healthy Communities Initiative. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29 (2), 167-182.
- Berry, J.M., Portney, K.E., & Thomson, K. (1993). *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute.
- Browne, G., Byrne, C., Roberts, J., Gafni, A. & Whittaker, S. (2001). When the bough breaks: provider-initiated comprehensive care is more effective and less expensive for sole-support parents on social assistance. *Social Science & Medicine*, 53, 1697-1710.
- Browne, G., Roberts, J., Byrne, C., Gafni, A., Weir, R. & Majumdar, B. (2001). The costs and effects of addressing the needs of vulnerable populations: results of 10 years of research. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 33 (1), 65-76.
- Brudney, J.L. (1984). Local coproduction of services and the analysis of municipal productivity. *Urban Affairs Review*, 19, 465-484.
- Brudney, J.L. (1985). Coproduction: issues in implementation. *Administration and Society*, 17 (3), 243-256.
- Chaskin, R. J. (2001). Building community capacity: a definitional framework and case studies from a comprehensive community initiative. *Urban Affairs Review*, 26 (3), 291-323.
- Chaskin, R.J. (2003). Fostering neighborhood democracy: legitimacy and accountability within loosely coupled systems. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32 (2), 161-189.
- Chavis, D.M. & Wandersman, A. (1990). Sense of community in the urban environment: a catalyst for participation and community development. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18 (1), 55-81.
- Cooper, T.L. & Kathi, P.C. (2005). Neighborhood councils and city agencies: a model of collaborative coproduction. *National Civic Review*, 94 (1), 43-53.
- Derksen, B. & Nelson, G. (1995). Partnerships between community residents and professionals: issues of power and social class across the lifespan of neighbourhood organizations. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, 14 (1), 61-77.
- Donnelly, P.G. & Kimble, C.E. (2006). An evaluation of the effects of neighbourhood mobilization on community problems. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 32 (1/2), 61-80.
- Fagotto, E. & Fung, A. (2006). Empowered participation in urban governance: the Minneapolis neighborhood revitalization program. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30 (3), 638-655.
- Frankish, C. J., Milligan, C.D., & Reid, C. (1998). A review of relationships between active living and determinants of health. *Social Science Medicine*, 47 (3), 287-301.
- Frisby, W. & Millar, S. (2002). The actualities of doing community development to promote the inclusion of low income populations in local sport and recreation. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 2(3), 209-233.
- Frisby, W., Thibaut, L. & Kikulis, L. (2004). The organizational dynamics of under-managed partnerships in leisure service departments. *Leisure Studies*, 23 (2), 109-126.

- Glover, T.D. (2002). Citizenship and the production of public recreation: is there an empirical relationship? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34 (2), 204-231.
- Larsen, L., Harlan, S.L., Bolin, B., Hackett, E.J., Hope, D., Kirby, A., Nelson, A., Rex, T.R. & Wolf, S. (2004). Bonding and bridging: understanding the relationship between social capital and civic action. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24 (64-77).
- Levine, C.H. (1984). Citizenship and service delivery: the promise of coproduction. *Public Administration Review*, 44 (Special Issue), 178-189.
- Leviten-Reid, E. (2006). Asset-based, resident-led neighbourhood development, The Caledon Institute of Social Policy.
- Logan, J. R. and Rabrenovic, G. (1990). Neighborhood associations: their issues, their allies, and their opponents. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 26 (68), 68-94.
- Marschall, M.J. (2004). Citizen participation and the neighbourhood context: a new look at the coproduction of local public goods. *Political Research Quarterly*, 57 (2), 231-244.
- Nelson, G., Pancer, S.M., Hayward, K. and Kelly, R. (2004). Partnerships and participation of community residents in health promotion and prevention: experiences of the Highfield Community Enrichment Project (Better Beginnings, Better Futures). *Journal of Health Psychology*, 9 (2), 213-227.
- Peters, R.D., Petrunka, R. & Arnold, R. (2003). The Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project: a universal, comprehensive, community-based prevention approach for primary school children and their families. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 32 (2), 215-227.
- Pill, M. (2007). What rationales are driving neighbourhood governance initiatives in the US and UK. Presented at "The Vital City" European Urban Research Association, University of Glasgow, 12-14 September 2007.
- Powell, B. & Nelson, G. (1997). The cultivation of neighbourhood centers: a lifecycle model. *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 28 (1), 25-42.
- Roussos, S. T. & Fawcett, S. B. (2000). A review of collaborative partnerships as a strategy for improving community health, *Annual Review of Public Health*, 21, 369-402.
- Sampson, R.J., Raudenbush, S.W. & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: a multi-level study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277, 918-924.
- Taylor, M. (2003). Neighbourhood governance: Holy grail or poisoned chalice? *Local Economy*, 18 (3), 190-195.
- Thomas, J.C. (1987). Neighborhood coproduction and municipal productivity. *Public Productivity Review*, 42, 95-105.
- Torjman, S. (2007). *Shared Space: The Communities Agenda*. Ottawa: The Caledon Institute of Social Policy.
- Vail, S. E. (2007). Community development and sport participation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21, 571-596.
- Vandebelt, D. (2003). Involvement of citizens and neighbourhood groups in municipal decision-making: a review of the literature. A Report for Region of Waterloo Public Health, Planning and Evaluation Program.

Appendix D: Environmental Scan

The following environmental scan includes 3 parts: Neighbourhood Group and Policy History, Community Profiles, and Neighbourhood Group Summaries.

Environmental Scan – Neighbourhood Group and Policy History

Neighbourhood groups exist because of the hard work of resident volunteers and other stakeholders with an interest in the neighbourhood. In each case, they form around a specific interest or issue that brings an affinity group together. Over the history of neighbourhood groups in Guelph, various strategies and plans have set the contexts in which neighbourhood groups have formed, changed, and been supported by the City of Guelph and other partners.

The role of partners has been crucial to the development of neighbourhood groups, and their importance is emphasized in many policies. Early in the history of neighbourhood groups (Vision 2007, and the Neighbourhood Partnership Policy), developing and maintaining partnerships with agencies and organizations was central to making neighbourhood groups more sustainable. Partners have played a variety of important roles around leadership support, administrative assistance, program development, supplies, donations, and space. The City of Guelph and Family and Children Services have traditionally been lead partners (sometimes referred to as sponsoring agencies) through their consistent funding, staffing and policy support to neighbourhood groups and the Neighbourhood Support Coalition. The influence of the City and Family and Children Services on the development of neighbourhood groups is evident in the policies described below.

The following is a brief exploration of significant plans and policies that have shaped the relationship between the City of Guelph and neighbourhood groups, particularly those that participate in the Neighbourhood Support Coalition.



Neighbourhood Group History

VISION 2007 (1997)

Vision 2007 set aside the initial funding and support for the Neighbourhood Support Coalition (NSC) and created a venue to share community needs and issues. Many of the initial groups coalesced around a shared perception of local need. The Vision 2007 policy created the space for neighbourhoods groups to continue to deliver recreational and leisure programs in partnership with the City and the Parks and Recreation department by encouraging Parks and Recreation to shift away from direct service delivery to community development support – an approach that the policy defined as a “Community Development Service Model”. To clarify: the city would engage in community development by working in collaboration with local, community-led groups to deliver services and programs to the neighbourhoods. The vision document emphasizes that neighbourhood group involvement should represent the diversity of the community (cultures, incomes, age groups). The responsibility for supporting the development of new neighbourhood groups was placed on the NSC.

The 5 initial groups (Onward Willow, Parkwood Woods, Waverley, Two Rivers, and Brant Avenue) have remained the largest groups in terms of the number of volunteers that support the work of the group, program and event participants, and partners. These groups, as described above, formed in response to a perceived lack of activities or programs in their neighbourhoods. Out of the initial groups, Onward, Parkwood, and Waverley are the largest and most established groups – according to the definition of size above – and are delivering more programs focused on identified community needs for groups that face barriers accessing information, programs, services, and supports. Brant and Two Rivers are the two smallest of the 5 initial groups, and have the fewest community needs based programs. While existing groups were focused on the continuation of their programs and services, no new groups joined the NSC under the Vision 2007 policy.

CITY OF GUELPH – NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP POLICY (2001)

In 2001, the City of Guelph expanded the notion of delivering recreational programs using a community development approach with the development of a Neighbourhood Partnership Policy. This expansion brought in the specific objectives of increasing citizen participation and wellness, and developing community capacity and leadership. To these ends, the City committed to supporting groups offering recreational programs, leadership or capacity building, the delivery of creative programs and accessible programs. The City would also assist in the development of new neighbourhood groups rather than leaving this function solely to the NSC. The policy also defines the various levels of engagement with neighbourhood groups in terms of the resource scale (based on the level of resources and types of supports from the City and the organization’s resources from other sources). The latter two points likely led to the inclusion of a series of new neighbourhood groups into the NSC.

Six new neighbourhood groups joined the NSC between 2004 and 2007 (Clairfields, Exhibition Park, Grange Hill East, Hanlon Creek, Kortright Hills, and West Willow Woods). These groups began under the existing 2001 Neighbourhood Partnership Policy. Many of these groups were initiated to address issues specific in their communities, but have since shifted their focus to mostly recreational program delivery. The continued emphasis on recreational programs in the Partnership Policy supported this shift in focus with newly emerged neighbourhood groups. The newer groups that joined the NSC in this period are more likely to offer recreational and social type programming than the initial groups and tend to be smaller in terms of number of participants and volunteers. Their neighbourhoods are generally newer (in terms of construction and development) and wealthier with the possible exceptions of West Willow Woods that has pockets of poverty and big ethno-cultural

diversity. Grange Hill East has also delivers programs that provide social supports to meet the needs of their neighbourhood. Exhibition Park also has pockets of poverty, is an older community, but all programming is focused on recreational activities and events. The implementation of a resource scale for the funding of neighbourhood groups through the NSC further allowed groups at various stages of program development and community engagement to become involved with the NSC and begin receiving supports (including those groups that had not yet received funds through the NSC). This potentially allowed for the inclusion of groups that prior to 2001 may have been unable to join the NSC until they had a reached a more expansive level of programming.

FAMILY AND CHILDREN SERVICES – SERVICE AGREEMENT (2002)

Family and Children Services (FACS) (funded by the Province of Ontario) and the City of Guelph drafted an agreement in 2002 to allow for the provision of Community Development Workers (CDWs) to support neighbourhood groups and the NSC in outreach and program delivery in areas determined to be in highest need (Brant Avenue, Onward Willow, Parkwood Gardens, Two Rivers, Waverley, West Willow Woods). CDWs support programs in those neighbourhoods, in particular those geared to child poverty and abuse prevention. Those neighbourhood groups which are currently delivering the most programs and services geared toward community need are doing so with the support of FACS' CDWs. Those groups without FACS support are less likely to be engaging in the delivery of those types of programs and more likely to be focused on delivering recreational, social and event type programming.

FACS involvement in the support of neighbourhood groups clarifies 3 different stages of group development based on need, support, and resources: high capacity neighbourhood groups in communities of need, emerging neighbourhood groups in communities of need, and high capacity or emerging neighbourhood groups in wealthier and healthier neighbourhoods.

CITY OF GUELPH – CONTEXT: LOCAL GROWTH MANAGEMENT STUDY (2006)

The City of Guelph Growth Study drafted in 2006, describes a city that is growing and changing rapidly. The study has planned for the emergence of new neighbourhoods and the changing (intensification, and demographic change – in terms of ethnicity and age) of existing neighbourhoods. The plan also outlines the need for community engagement to maintain active neighbourhoods and further service delivery to fill anticipated service gaps around health and healthy neighbourhoods in the face of change. Both of these directions from the Growth Study have created space for neighbourhood groups to continue to be involved in community engagement and program delivery as Guelph grows and changes. Neighbourhood groups' involvement in recreational activities are acknowledged as an important way of promoting healthy communities and it asserts that active communities can be maintained through community engagement in the delivery of programs. Many groups have responded to changing cultural diversity outlined in the Growth Study by drafting vision statements that include creating culturally inclusive communities, and in Onward Willow's and Parkwood Gardens' culturally specific programming. In spite of concerns identified in the study around lost activity of residents as their communities change, the communities that have already faced some of the greatest changes in terms of recent immigration have some of the higher involvement of volunteers and participants (Onward Willow, Parkwood Gardens, West Willow Woods, and Grange Hill East).

The intensification of development in areas slated for new development (Downtown, Gordon St and Arkell Rd, and Edinburgh Rd between College Ave and Stone Rd) could lead to the drive for new neighbourhood groups forming in those areas that may seek membership in the NSC. New groups forming in areas of significant growth and change will face challenges in generating community development because of transient and unanticipated populations living in the neighbourhood. While anticipated growth in areas with existing neighbourhood groups (Clairfields, Exhibition Park, Grange Hill East, Onward Willow, Waverley, and West Willow Woods) may create additional challenges for those groups to remain receptive to the changing needs of their neighbourhoods.

CITY OF GUELPH – STRATEGIC PLAN 2007 AND BEYOND (2007)

The City of Guelph's Strategic Plan in 2007 reinforced the idea that communities should be safe and healthy places to live. According to the plan, this means physically active, socially active, and well connected/networked residents that values diversity and volunteerism. This strategic plan is reflected in many of the existing groups' vision statements or recreational and social programs. This strategic plan provides further incentive to neighbourhood groups to continue to operate in these directions.

GUELPH NSC ORGANIZATIONAL RENEWAL PROJECT REPORT (2008)

In 2008, the NSC members selected the Guelph Volunteer Centre to engage them in a process of organizational renewal. The renewal came out of a desire from NSC neighbourhood groups to re-organize the NSC organizational structure and to clarify a number of organizational details including defining and engaging NSC partners and membership. The renewal project reaffirms the need for the NSC to continue to operate with a focus on strengthening neighbourhoods, developing leadership skills, co-ordinating resources, and sharing skills and knowledge. Many of the needs the NSC identified through this process were later reflected in the Parks and Recreation Strategic Master Plan in 2009. A board model of governance was selected that uses decision-making by consensus and ensures that all neighbourhood group members have voice. Leadership of the NSC was transferred more to the neighbourhood groups rather than supporting partners and agencies. Specifics around membership and effective partnership were acknowledged, but not explicitly defined.

CITY OF GUELPH – RECREATION, PARKS, AND CULTURE STRATEGIC MASTER PLAN (2009)

The Strategic Master Plan offers supports to build neighbourhood groups' capacities. Community engagement and development are described as tools for neighbourhood groups to build leadership and capacity through existing programming. The plan also identifies the need to strengthen neighbourhoods. According to the plan, neighbourhoods can be strengthened through neighbourhood leadership, advocacy, relationships, and capacity. The renewed emphasis on leadership, relationships and capacity is an indication that there is the opportunity for neighbourhood groups to focus internally on capacity and community development related issues while continuing to delivery programs. The plan re-emphasizes one of the driving forces behind the creation of neighbourhood groups in the 1990s: that a grassroots approach should be taken from the neighbourhoods up in that neighbourhoods identify the need for programs and service gaps and the City supports build the capacity of the group to deliver them through planning, training, governance, grant applications, and space provision.

Newer groups joining the NSC tend to have limited capacity and resources (see below) to undertake extensive program development. This is reflected in those groups facing barriers to receiving NSC funding for programs and services. Funding decisions are often based on the neighbourhood group's skills and abilities to deliver, and newer groups will typically have less capacity to do so. The supports offered in this plan primarily would support those newer groups in building capacity to take on more programs, but also supports those groups looking to diversify funding and partnerships by connecting the NSC with service providers to become more sustainable. Many groups within the NSC have struggled with finding more sustainable partnerships and funding sources. Even while Onward Willow receives core funding from outside of the City, they still struggle with funding for certain programs.

The history of the neighbourhood groups and the important policies that reflected and shaped their development and directions provide the basis for a current framework of the role of neighbourhood groups, their overall objectives, and how they are supported by the City and other partners. Each neighbourhood group is very different, with its own history – as described in greater length in the next section – but this does not indicate that some groups are “doing it right” or “doing it wrong.” It simply reflects the reality that groups form for a variety of reasons, with varying levels of participation and resources that may or may not reflect the unique characteristics of their neighbourhood. All are trying to fit into a neighbourhood group framework. The framework needs to be responsive to the multiple pathways to group formation, the potential for groups to expand their mandate and inclusion over time, and the need for clearly defined criteria for municipal and other sources of support. The range of activities recognized needs to be expansive from recreational programs, to events, to social programs, and to programs that have been developed to address specific community needs or concerns. When reviewing the histories and programs of the neighbourhood groups, it may be helpful to consider different categories of neighbourhood groups based on varying levels of capacity and need.



Guelph Environmental Scan – Community Profiles

Please keep in mind that the community profiles are based on available data. This data includes mostly Statistics Canada census data, information from the Well-being of Children Ages Birth to Six (indicated by “*”), and Population Health Community Needs Assessments provided for Brant Avenue, Hanlon Creek, Kortright, and Two Rivers through the McMaster Nursing students (indicated by “†”). While the validity of the health needs assessments has been questioned, they offer some additional insight into some potential issues in the neighbourhood. The data from the Well-being of Children Ages Birth to Six includes Early Development Instrument (EDI) information. This information is a measure of children’s states of development upon entering kindergarten. As is generally the case, the data is limited by challenges of matching boundaries with defined neighbourhoods, with the changes that will have occurred since the data was collected, and with reporting inaccuracies and omissions. The data is useful in identifying broad trends, and anomalies that warrant further exploration. This stresses the importance of key informant interviews and other methods to explore the neighbourhood “on the ground.”

GUELPH

Overall, Guelph is a growing and diverse city with several neighbourhoods that are distinct and yet share commonalities with the city as a whole. Guelph is a city of 115,000 people but is expected to grow significantly to 195,000 by 2031. While Guelph continues to be a city of young families, it is also an ageing community. The median age of the population increased from 35.4 years old to 36.4 years old between 2001 and 2006. This is a younger median age than Ontario (39.0 years old) and is due to the high number of young families. Families in Guelph are typical in size compared to the rest of Ontario with an average of 1.1 children per family. Lone parent families make up 16% of families in the neighbourhood and childcare burdens are understandably high with more people doing unpaid childcare work.

As an indication of Guelph’s considerable growth, 12% of homes in the city were built between 2001 and 2006. The total number of new homes rose by 5,285 in that time period and signifies several thousand new residents who are shaping the nature of the city. While the neighbourhoods currently with the most new growth tend to be located on the outskirts of Guelph, intensification of residential areas is anticipated across the city. Thirty one percent of homes in Guelph are rental homes, and 11% are in high rise apartment buildings. This is an indication of both high student populations and pockets of lower incomes throughout the city. The city is generally divided into communities of large, owner-occupied, single-family homes, and of smaller, rental homes. Housing affordability in Guelph is generally good for Ontario with only slightly higher housing expenses for homeowners than the Provincial average; however challenges around affordability are on the rise (10% rise for tenants, 22% for homeowners between 2001 and 2006). Median household incomes are generally high in Guelph at \$64,000 and increased by 22% from 2001 to 2006. This increase in incomes combined with a worsening of housing affordability is an indication of a widening gap between Guelph’s wealthy and people living with low income. This is demonstrated by an increase in the number of families living below the Low Income Cut Off (LICO) which rose by 14% in the same time period. In spite of this, there are relatively few people living below LICO compared to the province (11% to 15%).

Immigration numbers are high in Guelph for Ontario with over 20% of residents being born outside of Canada, however these numbers are low compared to major city centres such as the GTA where immigrants account for almost half of the population. Immigration in the city is growing. Immigration is shifting from European to Asian countries of origin. Recent immigrants (those who immigrated between 2001 and 2006) account for 3% of people in the neighbourhood. Again this is high for Ontario but low for major city centres. Recent immigration shows trends of newcomers coming mostly

from China, India, and the Philippines. Ethnically, Guelph is mostly European and specifically from the British Isles (55%), North America (26%), and other European countries (40%). These totals add up to over 100% because of multiple-responses (i.e. someone responding they are of British and North American ethnicity). The language diversity reflects this across the city, with the languages other than English spoken most often at home being Italian, Polish, and Hungarian. Languages other than English spoken at home have doubled in Guelph from 5% of the population in 2001 to 10% in 2006. However, 94% of immigrants in Guelph can speak English, a higher rate than the rest of Ontario. While there are currently modest language barriers in the education system (see paragraph below) and in accessing services and jobs, cultural and racial barriers are growing.

Unemployment rates are fairly low for the province at 5.3%. In 2006, unemployment rates showed a downward trend. The manufacturing industry is the single largest industry in the city and employs 25% of residents. Unemployment rates are likely higher than 2006 rates because of the economic recession that impacted largely construction and manufacturing industries. The education sector is also a large employer in Guelph, likely because of the University of Guelph. Both of these industries employ double the proportion of residents than the provincial average. Low unemployment in the city is supported by generally higher than provincial average education attainment levels with only 21% not completing high school. 24% of Guelph residents have a university degree compared to 20% of provincial residents. Sixteen percent of these degrees in Guelph were obtained from outside of Canada. Children in Guelph have also demonstrated higher than average EDI scores*. Despite some of these higher scores, scores for language and cognitive development were 16% lower than Ontario average*. This is likely connected to the growing language diversity and immigrant populations as indicated above. There are also more children in Guelph that scored in the bottom 10th percentile in multiple categories* that point to pockets of the population that are facing greater challenges in terms of education, language barriers, employment, incomes, and the overall health of the City. It is an indication of disparities that impact the overall health and vitality of the city.

GENERAL NEIGHBOURHOOD GROUPS

The catchment areas represented by active Neighbourhood Group areas have tend to share certain characteristics that distinguish them from the average city neighbourhood:

- more young families than average
- far fewer seniors than average
- fewer people living alone than average
- more children per family and higher unpaid childcare demands
- low numbers of rentals, high rise apartments and major repairs than in Guelph
- fewer government transfer payments made to individuals than average
- more children living below LICO
- generally more languages and diversity than average
- generally higher recent immigration and visible minority populations than average
- slightly higher unemployment rates than average
- people with lower levels of education than the average for the City

A CAUTION

As mentioned above, the following reflects information from available Statistics Canada data, and is intended as an overview that will be tested with the neighbourhood groups and other key informants to build a profile that reflects issues, trends, assets that are not identified through the data.

BRANT AVENUE NG

The Brant Avenue neighbourhood is an area of Guelph represented loosely by tract 13.02 according to Census data. However, this census tract also includes some homes that lie outside of the neighbourhood group boundaries West of Victoria Road. The well-being study combines data from Brant Avenue and Waverley neighbourhoods. Brant Avenue is home to nearly 5,000 people and is made up of mostly young families. Over 20% of people in the neighbourhood are children under the age of 14. The high numbers of children in the neighbourhood also face considerable stresses with low childcare availability in the area and the highest unpaid childcare demands in the City (12% of people do more than 60 hours of this work a week). There are also further stresses on parents with 22% of families being led by single parents (mostly single mothers). These are indications of family stresses and childcare challenges of parents in the neighbourhood. Otherwise, families in Brant Avenue are living together and there are few people actually living alone outside of a family in the neighbourhood (6%).

As a result, many of the homes in Brant are single family homes – single detached homes, semis or row houses. Brant Avenue is one of the areas that has been growing significantly over the past few years in terms of new housing developments. Over 12% of homes in the community were built between 2001 and 2006. Despite this growth, there are still no high rises with more than 5 storeys in the neighbourhood. Over 33% of homes in the neighbourhood are rental homes and there are pockets of low income areas in the neighbourhood consisting of Wellington and Guelph Housing subsidized housing units and low rise apartment buildings. This is average for the city of Guelph but signifies that there are likely pockets of lower income in the area. The pockets of low income are reflected in a higher than average number of young children living below the Low Income Cut Off (LICO). Median household incomes are average for the city at about \$67,000. This means that there is a large mix of incomes in the neighbourhood and a division of families that are living comfortably (more affluent areas tend to be North of Woodlawn), and those that are struggling to make ends meet (over 27% of families with young children). Pockets of higher income are emerging in the Brant in new developments North of Woodlawn. This variation in incomes has led to divisions around class where communication across class presents a challenge in the neighbourhood.

Brant has a largely Eastern European immigrant community (from Poland and Russia). However, immigration is generally low for the City at about 16% of the total population. Despite these numbers, there is a slight trend toward increasing immigration in the neighbourhood as 2006 saw more than its fair share of people moving directly to Brant Avenue from another country in the last year. More recent immigration tends to come from the Philippines (almost half of recent immigrants). While language will become a greater barrier to access services and programs as new immigrants move into the Brant neighbourhood, 99% of people in the neighbourhood spoke English, and 91% spoke English most often at home (other languages include Polish, Russian, and Italian) in 2006. Like many neighbourhood groups, Brant Avenue currently lacks the funding to accommodate recent immigrants to access programs with translation services... While the City of Guelph is becoming more diverse, city residents' general awareness of that changing diversity has been low.

Unemployment in the neighbourhood is low which means that residents are able to access jobs effectively. A higher than average number of those jobs are located within the city of Guelph (80%). Women's unemployment is higher than average at 6.2%, however this is still relatively low

compared to the Province in 2006. Unemployment rates have likely climbed in recent years with the onset of the international recession. Female unemployment is likely connected to the types of industries in which residents are working. Over 30% of jobs are in the manufacturing industry. This is a male dominated industry with 2 in 3 manufacturing jobs in the neighbourhood going to men. Limited opportunities with the biggest employers are likely driving this unemployment number. Interestingly, educational attainment in Brant is the lowest in the city with over 30% of adults and youth without a high school education. This is a potential area for concern if people are laid off from their jobs in a time of economic recession and have fewer qualifications than other employment seekers. Education levels are not showing great signs of improvement with overall low Early Development Instrument (EDI) scores*. Brant had the most children scoring low EDIs in Guelph for Social Competence and Emotional Maturity*. These scores are likely tied to the family stresses, lack of childcare opportunities, and unsupervised play highlighted above.

Children in the neighbourhood are generally healthy with positive EDI scores around physical health, and parents self-identifying 96% of their children as being in excellent or very good health*. However, children are not very active in team sports and recreational programs which may have longer term health impacts in the Brant neighbourhood*.

CLAIRFIELDS NG

The Clairfields neighbourhood is an area of Guelph represented loosely by tract 1.06 according to Census data that also includes the area south of Kortright Road, and West of Gordon Street. The Clairfields neighbourhood is home to over 6,300 people and has the highest proportion of young families in the city. Along with this demographic make up, Clairfields also has the lowest number of seniors at less than half the city average (6%). Because of the young families, there is a higher than average number of people doing unpaid childcare work. Childcare supports in the neighbourhood are average. In keeping with many young family neighbourhoods, there are very few people living alone.

As a result, homes in Clairfields are overwhelmingly single-family and owned homes. Homes in the neighbourhood are larger than average. Clairfields has the lowest rental rates in the city at 9%, and the highest rate of new housing construction with nearly _ (49%) of the homes in Clairfields built between 2001 and 2006. The scope of development in one of the newest neighbourhoods in Guelph has been focused on large single family homes. This is an indication of both slightly larger than average families (1.3 children at home per family), and much higher than average incomes (\$82,000). Despite these high incomes, housing affordability in the neighbourhood is poor for home owners with people buying large homes that strain resources. Despite these housing affordability issues, only 4% of families are living below LICO which is well under half the city average.

As Clairfields is an emerging neighbourhood in Guelph, it is a potential sign of emerging trends in demographics for the City. As such, there is high immigration in this neighbourhood with 24% of people born outside of Canada, and has one of the highest recent immigration rates in the city at 5% of the population. Immigration is also shifting from more European based immigration to people from China and India. Chinese and Indian populations now each make up about 4% of the total neighbourhood population. There are 5 languages that are spoken by over 1% of the population at home – which indicates a great deal of diversity in terms of the languages that residents are most comfortable speaking in the neighbourhood. Over 99% of people are able to speak English. This means that language barriers may not be as evident in Clairfields as they are in other parts of the City, despite the more obvious language diversity. The top 3 languages that are spoken most often at home in Clairfields are Spanish, Mandarin, and Hungarian. The high rates of immigration and new construction help generate the highest mobility rates in the city with 63% of people moving into the neighbourhood between 2001 and 2006.



Surprisingly, considering the high incomes in the neighbourhood, unemployment rates are high overall for the City at 5.6%, but below the provincial rate of 6.4%. The low number of families living below LICO is an indication that there are dual-income families that are able to have one provider be unemployed and still sustain themselves financially. Many workers in Clairfields are traveling outside of the city to work (35%). This is likely connected with Clairfields geographic position on the outskirts of the City, and its proximity to highway 401. This is an indication of many commuter residents that may not be as connected to social networks in the community. This dependence on distant employers and higher rates of unemployment are concerns given the likely worsening of those trends in the recent recession. Clairfields also has the highest educational attainment in the City with only 13% of youth and adults not completing high school. Every indication is that this education trend will continue with the highest overall EDI scores in the city: only 7% of children scored in the bottom 10th percentile in multiple categories, less than half the city average*.

Children are in generally good health with 96% of children being identified as in excellent or very good health*. Clairfields has the lowest recreational opportunities in the city with 73% of parents saying there aren't enough*. The lack of recreational opportunities is likely connected to Clairfields being an emerging and quickly growing neighbourhood. While the children of Clairfields are healthy, the long term health impacts of low recreational involvement could bring those numbers down in the future*. Parent supports and reading programs were also emphasized as areas of services that are missing in the community and could have impacts on education and child development*.

EXHIBITION PARK NG

Exhibition Park is represented by tract 11.00 in the census data and it home to over 5,800 people. While, like the rest of Guelph, Exhibition Park is predominately families, there is a much higher proportion of seniors living in the neighbourhood. Families in Exhibition are also smaller than average and this means that there are also a lot of people living alone (16%). Many of the people living alone are the high numbers of seniors in the neighbourhood, in fact, 35% of all seniors in the neighbourhood are living alone. These people may be facing isolation issues. As a result there are slightly higher than average numbers of people doing more than 20 hours of unpaid seniors care.

People living alone is reflected in the high rental rate in Exhibition Park of 39% of homes. Few families also indicates that homes in the neighbourhood are generally smaller. However there are both indications of wealth and poverty in the neighbourhood indicating a mix of housing as well. Housing affordability is better than average for Guelph for both tenants and home owners; however, housing is also in comparatively poor condition with 10% of homes needing major repair. Household incomes are lower than average at \$54,000, but at the same time, there are very few people living below LICO (6% of families). Incomes could be being brought down by the high number of seniors in the neighbourhood that may not be earning high incomes. However, there are fewer than average seniors living below LICO at 12%. Despite this, there are some pockets of seniors and young families living with low income in the neighbourhood.

While Exhibition Park is one of the least diverse neighbourhood in the City by comparison, 15% of people were born outside of the country. The vast majority of people in the neighbourhood are of European descent. Recent immigration is lower than average at 2% of the population, but demonstrates a trend away from European immigration with almost half of recent immigrants coming from Asia (India is the biggest country of recent immigration). Everyone in the neighbourhood speaks some English, and only 2% of people speak a language other than English at home indicating that 98% of most comfortable speaking English. The biggest languages spoken at home are spoken by less than 1 in 200 people each: Italian, Urdu, and Gujurati. While there are few recent immigrants and people with little knowledge of English in Exhibition Park, these people are likely to fall through service gaps because of their lack of numbers.

Unemployment rates in Exhibition Park are high compared to the City at 7.3% which could be leading to some of the lower household incomes described above. The recent international recession has likely increased unemployment rates higher than 7%. Youth in the neighbourhood are having the hardest time finding work with over 17% unemployment rate and high participation rates in the job market. The largest industry for workers from Exhibition Park is in the education industry – likely tied to the University of Guelph. For this reason, workers in the area are more likely to be working within the city than other neighbourhoods. Educational attainment levels in the neighbourhood are relatively high, which means that there is a generally more unemployed and more educated workforce. EDI scores for the neighbourhood indicate an emerging trend around education in the neighbourhood*. Exhibition Park children scored low on Social Competence, Emotional Maturity and Communication Skills categories*.

Exhibition Park is arguably the safest and healthiest neighbourhood in the City with 94% of parents indicating that there are safe places for children to play, and 100% indicating that their children are in excellent or very good health*. Despite these reassuring numbers, there are low opportunities for recreation in neighbourhood (59% of parents say there aren't enough) low involvement in children's programs*. The lack of programs signify challenges for health in the future and an indication of low Social Competence and Communication Skills EDI scores for children.

GRANGE HILL EAST NG

The Grange Hill East neighbourhood is represented by tracts 4.01, 4.02, and 4.03 in the census data. This area also includes some less developed land around York Road; some of which has been slated for new growth with the Growth Management Strategy. Perhaps due to the boundaries of the census tracts, Grange Hill East is the largest of neighbourhoods with almost 11,000 residents (almost triple the size of the Two Rivers neighbourhood). The neighbourhood is largely divided in two parts: North West, and South East. The South East end is almost entirely new construction. Overall, Grange Hill East is a community of mostly young families and is home to the most children in the city at 24% of the population. Despite the high number of children, family sizes in the neighbourhood are average, and the availability of childcare is low. This has resulted in a higher than average number of people doing extensive unpaid childcare work (11%). Families are also close in the neighbourhood with few people living alone.

As a result, homes in the neighbourhood tend to be larger, single-family homes. Home ownership is also high in the neighbourhood at 88% of homes. The low number of rentals, and absolutely no high rises in the area is an indication of new construction, and 28% of homes were constructed between 2001 and 2006. The large homes in the neighbourhood are leading to poorest housing affordability for home ownership in the City with almost half of owners spending more than 30% of their incomes on housing. This is surprising considering the high household incomes in the neighbourhood at \$73,000 and the few numbers of families living below LICO (6%). There are pockets of social housing in the North West end of Grange Hill East.

Grange Hill East has slightly lower than average immigration at 19% of the population. However, there is some shift in immigration from European immigration to nearly 60% of recent immigrants coming from Asian (namely, the Philippines, China, and the Middle East). Recent immigration rates are generally low compared to the Guelph average. Despite low immigration numbers, there is an average number of people that speak a language other than English at home (10% of the population). The largest languages spoken by over 1% of the population at home are Hungarian, Italian, and Polish; however, over 99% of residents are able to speak English. While there may not be many language barriers in the community, the changing demographics of the neighbourhood (especially considering areas of new growth) lead to a need for further awareness of emerging diversity.

In keeping with high incomes in the neighbourhood, Grange Hill East has some of the lowest unemployment rates in the City at only 3.7% and higher than average participation rates in the job market. Slightly higher than average numbers of people are working outside of Guelph (about 30%). This is likely a result of Grange Hill East's geographic location on the Northeastern outskirts of the City. Educational attainment levels in the neighbourhood are generally average but the area has the highest rates of college education (23% of adults have a college diploma in the neighbourhood). The main source of employment for workers in the community is manufacturing (almost 33% of people work in this industry). The international recession has led to further unemployment in the manufacturing industry and this may have led to some people unemployed with potentially an education that does not offer a range of new job opportunities. In keeping with educational levels, EDI scores for the neighbourhood are similar to the City's*. Grange Hill East children scored lower on language skills, which is an indication of some younger families from new immigrant communities facing language challenges*.

Children are generally healthy with parents reporting generally high health status for their children and with higher than average physical health EDI scores*. Children are also heavily involved in children's programs which can positively affect the long term health of the neighbourhood, but parents have also indicated a lack of supports needed in the community*.

HANLON CREEK NG

The Hanlon Creek neighbourhood is represented exclusively by 1.05 and 1.07 in the census data. It is home to over 7,600 people and tends to be made up of older families and university students. With older families and students comes some of the highest youth populations in the city with 20% of the population between the ages of 15 and 24, and 11% between the ages of 20 and 24. Many of the families in the neighbourhood are lone-parent families (18%) and yet there is an above average number of families with 5 or more people in it, indicating either a division between large families and small, single-parent families since single-parent families have fewer than average children at home than the City. The neighbourhood has the highest number of childcare spots (almost 400) in the City and this is likely relieving some pressures associated with single-parent families. Few people in the neighbourhood are living alone (6%) which is an indication of families and shared rental housing in the neighbourhood.

Overcrowding is potentially an issue in the neighbourhood where there are big families, but housing tends to be smaller than in other family neighbourhoods. There is an average of 1.5 people per bedroom in the neighbourhood, over 50% higher than the city average. This may be impacting the youth population in terms of education and privacy issues. Rental homes in the neighbourhood are generally low at 16% of homes, but those rentals are largely students†. There is a perceived lack of community in this neighbourhood because of some renting students that have engaged in un-neighbourly behaviour including park parties, unsafe driving, and vandalism†. This lack of sense of community has led some people to see some tension in the neighbourhood of long term residents and student tenants†. Besides this concern about transient housing for students, Hanlon Creek has the lowest mobility rates in the city with less than 30% of residents moving into the community over a 5 year period. Housing affordability is poorest for tenants in the neighbourhood, and issues of low income are likely mostly attributed to student populations. Despite the number of students, Hanlon Creek has a relatively high average income at \$79,000. There are also a higher than average proportion of young children living below LICO (14%). This is an indication of some pockets of poverty for young families in the neighbourhood who are likely also renting homes.

Immigration in the neighbourhood is average for the city at about 20% of the population. Again, the demographics of the neighbourhood are changing with almost a 3% recent immigration rate. Over 34% of recent immigrants are coming from China, with over 70% coming from Asia. Despite

these trends, language barriers are about average with 10% of people speaking a language other than English most often at home. The most common home languages are Chinese (not specified by dialect), Persian (which has surpassed Spanish and Hungarian from 2001), and Mandarin.

Unemployment in the neighbourhood is low at 5% and helps explain the high household incomes in Hanlon Creek. Despite overall unemployment numbers, youth unemployment is high – possibly due to the high proportion of students in the neighbourhood (there are almost triple the number of people with university degrees in Hanlon Creek than the Guelph average). An average number of people are commuting to work outside of Guelph from Hanlon Creek (24%), and an above average number working in the manufacturing and education industries. The manufacturing industry employing a significant number of residents may have resulted in layoffs under the recent recession and unemployment numbers may have increased since 2006. Educational attainment levels are high across the board and not simply reflective of the number of students in the neighbourhood, which should provide some stability to the neighbourhood in the event of job losses. Educational trends are reassuring considering EDI scores for Hanlon Creek are high across the board with the exception of communication skills where a higher than average number of children (12%) scored low*.

Children in the neighbourhood are also very healthy compared to the city average. Parents cite having the highest amount of supports in the city, and the highest involvement in children's recreational programs (75% of children)*. These are both positive indications of a community that is likely to continue to have health children and residents*. Despite some concerns around un-neighbourly behaviour from some people in the neighbourhood, it was also identified as the safest neighbourhood in Guelph to walk in at night*.

KORTRIGHT HILLS NG

The Kortright Hills neighbourhood is represented by tract 1.02 west of the Hanlon Parkway. The area also includes a neighbourhood to the Northwest of Kortright hills in the census data and is home to over 7,000 people. The area is a mixed community of younger and older families, with generally large families and very few people living alone (5% of people). The older families have led to a higher than average proportion of youth ages 15 to 24 in the neighbourhood (17%), but a lower number of seniors. Despite a high number of youth in the community, there is an acknowledge lack of youth activities available to residents†. There are low supports for childcare in the neighbourhood, but reassuringly there is the lowest demand for childcare in the City with only 6% of the population engaging in extensive unpaid childcare work.

Homes in the neighbourhood are large, single-family, owned homes that are necessary to house many large families. Kortright Hills has seen some changes over the years with 12% of homes being built between 2001 and 2006. There is some growing concern in the neighbourhood about the speed of development†. Residents have identified a number of issues connected to protecting the natural environment in the area – currently there is good access†. Kortright Hills is the wealthiest neighbourhood in the city with household incomes over \$92,000 and less than 1% of families living below LICO. The high incomes are likely connected with a high concentration of dual-income families in the area. The only indication of financial challenges in the neighbourhood is that Kortright Hills has the poorest housing affordability for tenants in the City – with over half of tenants spending too much of their income on housing. Despite recent growth in the neighbourhood, mobility rates are low for the City within only 10% of resident moving into the neighbourhood every year.

Immigration in Kortright Hills is higher than the city average at 24% of the population. Recent immigration highlights a trend of immigration changing from European-based immigration to immigration from Asia. Recent immigration is rapidly increasing what had been a rather small Chinese population in the area. While recent immigration is low at 2% of the population, 28% of recent immigrants are from China (though Chinese immigrants make up only 2% of the total



neighbourhood population). This growth in the Chinese population is reflected in the fact that Chinese is the language other than English spoken most often at home. Other common languages spoken at home are Spanish and Polish. Despite some language diversity in the neighbourhood, over 99% of residents are able to speak some English.

In contrast to having the highest incomes in the city, there are also high unemployment rates at 6.1%. Female unemployment is lower than average, indicating an even higher male unemployment rate. Some residents have identified difficulties in acquiring jobs that are located in the neighbourhood. According to the census data, there are an average number of people working outside of the city of Guelph, commutes outside of the neighbourhood is not tracked. Kortright Hills have higher than average educational attainment levels, and average EDI scores*.

Accessing to programs and services specifically for seniors and youth is an issue in the neighbourhood. There are some safety concerns in the neighbourhood, specifically around speeding traffic and drug deals in local parks at night†. However, other studies have suggested that Kortright Hills is one of the safest communities to walk in at night in the City*. Kortright Hills is also one of the healthiest communities with 100% of children being identified as in excellent or very good health, and with good involvement in children's programs*.

ONWARD WILLOW NG

Onward Willow is represented by tracts 10.01 and 10.02 in the census data. This area occupies the same boundaries of the Onward Willow neighbourhood group and is home to over 7,300 people. Overall, Onward Willow is likely the neighbourhood that is facing the most significant challenges in terms of incomes, changing demographics, and neighbourhood health and safety.

Onward Willow is a community of young families similar to the age make up of Guelph as a whole. Almost 24% of families in the neighbourhood are single parent families which is an indication of increased challenges around family economics and childcare. Reassuringly, there is good childcare accessibility in the neighbourhood, and a high number of children are able to access childcare subsidies (17%). While there are a lot of young families in the neighbourhood there are also a lot of people living alone.

The housing situation in the neighbourhood matches the family situation well, and as a result housing affordability is not an significant issue for most people in Onward Willow. Onward Will is a community of smaller, rental high-rise apartments. Well over half (57%) of people rent, and 36% of homes are located in high rise buildings. Growth in the community has slowed down with only 0.5% of homes being constructed between 2001 and 2006. While Onward Willow is slated for further development in the Growth Management Study, it has seen only changes in demographics. Onward Willow has the low household incomes at \$47,000 and the most numbers of families and children living below LICO (18% and 31% respectively). Low incomes are likely partly a result of a large proportion of lone-parent families. There is also a high proportion of people on social assistance, and people who are working for low wages. The number of children living below LICO is particularly concerning especially since only 17% of childcare participants are receiving subsidies.

Onward Willow is one of the most diverse communities in the City. Immigration is high at 28% of the population, but recent immigration is the highest in the city at over 10% of people in the neighbourhood. The biggest group of recent immigrants comes from India (17% of recent immigrants). There is also a small but growing African immigrant population. These numbers all indicate that Onward Willow is a diverse community that is changing quickly. It also appears to be an emerging entrance community for new immigrants coming into Canada. Nearly 2% of the neighbourhood population came to Canada from their home country 1 year ago. Other than recent immigration there are large Vietnamese

and Chinese populations in the neighbourhood. Nearly 22% of people speak a language other than English most often at home indicating a variety of language barriers to accessing programs and services. Over 3% of people do not speak English at all. Other than English, the most common languages in the neighbourhood spoken at home are Vietnamese, Chinese and Punjabi.

In keeping with low incomes in the neighbourhood, Onward Willow also has the highest overall unemployment rate at 7.5%. Nearly 40% of jobs for neighbourhood residents are in the manufacturing industry. This industry has been hit some of the hardest since 2006 with the international recession. Unemployment numbers are likely higher than those indicated in the census. Only 16% of people in the neighbourhood commute out of the city to work. Educational attainment levels are low in the community with almost 30% of people not completing high school. Low educational attainment presents challenges in circumstances of high unemployment where specific skills help with employability. Of those that have university degrees, 31% were obtained outside of Canada. This is an indication of accreditation issues within the immigrant community in Onward Willow and is likely causing underemployment that is not accounted for by the high unemployment numbers. EDI scores are the lowest in the City with the exception of Onward Willow's above average emotional maturity scores*. These results indicate that educational issues in the neighbourhood are not necessarily in decline.

Onward Willow is considered to be the least safe neighbourhood in the city with only 31% of resident that feel safe in the community at night*. Despite these concerns, safety in the neighbourhood has improved; although, stigma around the neighbourhood continues to be an issue. Children's health is also the lowest in the city with only 73% of parents reporting children's health to be excellent or very good*. In spite of the challenges facing Onward Willow, the neighbourhood has the highest rate of parent volunteers (50%), and parents have access to a high number of supports*. Children's relatively frequent involvement in faith-based programming is an indication of a well connected informal service network in operation*.

PARKWOOD GARDENS NG

The Parkwood Gardens neighbourhood is represented by 9.05 and 9.06 in the census data. The neighbourhood is home to over 9,800 people and is one of the biggest neighbourhoods in the city. Parkwood Gardens is a community of young families and has some of the highest numbers of children in the City at 24% of the population. Parkwood Gardens also has the biggest families in the city averaging 1.5 children per family and a high proportion of families with more than 5 people in them. Not surprisingly considering the size and number of families in the neighbourhood, there are the fewest numbers of people living alone with only 4% of people doing so.

Again, the housing matches the types of people living in the community with large, single-family, owned homes. Parkwood Gardens also has the highest proportion of multi-family households – multiple families living under one roof to save costs. This is often an indication of pockets of low incomes. Housing affordability in the community is good, and this is likely due to some of the highest incomes in the city at \$82,000. Despite some of the indications of high incomes, there are a higher than average number of children living below LICO (13% of children under the age of 6). This means that youngest families are facing the greatest challenges financially in Parkwood Gardens. These families could be contributing to the high numbers of multi-family households as only 2% of the neighbourhood are rental homes. This means there are likely people living below LICO that own their homes. Owning a home with multiple families can significantly reduce the cost of living but presents other challenges around overcrowding. Parkwood Gardens has low mobility rates compared to the City which can lead to a population that is more socially connected.

Parkwood Gardens is likely the most diverse neighbourhood in the city with 29% of the population being born outside of the country. Parkwood Gardens and West Willow Woods are the only two neighbourhoods in the city where immigrants from Asia outnumber immigrants from Europe. While recent immigration is low at 5% compared to entrance communities like Onward Willow, recent immigration is relatively high compared to Guelph. While the largest non-European immigrant group in the neighbourhood is still Vietnamese, there is a growing number of recent immigrants from India and China that are greater than recent immigration from Vietnam. There are 7 languages in Parkwood Gardens that are spoken most often at home by over 1% of the population, the most common languages other than English are Vietnamese, Chinese, and Punjabi. Three percent of people do not speak English at all. Not surprisingly, Parkwood Gardens has the biggest visible minority population in the city at 27%. The largest visible minority ethnic groups according to the census data are South Asian (which includes India), Chinese, and Southeast Asian (which includes Vietnam and the Philippines). These people may face systemic barriers in terms of access to services and employment.

Unemployment is very low overall at 4.6% of the neighbourhood's workforce. A higher than average number of the workforce work in the manufacturing industry and specifically the automotive industry. This industry has faced a number of challenges in light of the recent recession, and unemployment rates are likely higher than the 2006 rates. Recent indications do show an increase in use of programs meeting basic needs. Education attainment levels are slightly lower than the city average with 22% of people not completing high school, likely a barrier to future employment in a recession. Of those that have completed university a high proportion received those degrees outside of Canada. This is an indication of underemployment with educational accreditation issues in Canada that are not reflected in the low unemployment rates. Despite some low educational attainment levels, EDI scores are among the highest in the city (especially for Emotional Maturity scores)*.

Children in neighbourhood are healthier than average*. While parent supports and involvement in children's programs (only 29% of children) is low, there are the highest number of recreational opportunities which could lead to the increased health of Parkwood Garden's children*.

TWO RIVERS NG

The Two Rivers neighbourhood is represented by tract 3.00 in the census data and is home to over 3,700 people. This makes it the smallest neighbourhood out of all of the neighbourhood group areas. Two rivers is a neighbourhood of older families with the highest number of adults ages 25 to 64 in the city (at nearly 60% of the population). Despite the trend of older families in the neighbourhood, younger families are facing some family stresses with a high proportion of people doing significant amount of unpaid childcare support. There are also a large number of single-parent families (23% of families) that are potentially facing childcare and income challenges. Single parent families are big with 32% of families having 3 or more children at home. These are significantly larger single-parent families than the city average of 1 in every 15. While there is a demand for childcare in the neighbourhood (high number of people doing unpaid childcare), there were no childcare spaces identified in the neighbourhood*. Two Rivers is also the neighbourhood with the most number of people living alone at 17% of the population.

As a result, housing in the neighbourhood tends to be smaller rental homes, many of which are in need of major repair (13%). Two Rivers has a large rental market making up nearly half (45%) of homes. Some of the worst housing affordability issues are in the neighbourhood for both tenants and home owners. This is mostly attributed to the lowest median household incomes in Two Rivers at \$45,000. Low incomes in the neighbourhood are driven by the high proportion of single-parent families and low education levels. As a results of these incomes, 19% of children in the neighbourhood is living below LICO.

While the history of the neighbourhood is rooted in immigration from Italy and Ireland, current immigration and recent immigration are the lowest in the city at 12% and 0.4% respectively. Only 15 people that live in Two Rivers immigrated to Canada between 2001 and 2006, and all those people came from European countries. Eight in 9 immigrants that live in the neighbourhood came to Canada over 20 years ago. Low immigration rates are matched by the lowest language diversity in the neighbourhood with Italian being the only language spoken most often at home by over 1% of the population. There are higher than average mobility rates in the neighbourhood with 20% of the population moving into the neighbourhood every year. This presents some challenges for people developing and connecting to social networks in Two Rivers.

Unemployment rates are higher than average at 6.8% and can present significant financial challenges for some families. Unemployment rates for women are some of the lowest in the city at 4% meaning that most of the unemployment issues are for men in the neighbourhood. Women in Two Rivers are more likely to be working in the educational or health sectors rather than manufacturing which accounts for 33% of neighbourhood jobs. However, factory closures identified in 2007† indicate that unemployment rates (especially for men) have likely increased from 2006. The 2007 needs assessment conducted in Two Rivers highlighted that low educational attainment levels in the neighbourhood is leading people to take low or minimum wage jobs in the fast food industry outside of the neighbourhood†. Education attainment levels are the lowest in the city with almost 30% of people not completing high school. Low education levels are potentially a result of an older community, where people are spending their time doing unpaid childcare, and there are a number of family stresses around single-parent families. EDI scores for the neighbourhood are similar to the City's with the exception of lower than average social competence scores which have translated into behavioural problems at school†. While scores tend to be typical of Guelph on average, there are a high proportion of children that are scoring consistently low on the EDIs. 22% of children scored in the bottom 10th percentile in multiple categories*.

Children's health in the neighbourhood is slightly lower than average with 83% of children being identified as having excellent or very good health*. Despite this trend of children's health, there is a lack of health services in the neighbourhood†. Other than health services, there are the most supports for parents in the city, and children tend to have high involvement in a variety of children's programming*. Two Rivers is considered to have good services for low income families in the neighbourhood but there are a variety of barriers around safety to accessing those services†. Safety was identified as an issue relating to illegal drug activity and drug houses in the neighbourhood and to fast traffic and inconsistent sidewalk coverage†. Particularly unsafe areas were identified around the intersection of Alice and Huron†. Despite safety concerns, a high number of parents suggested that there were safe places for their children to play in the neighbourhood*.

WAVERLEY NG

The Waverley neighbourhood is loosely represented by tracts 12.00 and 13.01 in the census data. This division of census tracts leaves out the area West of Victoria Rd and North of Woodlawn. This section of Waverley (tract 13.02) has been included in the Brant neighbourhood profile. Waverley neighbourhood is home to over 7,200 people and is a community of small families and seniors. Seniors make up 24% of people in the neighbourhood – this is double the city's proportion of seniors. In keeping with this trend, there is the lowest proportion of children in the city. This is a result of small families with an average of less than 1 child per family at home. Regardless of this, many parents have identified a need for more childcare supports within Waverley*.

Despite the numbers of small families and seniors, the housing in Waverley is mostly average-sized, single-family owned homes. About 28% of homes in the neighbourhood are rentals, and there is also only one collection of high rise apartments. Housing affordability is slightly poorer than average and is comparatively slightly worse for home owners with 19% spending over 30% of their income on housing costs. There are lower than average incomes in Waverley at \$58,000. This is not surprising given the number of seniors in the community. While incomes are low, there is a very small proportion of families below LICO, and the lowest proportion of children (3%). There are even lower numbers of seniors below LICO when compared to the city, indicating that while incomes are lower than average, there are only a few pockets of poverty in Waverley.

Waverley is a community with lower than average immigration rates (15% of the population), and some of the lowest recent immigration in the city at less 0.6% of the population. While recent immigration numbers are almost non-existent, 2 in 3 recent immigrants living in Waverley moved to Canada less than 1 year ago. These people are moving to Waverley soon after immigrating to Canada. This is an indication of an increasing recent immigration rate in the neighbourhood. Most of the people in the neighbourhood are of European ethnicity, and the low language diversity is another reflection of this. Italian is the only language in the neighbourhood other than English spoken most often at home by over 1% of the population. The other most prominent languages in the community are Polish and Cantonese. Not surprisingly, considering immigration and language diversity, Waverley has the lowest numbers of visible minorities in the City at only 2% of the population.

Waverley has the lowest rates of people participating in the workforce – likely due to the high number of seniors in the neighbourhood. However, of those people who are participating in the workforce, Waverley has the lowest overall unemployment rate in the City at 3%. The largest single industry in the neighbourhood is manufacturing at about 20% of jobs, however, women are more likely to work in the education and health sectors. While unemployment might have increased since 2006 with the onset of the recession, unemployment rates are still likely lower than average. Educational attainment in the neighbourhood is low overall with 24% of people not completing high school. Low educational attainment is not directly associated with the number of seniors (who are generally less likely to have completed high school). Waverley has some of the lowest EDI scores in the city indicating that the trend of low incomes is likely to continue. Waverley scored lowest on Social Competence and Emotional Maturity categories indicating that children in the neighbourhood do not have opportunities to socialize*.

In fact, children in the community are less active in programs and team sports than average*. This combined with the indicated need for childcare are potentially leading to fewer opportunities to socialize. Children in the neighbourhood are generally healthy with positive EDI scores around physical health, and parents self-identifying 96% of their children as being in excellent or very good health*.

WEST WILLOW WOODS NG

West Willow Woods is represented by tracts 9.03 and 9.04 in the census data and is home to over 9,700 people. West Willow Woods has a higher than average number of young families with 22% of people being children under the age of 14. These young families are large with a high number of them including 5 or more people. Despite the big families, there are also a high proportion of single-parent families (19% of families). While lone-parent families often face greater financial and childcare challenges, single-parent families in West Willow Woods tend to have fewer children. The neighbourhood has some of the highest childcare availability in the city which should help to relieve some childcare burden. Children in West Willow Woods also have the best access to childcare subsidies (17% of children) which makes childcare supports more accessible, but also indicate some pockets of poverty in the neighbourhood.

Nearly 1 in 3 homes in the neighbourhood are rentals, and there is a slightly higher than average number of homes in high rise apartments (14%). In contrast to the high number of parents in need of childcare subsidies, median household incomes in the neighbourhood are above average at \$77,000. This is an indication of a community that is mixed economically. Potential pockets of low income are around young families. Eight percent of families are living below LIC0, which is similar to the City's level; however, families with children under the age of 6 at home are more than twice as likely to be living below LIC0 (19%). Income challenges are likely driving high childcare subsidies in the neighbourhood, but on the other hand, many of these families have access to the supports needed.

West Willow Woods has some of the highest immigration in the City at 29% of the total population. Immigrants tend to be from Asia (Vietnam, Philippines and India) rather than from Europe – which goes against the trend in most city neighbourhoods (Parkwood is the only other neighbourhood where this is the case). Recent immigration is high for the city at 6% and highlights changes in diversity in the neighbourhood. Recent immigration is much higher for the Philippines (25% of recent immigrations) and India, while Vietnamese immigration is on the decline. Not surprisingly, language diversity is high in the neighbourhood where 16% of people speak a language other than English most often at home. Language barriers are evident in schools where some children first come to school not able to speak English. The most common languages other than English in West Willow Woods are Chinese, Vietnamese, and Hungarian. While there are low Chinese immigration numbers, there is a significant Chinese population that is 2nd or 3rd generation Canadian making up over 5% of the total population. West Willow Woods is also potentially an emerging entrance community with an above average number of people moving to the neighbourhood from outside of Canada in the last year. Not surprisingly considering the high rates of immigration, West Willow Woods is also home to one of the biggest visible minority population (26%), made up mostly of people of Chinese, Filipino, and South Asian ethnicities. Visible minorities are more likely to face more systemic barriers in terms of access to services and employment. Overall mobility rates for the neighbourhood are average meaning that there is not a high proportion of people moving in or out of the community.

Unemployment in West Willow Woods is high overall at 6.3%. The neighbourhood also has the highest rates of female unemployment in the city at 7.7%. Slightly more people are working in the manufacturing industry than Guelph as a whole. This industry has faced a number of challenges in the economic recession, and unemployment numbers have likely climbed above 2006 levels. The high proportion of female unemployment is of particular importance because of the high proportion of single mothers in the neighbourhood. Education attainment levels are average in the neighbourhood with only a slightly lower proportion of people with university degrees. While education can impact on employment, this does not account for the higher than average unemployment rates in West Willow Woods. EDI scores for the neighbourhood are slightly lower than average with particularly low scores or emotional maturity and communication skills categories*.

EDI scores in West Willow Woods indicate significant health issues with 17% of children receiving low health scores*. The community is also considered less safe than average by residents with less than half feeling safe at night in the neighbourhood*. Despite some education, health, and income challenges in the neighbourhood, there are good parental supports, and the most recreational opportunities in the city (82% of parents say there are enough)*.

Environmental Scan – Neighbourhood Groups

The summary of neighbourhood groups provided is based on Program/Service Participation Statistics between 2006 and 2008, an inventory of neighbourhood groups (based on information provided by the groups), neighbourhood group budgets, and some information from the Population Health Community Needs Assessments. This information will help to deepen the understanding of the diversity of neighbourhood groups in terms of history, purpose, size, program delivery, and neighbourhood circumstances. However, there are also limitations to the information. Some information is incomplete, outdated, and open to multiple interpretations which emphasizes again the need to understand local contexts through key informant interviews and focus groups. For the purpose of this summary, “community need” is defined as programs that address socio-economic, cultural or other factors that present barriers to residents accessing programs and services. “Resource scale” refers to different stages of neighbourhood group development and the different types of supports provided for groups at each stage. All allocation amounts included in this summary are for 2009.

Brant Avenue Neighbourhood Group

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- One of the oldest groups (started in 1992)
- Governed by advisory board of community members and partners
- Started over a lack of children’s programs and activities in the community
- Working to reduce poverty issues in the community: some practices that support this:
 - Free children and adults programs, free childcare, travel reimbursement to meetings, training fund for capacity building, free events, collective kitchen, emergency food pantry, legal clinic, income tax clinic, free access to computers, internet, printer, phone and fax
- 2nd phase of Resource Scale (2008)
- \$38,436 NSC Allocation
- Key informant interviews in 2007 indicated that there could be challenges making programs inclusive to various cultures and ethnicities

SIZE AND PROGRAMMING

- Medium size group (1500 participants, 10 programs)
- Large number of partners (15 – mostly financial support, staff time)
- 2nd biggest active volunteer base (44)
- ½ participants children ages 5 to 12 (high)
- ¼ participants adults (high)
- ½ programs are focusing on community need

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- Brant Ave is a community of young families that is represented in the participants
- Highest unpaid childcare in Brant and lowest child care availability (3 in 4 say not enough), driving up numbers of children's programs
- Above average families and children living below LICO – need for subsidies and free programs highlights poverty issues
- Children in Brant not very active in programs – led to creation of group
- Emerging entrance community – changing demographically
- High mobility – possibly not as connected to networks
- Low Social and emotional EDI scores – need for social programs

Clairfields Neighbourhood Group

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- Limited written information on this group youngest as of this report started in 2005
- Indication that it is a new group based on 30 participants ages 5 to 12
- 1st phase of Resource Scale (2008)
- \$2,600 NSC Allocation

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- Highest number of young families indicates a need for children programming
- ½ homes built between 2001 and 2006 – a lot of new people in the community, possibly not as connected to networks
- Low recreation opportunities for children in the neighbourhood
- Low housing affordability despite being a wealthy community
- Highest EDI scores
- High immigration and language diversity – may be excluded from certain activities, programs

Exhibition Park Neighbourhood Group

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- Start date of group is currently unknown
- Started around local issues but would appear to be focusing more on community events
- Objectives to create a healthy and helpful neighbourhood – not specified in detail
- Governed by a leadership team
- 2nd phase of Resource Scale (2008)
- \$9,000 NSC Allocation



SIZE AND PROGRAMMING

- Small group (participants, volunteers, programs, and partners)
- ½ participants adults
- 7% participants seniors (highest)
- Over ¼ participants children 5 to 12
- All recreational programs or events
- All partnerships around space usage

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- High seniors population living alone – not reflected in programs
- Low recreational opportunities for children – potentially leading to the creation of recreational programs
- Healthiest children in the City
- High unemployment – likely effecting health of the neighbourhood
- Rental homes in need of major repair also contributing to neighbourhood health

Grange Hill East Neighbourhood Group

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- Started in response to the proposed development of a halfway house in the neighbourhood
- Young group (started in 2004)
- Purpose is for neighbours to help neighbours
 - Have childcare subsidies
 - Hold events in different parts of the neighbourhood
- Governed by leadership team
- 2nd phase of Resource Scale (2008)
- \$26,000 NSC and County Allocation

SIZE AND PROGRAMMING

- Relatively small in terms of participants (250) and partnerships (5)
- Large in terms of programs and events (17 listed)
- Medium involvement of volunteers
- ½ participants children 5 to 12
- Most programs social and events (9)
- Most number of drop-ins (3); all programming for children under 6 is drop in
- Partnerships all around space and services

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- Young families, with the most children – contributing to high child participation
- ¼ of community new homes from 2001 to 2006 – possibly not as connected to networks
- While few people are living below LICO, housing affordability is an issue – potentially driving the program and childcare subsidies
- Lowest supports for parents – likely driving the number of children’s drop-ins

Hanlon Creek Neighbourhood Group

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- Young group (started in 2005)
- Started as an issue based group around Shared Rental Housing – building relations with university students
- Became more about community building in 2006, programming started in 2007
- Group governed by consensus with group members
- 1st phase of Resource Scale (2008)

SIZE AND PROGRAMMING

- Smallest group in terms of participants (100), Volunteers (76), number of programs (6)
- 4 partnerships that cover a range of needs
- Over ½ participants are adults
- Karate program, major program for children (free)
- Adults likely participating in Shared Rental Housing information nights
- Many programs and events are family programs where adults and children participate at the same time. This also might be part of the reason why adult programming is high.

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- Older families and youth – reflected in the high level of adult participation
- High number of youth – not reflected in programs
- Low rental neighbourhood
- Low housing affordability for tenants
- Highest involvement in recreational programs

Kortright Hills Neighbourhood Group

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- Young group (started in 2003)
- Started to provide recreational activities and events in the community
- Want to create a village within the city
- Goal – to create a safe neighbourhood
- Group governed by a governing committee
- 2nd phase of Resource Scale (2008)
- \$9,000 NSC Allocation



SIZE AND PROGRAMMING

- Medium sized group (participants, volunteers, and programs)
- 3rd highest number of active volunteers (40)
- Only one partnership – with school around use of space
- Most participants (1 in 3) are children under the age of 6
- All programs recreational or social with the exception of:
 - Daycare support program
 - Neighbourhood clean up program

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- Mix of families and ages of children – supported by a mix of participants
- High incomes, but poor housing affordability – creating different “pockets” in the neighbourhood
- High immigration – increasingly diverse
- Already considered a safe community by residents
- High mobility rates – possibly disconnected from local networks

Onward Willow Neighbourhood Group

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- Oldest group (started in 1991)
- Began around primary prevention programs
- Only group that is in the 3rd phase of Resource Scale (2008)
- Healthy children, strong families, embraces diversity
- Strengthening individuals and families
 - Children’s programs
 - Peer parenting programs
 - Community Development programs
 - Childcare supports for meetings
- \$13,856 NSC Allocation

SIZE AND PROGRAMMING

- Largest Group
 - 9000 participants
 - 1207 volunteers
 - 4 areas of programming
- Large in terms of numbers of partners (8)
- Programs spread out evenly by age group
- Most family wellness programs at 1 in 5 participants
- Most youth programs
- Most 0-6 programs

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- Community facing greatest challenges/barriers; Least safe community; Least healthy children; Lowest involvement in children's programs; Highest recent immigration; Most non-English speakers; Low incomes, Lowest EDI, High lone parents
- All provide barriers to creating healthy children, strong families, and embracing diversity
- Young families in community – reflected in high number of children participants and family wellness participants
- Lower than average youth numbers overly represented in programs

Parkwood Gardens Neighbourhood Group

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- Old group (started in 1996)
- Started around issues of vandalism
- Purpose – to create children and youth programs because of a lack of constructive activities for these age groups
- Develop community-based programs to address the needs of the neighbourhood
- Governed by an executive with 4 sub committees
- Offer subsidies to participate in programs
- 2nd phase of Resource Scale (2008)
- \$32,453 NSC Allocation

SIZE AND PROGRAMMING

- Large Group
 - 6500 participants
 - 886 volunteers
 - 34 programs
 - 31 partnerships
- Participants distributed fairly evenly across age, with the exception of few seniors and few participants in Family Wellness programs
- ½ programs are to address community need
- Partnerships mostly around service provision and financial support
- Some culturally-specific programs (Vietnamese)

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- Young families with the most numbers of children – reflected in distribution of participants in programs
- High incomes, but children living below LICO – represented in need for subsidies
- Highest immigration, language diversity, and visible minority populations, suggests priority to address barriers to diverse program delivery – one Vietnamese specific program (which is the biggest visible minority group in the neighbourhood)
- Low mobility rates, despite high immigration, means generally people are staying put – and possibly more connected to local networks
- Few seniors – but few seniors programs
- Low parental supports
- Other area of need: multifamily households and low education levels



Two Rivers

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- Started in 1996
- Started around a need for children's activities and programs, with an initial focus on recreational and educational programs
- Trying to meet the needs of the "diverse" community
- Church basement space used
- Governed by consensus – details not specified in available materials
- 2nd phase of Resource Scale
- \$25,448 NSC Allocation

SIZE AND PROGRAMMING

- Large group with 2000 participants and few volunteers (15 active)
- 14 programs offered (high), but only 3 partnerships (low)
- ½ participants are ages 5 to 12
- Programs almost entirely social or events, with a few around community need: i.e. collective kitchen, breakfast programs: these are geared towards low income families
- Few partnerships, most around service delivery

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- Older families – possibly reflected in participation numbers
- Not a terribly diverse community in terms of immigration and visible minorities
- "Needs" of the community include: people living alone, need of major repairs, lowest incomes, low children health, low involvement in recreation problems
- Not many rec programs, and limited programs to address community need

Waverley

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- Oldest group (started in 1991)
- Started around safety issues in park, at a kitchen table
- Want to engage communities to in delivering programs to address the needs of the community
- Subsidies and reimbursements for all programs
- Governed by leadership board
- 2nd phase of Resource Scale (2008)
- 38,818 NSC Allocation

SIZE AND PROGRAMMING

- Large group (3700 participants) and 474 volunteers
- 19 programs offered (high)
- 14 partners identified (high)
- ⅔ participants are 5 to 12 (high)
- Most programs are recreational and to address community need:
 - i.e. Legal clinic, collective kitchen, training opportunities, computer skills training
- Partnerships mostly around service delivery and funding support

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- High seniors – not reflected in programs
- Fewest children – opposite reflected in children
- Safety an issue in the community
- Slightly low incomes with few below LICO
- 15% immigration, low language diversity
- Children not active in programs

West Willow Woods

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF GROUP

- Started participating in allocation in 2002
- Started around lack of activities for low income families and a rise in youth vandalism
- Want to involve a growing and diverse population in creating a safer and supportive neighbourhood
- To bring people together for a stronger community
- Governed by leadership board of community members, staff and partners
- Free or low cost programming with subsidies
- 2nd phase of Resource Scale
- \$30,739 NSC Allocation

SIZE AND PROGRAMMING

- Medium sized group with 1500 participants, 131 volunteers, 7 partnerships
- High number of programs: 23
- Participants almost all children 5 to 12 (83% – highest)
- Most programs around community need:
- Legal clinic, emergency food drop ins
- Partnerships mostly around space usage and service provision
- 2nd phase of Resource Scale

INTERESTING POINTS FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE

- Relatively high incomes, but families and children living below LICO is higher than average (19% of children below LICO)
- Young families, lots of children – reflected in programs
- High immigration and language diversity back up diverse population claims
- Emerging entrance community
- Most recreation opportunities in the neighbourhood – fewer recreational gaps for the neighbourhood group to fill
- Some of the least healthy children indicates need for attention in this area



Neighbourhood Group Data Tables

	CMA 2006	GUELPH 2001	GUELPH 2006
POPULATION	5,113,149	106,170	114,193
CHILDREN	18.6%	19.4%	18.4%
YOUTH	13.4%	14.3%	14.6%
ADULTS	56.2%	53.9%	54.6%
SENIORS	11.9%	12.4%	12.4%
SIZE OF CENSUS FAMILY: 5 OR MORE PERSONS	10.6%	N/A	9.2%
TOTAL LONE-PARENT FAMILIES BY SEX OF PARENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN	16.9%	14.5%	15.6%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME PER CENSUS FAMILY	1.3	1.2	1.1
ALL LIVING ALONE	8.2%	9.4%	10.0%
OVER 65 LIVING ALONE	22.6%	28.8%	26.3%
60 HOURS OR MORE OF UNPAID CHILD CARE	5.8%	6.4%	7.0%
20 HOURS OR MORE OF UNPAID CARE OR ASSISTANCE TO SENIORS	1.7%	1.0%	1.4%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF BEDROOMS PER DWELLING	2.7	2.6	2.7
RENTED	32.4%	33.5%	30.7%
APARTMENT, BUILDING THAT HAS FIVE OR MORE STOREYS	26.6%	12.7%	11.3%
MAJOR REPAIRS	6.0%	6.5%	5.2%
PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION, 2001 TO 2006	11.5%	12.5%	11.8%
PEOPLE PER BEDROOM (COMBINED DATA, PEOPLE, BEDROOM)	1.0	1	0.9
MULTIPLE-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	4.2%	1.5%	1.7%
TENANT-OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLDS SPENDING 30% OR MORE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME ON GROSS RENT	46.0%	37.8%	41.4%
OWNER HOUSEHOLDS SPENDING 30% OR MORE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME ON OWNER'S MAJOR PAYMENTS	27.1%	14.8%	18.0%
GOVERNMENT TRANSFER PAYMENTS %	7.5%	N/A	8.7%
TOTAL ECONOMIC FAMILIES LICO- 20% SAMPLE DATA	15.7%	7.2%	8.2%
CHILDREN LOW INCOME BEFORE TAX IN 2005 %	22.9%	N/A	11.0%
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME \$	\$64,128	\$54,497	\$66,279

	CMA 2006	GUELPH 2001	GUELPH 2006
NEITHER ENGLISH NOR FRENCH	4.2%	1.2%	1.2%
NON-OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN MOST OFTEN AT HOME	27.9%	4.9%	9.7%
# LANGUAGES ABOVE 1%	11	0	1
NON-OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT WORK	2.9%	0.2%	0.4%
#1 LANGUAGE	45.7%	Chinese n.o.s. 0.5%	Italian 0.9%
#2 LANGUAGE	8.8%	Vietnamese 0.5%	Polish 0.7%
#3 LANGUAGE	1.9%	Italian 0.5%	Hungarian 0.7%
IMMIGRANTS	19.3%	20.4%	21.1%
TOTAL RECENT IMMIGRANTS BY SELECTED PLACES OF BIRTH	42.9%	2.9%	3.4%
EXTERNAL MOVERS – 1 YEAR MOBILITY	14.1%	1.0%	0.7%
2001 TO 2006 IMMIGRANTS AS A PROPORTION OF ALL	44.9%	14.3%	15.8%
TOTAL VISIBLE MINORITY POPULATION	68.3%	11.6%	13.8%
#1 VISIBLE MINORITY	59.6%	Chinese 2.7%	South Asian 3.3%
#2 VISIBLE MINORITY	63.1%	South Asian 2.6%	Chinese 2.7%
#3 VISIBLE MINORITY	6.7%	Black 1.3%	Filipino 1.7%
MOVERS – 1 YEAR MOBILITY	15.2%	17.0%	16.2%
MOVERS – 5 YEAR MOBILITY	7.4%	49.8%	47.1%
3RD (OR MORE) GENERATION CANADIANS	19.7%	53.8%	54.1%
OVER 15 PARTICIPATION RATE	14.9%	72.0%	70.6%
YOUTH PARTICIPATION RATE	32.4%	75.6%	70.0%
FEMALE PARTICIPATION RATE	33.1%	67.0%	66.0%
OVER 15 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	N/A	5.3%	5.2%
YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	N/A	11.9%	10.8%
FEMALE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	N/A	5.9%	5.7%
NO HIGH SCHOOL	N/A	19.7%	20.4%
COLLEGE DIPLOMA	N/A	22.3%	17.1%
UNIVERSITY DEGREE	N/A	32.7%	27.8%
DEGREE OUTSIDE CANADA	N/A	N/A	16.1%



	CMA 2006	GUELPH 2001	GUELPH 2006
PARENTS WHO FEEL THEY NEED MORE SUPPORT AS A PARENT	N/A	N/A	31.0%
PARENTS WHO VOLUNTEER	N/A	N/A	34.3%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH REC OPPORTUNITIES	N/A	N/A	52.6%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH EARLY LEARNING OPPS	N/A	N/A	48.7%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH PARENTING SUPPORTS	N/A	N/A	20.0%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH CHILD CARE	N/A	N/A	35.4%
# OF LICENSED CHILD CARE SPACES AVAILABLE	N/A	N/A	1607
% OF CHILDREN RECEIVING FEE SUBSIDY	N/A	N/A	N/A
FAMILIES IN CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS	N/A	N/A	38.0%
FAMILIES IN READING PROGRAMS	N/A	N/A	38.0%
FAMILIES IN LENDING PROGRAMS (LIBRARY)	N/A	N/A	32.7%
CHILDREN IN TEAM SPORTS	N/A	N/A	51.4%
CHILDREN IN REC PROGRAMS	N/A	N/A	67.2%
CHILDREN IN DANCE, MUSIC, ART PROGRAMS	N/A	N/A	19.1%
CHILDREN ATTENDING FAITH BASED PROGRAMS	N/A	N/A	25.0%
SAFE TO WALK AT NIGHT	N/A	N/A	63.4%
SAFE TO PLAY	N/A	N/A	76.4%
CHILDREN WITH EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD HEALTH STATUS	N/A	N/A	92.6%
LOW PHYSICAL HEALTH SCORES	N/A	N/A	12.7%
LOW SOCIAL COMPETENCE SCORES	N/A	N/A	9.0%
LOW EMOTIONAL MATURITY SCORES	N/A	N/A	10.3%
LOW LANGUAGES AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT SCORES	N/A	N/A	11.2%
LOW COMMUNICATION SKILLS AND GENERAL KNOWLEDGE SCORES	N/A	N/A	11.6%
% BELOW 10TH PERCENTILE IN 2 OR MORE DOMAINS	N/A	N/A	14.7%
% OF IMMIGRANTS WITH NO ENGLISH	N/A	N/A	6.0%

	BRANT AVENUE	CLAIRFIELDS	EXHIBITION PARK
POPULATION	4956	6330	5848
CHILDREN	20.5%	23.4%	16.3%
YOUTH	14.5%	13.6%	12.5%
ADULTS	55.6%	57.3%	55.1%
SENIORS	10.4%	5.7%	16.1%
SIZE OF CENSUS FAMILY: 5 OR MORE PERSONS	8.5%	12.9%	7.8%
TOTAL LONE-PARENT FAMILIES BY SEX OF PARENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN	22.0%	7.9%	17.6%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME PER CENSUS FAMILY	1.1	1.3	1
ALL LIVING ALONE	6.2%	5.8%	15.8%
OVER 65 LIVING ALONE	25.7%	15.8%	35.3%
60 HOURS OR MORE OF UNPAID CHILD CARE	12.2%	7.3%	8.0%
20 HOURS OR MORE OF UNPAID CARE OR ASSISTANCE TO SENIORS	2.2%	0.3%	1.9%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF BEDROOMS PER DWELLING	2.9	3	2.4
RENTED	33.1%	9.0%	38.5%
APARTMENT, BUILDING THAT HAS FIVE OR MORE STOREYS	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
MAJOR REPAIRS	4.9%	0.9%	9.5%
PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION, 2001 TO 2006	12.3%	49.1%	3.0%
PEOPLE PER BEDROOM (COMBINED DATA, PEOPLE, BEDROOM)	0.9	1.0	0.9
MULTIPLE-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	3.3%	1.9%	0.4%
TENANT-OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLDS SPENDING 30% OR MORE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME ON GROSS RENT	40.2%	43.6%	44.1%
OWNER HOUSEHOLDS SPENDING 30% OR MORE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME ON OWNER'S MAJOR PAYMENTS	16.8%	22.9%	15.8%
GOVERNMENT TRANSFER PAYMENTS %	9.4%	4.1%	7.8%
TOTAL ECONOMIC FAMILIES LICO – 0% SAMPLE DATA	10.7%	3.8%	6.1%
CHILDREN LOW INCOME BEFORE TAX IN 2005 %	27.2%	3.0%	8.1%
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME \$	66661	81906	54305
NEITHER ENGLISH NOR FRENCH	1.1%	0.2%	0.0%
NON-OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN MOST OFTEN AT HOME	9.0%	10.7%	2.4%
# LANGUAGES ABOVE 1%	3	5	0
NON-OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT WORK	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%



	BRANT AVENUE	CLAIRFIELDS	EXHIBITION PARK
#1 LANGUAGE	Polish 1.9%	Spanish 2.0%	Italian 0.5%
#2 LANGUAGE	Russian 1.4%	Mandarin 1.4%	Urdu 0.4%
#3 LANGUAGE	Italian 1.0%	Hungarian 1.4%	Gujarati 0.3%
IMMIGRANTS	17.3%	23.5%	15.2%
TOTAL RECENT IMMIGRANTS BY SELECTED PLACES OF BIRTH	1.4%	5.3%	2.0%
EXTERNAL MOVERS – 1 YEAR MOBILITY	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%
2001 TO 2006 IMMIGRANTS AS A PROPORTION OF ALL	8.8%	22.6%	13.4%
TOTAL VISIBLE MINORITY POPULATION	10.0%	18.7%	6.2%
#1 VISIBLE MINORITY	Filipino 2.9%	Chinese 4.7%	Black 1.7%
#2 VISIBLE MINORITY	South Asian 1.3%	South Asian 4.0%	South Asian 1.6%
#3 VISIBLE MINORITY	Black 1.1%	Black 1.7%	West Asian 1.4%
MOVERS – 1 YEAR MOBILITY	21.1%	21.1%	14.7%
MOVERS – 5 YEAR MOBILITY	47.6%	63.4%	44.5%
3RD (OR MORE) GENERATION CANADIANS	60.3%	49.9%	60.0%
OVER 15 PARTICIPATION RATE	71.1%	77.6%	71.6%
YOUTH PARTICIPATION RATE	74.5%	70.3%	77.4%
FEMALE PARTICIPATION RATE	68.1%	74.5%	67.2%
OVER 15 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	4.1%	5.6%	7.3%
YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	6.3%	11.6%	16.8%
FEMALE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	6.2%	7.0%	7.5%
NO HIGH SCHOOL	30.4%	13.2%	18.5%
COLLEGE DIPLOMA	13.8%	18.0%	14.1%
UNIVERSITY DEGREE	15.3%	39.9%	36.0%
DEGREE OUTSIDE CANADA	19.3%	21.9%	9.3%

	BRANT AVENUE	CLAIRFIELDS	EXHIBITION PARK
PARENTS WHO FEEL THEY NEED MORE SUPPORT AS A PARENT	30.4%	34.6%	24.4%
PARENTS WHO VOLUNTEER	29.8%	31.7%	31.0%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH REC OPPORTUNITIES	50.0%	26.7%	41.3%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH EARLY LEARNING OPPS	50.0%	40.0%	60.9%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH PARENTING SUPPORTS	22.2%	11.7%	19.6%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH CHILD CARE	26.1%	35.2%	37.0%
# OF LICENSED CHILD CARE SPACES AVAILABLE	255	192	65
% OF CHILDREN RECEIVING FEE SUBSIDY	7.6%	2.7%	4.0%
FAMILIES IN CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS	44.0%	34.2%	43.8%
FAMILIES IN READING PROGRAMS	38.0%	27.0%	34.4%
FAMILIES IN LENDING PROGRAMS (LIBRARY)	24.5%	32.9%	18.8%
CHILDREN IN TEAM SPORTS	38.0%	67.1%	46.9%
CHILDREN IN REC PROGRAMS	58.0%	71.7%	64.0%
CHILDREN IN DANCE, MUSIC, ART PROGRAMS	13.4%	20.7%	16.7%
CHILDREN ATTENDING FAITH BASED PROGRAMS	18.0%	32.9%	28.1%
SAFE TO WALK AT NIGHT	52.9%	71.1%	67.7%
SAFE TO PLAY	82.4%	86.8%	93.5%
CHILDREN WITH EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD HEALTH STATUS	96.0%	95.9%	100.0%
LOW PHYSICAL HEALTH SCORES	2.2%	5.8%	9.3%
LOW SOCIAL COMPETENCE SCORES	15.1%	7.1%	10.7%
LOW EMOTIONAL MATURITY SCORES	17.0%	6.5%	14.9%
LOW LANGUAGES AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT SCORES	11.4%	1.9%	10.7%
LOW COMMUNICATION SKILLS AND GENERAL KNOWLEDGE SCORES	13.2%	5.2%	16.0%
% BELOW 10TH PERCENTILE IN 2 OR MORE DOMAINS	19.8%	6.5%	17.3%
% OF IMMIGRANTS WITH NO ENGLISH	5.4%	3.0%	2.2%



	GRANGE HILL EAST	HANLON CREEK	KORTRIGHT HILLS
POPULATION	10881	7624	7063
CHILDREN	23.8%	17.3%	19.1%
YOUTH	11.9%	19.8%	16.8%
ADULTS	57.9%	52.8%	56.1%
SENIORS	6.4%	10.2%	8.0%
SIZE OF CENSUS FAMILY: 5 OR MORE PERSONS	9.0%	10.0%	11.7%
TOTAL LONE-PARENT FAMILIES BY SEX OF PARENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN	16.5%	17.7%	9.9%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME PER CENSUS FAMILY	1.1	1.3	1.3
ALL LIVING ALONE	6.1%	5.7%	5.1%
OVER 65 LIVING ALONE	26.3%	18.1%	9.7%
60 HOURS OR MORE OF UNPAID CHILD CARE	10.6%	6.0%	5.9%
20 HOURS OR MORE OF UNPAID CARE OR ASSISTANCE TO SENIORS	0.7%	0.8%	2.1%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF BEDROOMS PER DWELLING	3	1.9	3.3
RENTED	11.7%	16.4%	11.5%
APARTMENT, BUILDING THAT HAS FIVE OR MORE STOREYS	0.0%	6.0%	0.0%
MAJOR REPAIRS	3.0%	4.0%	3.1%
PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION, 2001 TO 2006	27.9%	0.6%	12.1%
PEOPLE PER BEDROOM (COMBINED DATA, PEOPLE, BEDROOM)	0.9	1.5	0.9
MULTIPLE-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	2.7%	1.9%	1.5%
TENANT-OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLDS SPENDING 30% OR MORE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME ON GROSS RENT	47.3%	43.5%	50.9%
OWNER HOUSEHOLDS SPENDING 30% OR MORE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME ON OWNER'S MAJOR PAYMENTS	20.1%	13.8%	13.7%
GOVERNMENT TRANSFER PAYMENTS %	8.0%	6.4%	4.7%
TOTAL ECONOMIC FAMILIES LICO- 20% SAMPLE DATA	6.1%	6.8%	0.8%
CHILDREN LOW INCOME BEFORE TAX IN 2005 %	7.0%	14.0%	0.0%
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME \$	72658	79400	92154
NEITHER ENGLISH NOR FRENCH	0.7%	0.9%	0.9%
NON-OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN MOST OFTEN AT HOME	9.5%	9.6%	9.9%
# LANGUAGES ABOVE 1%	3	1	3
NON-OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT WORK	0.7%	0.5%	0.0%
#1 LANGUAGE	Hungarian 1.7%	Chinese n.o.s 1.4%	Chinese n.o.s 1.6%

	GRANGE HILL EAST	HANLON CREEK	KORTRIGHT HILLS
#2 LANGUAGE	Italian 1.3%	Persian 1.0%	Polish 1.3%
#3 LANGUAGE	Polish 1.3%	Mandarin 0.9%	Spanish 1.1%
IMMIGRANTS	18.5%	20.4%	24.0%
TOTAL RECENT IMMIGRANTS BY SELECTED PLACES OF BIRTH	2.3%	2.8%	2.1%
EXTERNAL MOVERS – 1 YEAR MOBILITY	0.2%	0.7%	0.4%
2001 TO 2006 IMMIGRANTS AS A PROPORTION OF ALL	12.4%	13.5%	8.9%
TOTAL VISIBLE MINORITY POPULATION	9.9%	12.8%	14.2%
#1 VISIBLE MINORITY	Black 1.9%	Chinese 4.7%	South Asian 4.2%
#2 VISIBLE MINORITY	Filipino 1.9%	South Asian 3.2%	Chinese 3.3%
#3 VISIBLE MINORITY	South Asian 1.7%	West Asian 1.1%	Latin American 1.2%
MOVERS – 1 YEAR MOBILITY	16.2%	8.2%	10.2%
MOVERS – 5 YEAR MOBILITY	52.8%	29.8%	44.9%
3RD (OR MORE) GENERATION CANADIANS	57.5%	54.5%	47.8%
OVER 15 PARTICIPATION RATE	74.2%	71.3%	78.9%
YOUTH PARTICIPATION RATE	70.3%	70.5%	76.9%
FEMALE PARTICIPATION RATE	68.6%	68.0%	76.3%
OVER 15 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	3.7%	5.1%	6.1%
YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	8.2%	13.2%	12.6%
FEMALE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	4.6%	5.3%	5.2%
NO HIGH SCHOOL	21.5%	14.9%	15.9%
COLLEGE DIPLOMA	23.3%	16.5%	18.8%
UNIVERSITY DEGREE	17.4%	32.7%	36.5%
DEGREE OUTSIDE CANADA	12.8%	16.9%	15.6%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THEY NEED MORE SUPPORT AS A PARENT	27.2%	31.0%	33.3%
PARENTS WHO VOLUNTEER	25.0%	39.7%	41.8%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH REC OPPORTUNITIES	56.3%	36.2%	48.7%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH EARLY LEARNING OPPS	27.5%	51.7%	61.5%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH PARENTING SUPPORTS	10.0%	29.8%	15.4%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH CHILD CARE	25.3%	44.8%	34.2%
# OF LICENSED CHILD CARE SPACES AVAILABLE	33	395	142
% OF CHILDREN RECEIVING FEE SUBSIDY	8.2%	11.8%	2.1%
FAMILIES IN CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS	42.1%	44.6%	35.5%



	GRANGE HILL EAST	HANLON CREEK	KORTRIGHT HILLS
FAMILIES IN READING PROGRAMS	39.5%	46.4%	51.6%
FAMILIES IN LENDING PROGRAMS (LIBRARY)	2.7%	38.2%	27.6%
CHILDREN IN TEAM SPORTS	53.9%	38.2%	54.8%
CHILDREN IN REC PROGRAMS	70.4%	75.0%	64.5%
CHILDREN IN DANCE, MUSIC, ART PROGRAMS	22.9%	25.0%	19.4%
CHILDREN ATTENDING FAITH BASED PROGRAMS	21.1%	21.8%	32.3%
SAFE TO WALK AT NIGHT	64.5%	76.8%	71.9%
SAFE TO PLAY	72.0%	77.2%	81.3%
CHILDREN WITH EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD HEALTH STATUS	94.6%	96.4%	100.0%
LOW PHYSICAL HEALTH SCORES	11.3%	8.1%	7.7%
LOW SOCIAL COMPETENCE SCORES	9.9%	4.0%	9.6%
LOW EMOTIONAL MATURITY SCORES	9.9%	8.0%	9.8%
LOW LANGUAGES AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT SCORES	12.0%	7.0%	11.5%
LOW COMMUNICATION SKILLS AND GENERAL KNOWLEDGE SCORES	9.2%	12.0%	5.8%
% BELOW 10TH PERCENTILE IN 2 OR MORE DOMAINS	14.8%	10.0%	15.4%
% OF IMMIGRANTS WITH NO ENGLISH	4.0%	3.5%	4.1%

	ONWARD WILLOW	PARKWOOD GARDENS	TWO RIVERS
POPULATION	7307	9824	3788
CHILDREN	18.5%	23.8%	15.4%
YOUTH	14.0%	13.4%	14.4%
ADULTS	56.8%	58.4%	58.8%
SENIORS	10.7%	4.4%	11.4%
SIZE OF CENSUS FAMILY: 5 OR MORE PERSONS	6.4%	14.0%	7.0%
TOTAL LONE-PARENT FAMILIES BY SEX OF PARENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN	23.8%	13.1%	22.9%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME PER CENSUS FAMILY	1.2	1.5	1
ALL LIVING ALONE	12.8%	3.4%	17.0%
OVER 65 LIVING ALONE	28.2%	12.4%	34.9%
60 HOURS OR MORE OF UNPAID CHILD CARE	6.9%	7.9%	8.4%
20 HOURS OR MORE OF UNPAID CARE OR ASSISTANCE TO SENIORS	0.8%	1.6%	1.1%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF BEDROOMS PER DWELLING	2.3	3.2	2.3
RENTED	57.1%	14.8%	44.9%
APARTMENT, BUILDING THAT HAS FIVE OR MORE STOREYS	35.7%	0.0%	11.3%
MAJOR REPAIRS	10.1%	1.5%	13.2%
PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION, 2001 TO 2006	0.5%	17.9%	3.7%
PEOPLE PER BEDROOM (COMBINED DATA, PEOPLE, BEDROOM)	1.0	1.1	0.9
MULTIPLE-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	1.1%	4.8%	0.6%
TENANT-OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLDS SPENDING 30% OR MORE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME ON GROSS RENT	31.5%	31.0%	46.5%
OWNER HOUSEHOLDS SPENDING 30% OR MORE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME ON OWNER'S MAJOR PAYMENTS	21.4%	16.6%	23.6%
GOVERNMENT TRANSFER PAYMENTS %	14.5%	5.5%	11.4%
TOTAL ECONOMIC FAMILIES LICO- 20% SAMPLE DATA	18.2%	6.3%	12.4%
CHILDREN LOW INCOME BEFORE TAX IN 2005 %	31.0%	13.0%	19.0%
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME \$	47257	82203	45366
NEITHER ENGLISH NOR FRENCH	3.3%	3.0%	0.8%
NON-OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN MOST OFTEN AT HOME	21.8%	17.3%	4.5%
# LANGUAGES ABOVE 1%	6	7	2
NON-OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT WORK	1.4%	1.1%	0.0%
#1 LANGUAGE	Vietnamese 3.7%	Vietnamese 2.3%	Italian 2.6%



	ONWARD WILLOW	PARKWOOD GARDENS	TWO RIVERS
#2 LANGUAGE	Chinese 2.4%	Chinese 2.2%	Polish 0.9%
#3 LANGUAGE	Punjabi 2.2%	Punjabi 2.1%	Spanish 0.4%
IMMIGRANTS	27.5%	29.2%	12.2%
TOTAL RECENT IMMIGRANTS BY SELECTED PLACES OF BIRTH	10.4%	4.6%	0.4%
EXTERNAL MOVERS – 1 YEAR MOBILITY	1.6%	0.6%	0.0%
2001 TO 2006 IMMIGRANTS AS A PROPORTION OF ALL	37.7%	15.7%	3.3%
TOTAL VISIBLE MINORITY POPULATION	23.5%	26.8%	4.9%
#1 VISIBLE MINORITY	South Asian 6.0%	South Asian 6.4%	Black 1.1%
#2 VISIBLE MINORITY	Southeast Asian (likely Vietnamese 4.0%)	Chinese 5.6%	Latin American 0.6%
#3 VISIBLE MINORITY	Chinese 3.1%	Southeast Asian (likely Vietnamese) 3.8%	Chinese 0.5%
MOVERS – 1 YEAR MOBILITY	20.5%	11.1%	20.2%
MOVERS – 5 YEAR MOBILITY	57.9%	40.8%	49.0%
3RD (OR MORE) GENERATION CANADIANS	50.5%	46.0%	63.6%
OVER 15 PARTICIPATION RATE	68.0%	76.0%	71.4%
YOUTH PARTICIPATION RATE	75.2%	69.4%	69.7%
FEMALE PARTICIPATION RATE	59.6%	71.5%	68.7%
OVER 15 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	7.5%	4.6%	6.8%
YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	11.4%	8.5%	13.2%
FEMALE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	7.4%	5.6%	4.1%
NO HIGH SCHOOL	29.0%	21.6%	29.6%
COLLEGE DIPLOMA	15.2%	18.1%	15.2%
UNIVERSITY DEGREE	15.7%	21.0%	22.5%
DEGREE OUTSIDE CANADA	30.5%	20.8%	4.2%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THEY NEED MORE SUPPORT AS A PARENT	39.0%	38.2%	17.5%
PARENTS WHO VOLUNTEER	50.0%	34.0%	35.2%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH REC OPPORTUNITIES	74.0%	74.5%	72.5%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH EARLY LEARNING OPPTS	75.0%	41.8%	59.0%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH PARENTING SUPPORTS	33.3%	14.5%	37.5%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH CHILD CARE	45.8%	40.0%	17.5%
# OF LICENSED CHILD CARE SPACES AVAILABLE	100	32	0
% OF CHILDREN RECEIVING FEE SUBSIDY	17.1%	11.1%	5.2%

	ONWARD WILLOW	PARKWOOD GARDENS	TWO RIVERS
FAMILIES IN CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS	30.8%	29.1%	58.8%
FAMILIES IN READING PROGRAMS	38.5%	32.7%	52.9%
FAMILIES IN LENDING PROGRAMS (LIBRARY)	46.2%	25.9%	41.2%
CHILDREN IN TEAM SPORTS	34.6%	50.0%	55.9%
CHILDREN IN REC PROGRAMS	55.8%	65.7%	65.6%
CHILDREN IN DANCE, MUSIC, ART PROGRAMS	11.5%	15.7%	22.5%
CHILDREN ATTENDING FAITH BASED PROGRAMS	30.8%	20.4%	32.4%
SAFE TO WALK AT NIGHT	30.8%	61.4%	52.9%
SAFE TO PLAY	34.6%	68.4%	84.8%
CHILDREN WITH EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD HEALTH STATUS	73.1%	92.9%	82.8%
LOW PHYSICAL HEALTH SCORES	15.7%	5.4%	11.9%
LOW SOCIAL COMPETENCE SCORES	11.4%	6.1%	10.4%
LOW EMOTIONAL MATURITY SCORES	10.0%	5.3%	6.0%
LOW LANGUAGES AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT SCORES	20.0%	9.8%	13.4%
LOW COMMUNICATION SKILLS AND GENERAL KNOWLEDGE SCORES	21.4%	7.9%	9.0%
% BELOW 10TH PERCENTILE IN 2 OR MORE DOMAINS	20.0%	8.8%	22.2%
% OF IMMIGRANTS WITH NO ENGLISH	11.5%	10.1%	0.0%



	WAVERLEY	WEST WILLOW WOODS
POPULATION	7255	9751
CHILDREN	13.1%	22.4%
YOUTH	11.6%	14.7%
ADULTS	50.9%	56.5%
SENIORS	24.1%	6.4%
SIZE OF CENSUS FAMILY: 5 OR MORE PERSONS	5.9%	10.8%
TOTAL LONE-PARENT FAMILIES BY SEX OF PARENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN	13.0%	19.4%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME PER CENSUS FAMILY	0.9	1.4
ALL LIVING ALONE	13.5%	5.9%
OVER 65 LIVING ALONE	26.2%	17.2%
60 HOURS OR MORE OF UNPAID CHILD CARE	6.1%	7.1%
20 HOURS OR MORE OF UNPAID CARE OR ASSISTANCE TO SENIORS	1.7%	1.7%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF BEDROOMS PER DWELLING	2.7	2.9
RENTED	27.5%	29.7%
APARTMENT, BUILDING THAT HAS FIVE OR MORE STOREYS	4.7%	14.9%
MAJOR REPAIRS	4.9%	3.1%
PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION, 2001 TO 2006	1.6%	9.5%
PEOPLE PER BEDROOM (COMBINED DATA, PEOPLE, BEDROOM)	0.9	1.0
MULTIPLE-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	1.0%	3.1%
TENANT-OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLDS SPENDING 30% OR MORE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME ON GROSS RENT	42.9%	32.0%
OWNER HOUSEHOLDS SPENDING 30% OR MORE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME ON OWNER'S MAJOR PAYMENTS	18.7%	16.7%
GOVERNMENT TRANSFER PAYMENTS %	10.4%	6.6%
TOTAL ECONOMIC FAMILIES LICO- 20% SAMPLE DATA	6.2%	8.4%
CHILDREN LOW INCOME BEFORE TAX IN 2005 %	3.0%	19.0%
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME \$	58055	76503
NEITHER ENGLISH NOR FRENCH	0.6%	2.2%
NON-OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN MOST OFTEN AT HOME	3.2%	16.1%
# LANGUAGES ABOVE 1%	2	4
NON-OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT WORK	0.0%	1.0%

	WAVERLEY	WEST WILLOW WOODS
#1 LANGUAGE	Italian 1.3%	Chinese 3.5%
#2 LANGUAGE	Polish 1.1%	Vietnamese 2.1%
#3 LANGUAGE	Cantonese 0.4%	Hungarian 2.0%
IMMIGRANTS	15.1%	28.5%
TOTAL RECENT IMMIGRANTS BY SELECTED PLACES OF BIRTH	0.6%	5.6%
EXTERNAL MOVERS – 1 YEAR MOBILITY	0.4%	1.3%
2001 TO 2006 IMMIGRANTS AS A PROPORTION OF ALL	3.7%	19.3%
TOTAL VISIBLE MINORITY POPULATION	1.8%	26.1%
#1 VISIBLE MINORITY	Filipino 1.2%	Chinese 5.5%
#2 VISIBLE MINORITY	South Asian 1.0%	Filipino 5.3%
#3 VISIBLE MINORITY	Black 0.6%	South Asian 5.0%
MOVERS – 1 YEAR MOBILITY	9.6%	17.3%
MOVERS – 5 YEAR MOBILITY	35.0%	46.3%
3RD (OR MORE) GENERATION CANADIANS	58.6%	48.0%
OVER 15 PARTICIPATION RATE	62.8%	76.6%
YOUTH PARTICIPATION RATE	77.2%	65.4%
FEMALE PARTICIPATION RATE	58.4%	72.9%
OVER 15 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	3.0%	6.3%
YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	8.6%	13.5%
FEMALE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	3.3%	7.7%
NO HIGH SCHOOL	24.2%	19.4%
COLLEGE DIPLOMA	18.7%	18.2%
UNIVERSITY DEGREE	22.9%	23.0%
DEGREE OUTSIDE CANADA	6.9%	22.4%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THEY NEED MORE SUPPORT AS A PARENT	30.4%	28.0%
PARENTS WHO VOLUNTEER	29.8%	25.8%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH REC OPPORTUNITIES	50.0%	81.8%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH EARLY LEARNING OPPS	50.0%	52.3%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH PARENTING SUPPORTS	22.2%	23.3%
PARENTS WHO FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH CHILD CARE	26.1%	52.3%
# OF LICENSED CHILD CARE SPACES AVAILABLE	255	75



	WAVERLEY	WEST WILLOW WOODS
% OF CHILDREN RECEIVING FEE SUBSIDY	7.6%	17.1%
FAMILIES IN CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS	44.0%	36.2%
FAMILIES IN READING PROGRAMS	38.0%	33.9%
FAMILIES IN LENDING PROGRAMS (LIBRARY)	24.5%	40.7%
CHILDREN IN TEAM SPORTS	38.0%	61.0%
CHILDREN IN REC PROGRAMS	58.0%	64.4%
CHILDREN IN DANCE, MUSIC, ART PROGRAMS	13.4%	13.0%
CHILDREN ATTENDING FAITH BASED PROGRAMS	18.0%	15.3%
SAFE TO WALK AT NIGHT	52.9%	49.2%
SAFE TO PLAY	82.4%	63.8%
CHILDREN WITH EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD HEALTH STATUS	96.0%	89.7%
LOW PHYSICAL HEALTH SCORES	2.2%	17.4%
LOW SOCIAL COMPETENCE SCORES	15.1%	5.3%
LOW EMOTIONAL MATURITY SCORES	17.0%	10.6%
LOW LANGUAGES AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT SCORES	11.4%	11.3%
LOW COMMUNICATION SKILLS AND GENERAL KNOWLEDGE SCORES	13.2%	14.3%
% BELOW 10TH PERCENTILE IN 2 OR MORE DOMAINS	19.8%	12.8%
% OF IMMIGRANTS WITH NO ENGLISH	5.4%	7.7%

Appendix E: Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework Advisory Committee

MEMBERSHIP:

Andrew Seagram, Coordinator, Community Use of Schools Program, Upper Grand District School Board
Anne Marie Simpson, Service Director, Family & Children's Services
Barbara Powell, Manager of Integrated Services and Development, City of Guelph
Brent Eden, Deputy Chief of Neighbourhood Services, Guelph Police Services
Cindy Richardson, Community Manager, Neighbourhood Engagement, City of Guelph
Gayle Valeriotte, Manager of Training and Consultation, Volunteer Centre of Guelph
Helen Fishburn, Director of Programs, Trellis Mental Health and Developmental Services
Kelly Guthrie, Community Engagement Coordinator, City of Guelph
Lynne Briggs, Seniors Services Manager, City of Guelph
Nancy Mykitschak, Programs and Services Director, Guelph Community Health Centre
Larry Lacey, Principal, Waverley Drive Public School
Brenda Albert, Community Leader, Onward Willow Neighbourhood Group
Niki Henry, Community Leader, Two Rivers Neighbourhood Group
Debbie Gorman, Community Leader, Brant Avenue Neighbourhood Group
Roy McLeod, Community Leader, Two Rivers Neighbourhood Group
Bill MacDonald, Community Leader, West Willow Woods Neighbourhood Group
Barb McPhee, Community Leader, Waverley Neighbourhood Group



Appendix F: Sustainable Neighbourhood Engagement Framework Consultation

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS:

Department of Community Services, City of Guelph
Brant Avenue Neighbourhood Group
Clairfields Neighbourhood Group
Downtown Neighbourhood Association
Exhibition Park Neighbourhood Group
Grange Hill East Neighbourhood Group
Kortright Hills Neighbourhood Group
Onward Willow Neighbourhood Group
Parkwood Gardens Neighbourhood Group
Two Rivers Neighbourhood Group
Waverley Neighbourhood Group
West Willow Woods Neighbourhood Group
Neighbourhood Support Coalition
Rickson Ridge
O.U.R. Three Bridges
Sunnyacres
City Council, City of Guelph
Family and Children's Services of Guelph Wellington County
Upper Grand District School Board
Wellington Catholic District School Board
Guelph and Wellington Task Force for Poverty Elimination
Ministry of Children and Youth Services, Government of Ontario
Wellington and Guelph Housing Services, County of Wellington
Childcare Services, County of Wellington
United Way of Guelph and Wellington
Trellis Mental Health and Developmental Services
Guelph Police Services
Volunteer Centre of Guelph-Wellington
Guelph Community Health Centre

FOCUS GROUPS WERE CONDUCTED WITH THE FOLLOWING GROUPS:

Neighbourhood Group Frontline Staff
Neighbourhood Group Program Participants
City of Guelph Senior Staff
Community Organizations in Guelph

ONCE THE FRAMEWORK WAS DEVELOPED, IT WAS PRESENTED AND DISCUSSED AT THE FOLLOWING CONSULTATION SESSIONS:

May 17, 2010
Affiliated and unaffiliated neighbourhood group volunteers and participants

May 18, 2010
City Council and City staff

May 18, 2010
Public session

May 19, 2010
Community agency partners

May 25, 2010
NSC Board

