



City of Vancouver Joint Operating Agreement Task Force Comprehensive Review of Community Based Delivery System (P2002-12) Final Report

Introduction

This “best practices” research project identifies key societal trends and community trends, which should be considered as Vancouver’s community based service delivery system, is further shaped. It also consolidates all the learnings from the literature, consultants’ experience, and interviews into 27 critical success factors. If integrated into Vancouver’s partnership framework, these critical success factors will position all community association partners to 1) work efficiently and effectively as interdependent organizations, 2) provide services that are truly valued by citizens, and 3) work with each other in a healthy and mutually respectful way.

Contained in this report are the following components:

1. Background
2. Methodology
3. Learnings
 - Society and community trends
 - Critical Success Factors
4. Six (6) Strategic Recommendations
5. Appendices which contains rich in depth information
 - Appendix I – Background Research and Recommended Partnership Models for Further Research
 - Appendix II – Interviews Notes from the 3 “best practices” organizations (Seattle, Regina, Calgary)
 - Appendix III – Interview Notes from the JOA Interview
 - Appendix IV - Notes from the Focus Group with Vancouver Community Association Members and ParkBoard Staff Members

By building an awareness of 1) the trends that will impact service delivery, 2) the critical elements for a successful partnership framework, and 3) the learnings from leaders in similar service delivery systems and using them as a reference point for evolving the partnership framework, the Vancouver Park Board and its 20 Community Association partners will be well positioned for the future.

Background

In December 2002, the Joint Operating Task Force (JOA) retained the team of Wilson & June Consultants and Anne K. Morrison Consulting Ltd. to assist with its partnership review process. The JOA's project objectives are to:

- 1) Review various partnership models including an evaluation of the current strengths (best practices) and challenges afforded by the partnership;
- 2) Evaluate the strengths and challenges from the partners' perspective (staff and Associations) and;
- 3) Ensure that the review encompasses technical issues ranging from (for example) finance to conflict resolution to accountability

The outcomes achieved by this review are:

- up-to-date information on the philosophy and operational reality from leaders in community and partnership development;
- “buy in” to the process and ownership of the deliverables by staff, Community Association members, and Task Force members, as a result of their engagement throughout the participatory research process;
- perceived value in being involved by those who were interviewed and, of particular note, those from external organizations
- increased awareness by all project partners about the nuances, opportunities, challenges, and potential of various partnership approaches/models;
- information which is organized and synthesized into a simple, easy to read format to ensure it is utilized for future decision-making; and
- a solid foundation for all partners to collaboratively develop a model that will position them for the future and provide exceptional value to the community, users, participants, Community Association members, Park Board staff and City staff.



Methodology

To achieve the project’s desired outcomes, the following tasks were undertaken between December 9th and March 10th:

1. Meetings, teleconference calls, and email communication between Consultants and co-chairs
2. Meetings (4) between the JOA Task Force and the Consultants
3. Definition of Criteria to Select Models to Research (See Appendix I)
4. Trends and Best Practices Research (See next sections)
5. Document and Present organizational snapshots of suggested “best practices” models (See Appendix I)
6. Confirmation of Partnership Models to Research
7. Determination of Criteria for Interviewees and Observers
8. Interviews (8) with 3 external organizations (See Appendix II)
9. Interview with the JOA (See Appendix III)
10. Focus Group with Vancouver Community Association Members, Park Board Staff and City Staff (Appendix IV)
11. Document Findings in a Summary Report and Present Information



The task schedule is noted in the table below:

◆ Denotes Task Force Meetings

Steps	Month of Execution			
	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Project Management	■	■		
1. Initial Meeting	■			
2. Define Selection Criteria		■ ◆		
3. Conduct Trends and Best Practices Research			■	
4. Confirm Models			■ ◆	
5. Conduct Detailed “real life” research			■ ◆	
6. Consolidate and Present Findings				■ ◆

Research Findings:

Societal Trends

There are a number of societal trends (trends that are occurring across Canada and the US) that will have a significant impact on the parks, recreation and cultural field over the next 10 years. These trends, the source, and implications for the services delivered in Vancouver are outlined below:

Societal Trend	Reference	Implications for services delivered/method of delivery
Growing gap between the have and the have nots and increasing poverty levels (including the working poor)	Interview – Seattle, Regina, Calgary, and Vancouver Consultants’ Experience Illuminating Our Future ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The gap is widening between those that have resources to participate in leisure pursuits and those that do not. Greater economic disparity makes the challenge of equal access to leisure pursuits a key issue which City and C.A.s need to address. In Canada, 60% of the wealth is controlled by those who are over 50 years of age². In the context of limited resources, treating seniors as a disadvantaged group might not be a true reflection of their financial situation. Instead focusing on ability to pay for all citizens might be a “fairer” approach.
Changing demographics – increasing diversity	Interview – Seattle, Regina, Calgary, and Vancouver Consultants’ Experience Illuminating Our Future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our society is becoming more diverse in terms of ethnicity, culture and capacities. Increasing diversity necessitates a Partnership Agreement that addresses communication strategies to connect with people of various ethnic backgrounds and with those with special needs. Staff training on how to engage various populations and develop leaders that reflect the local population is crucial.
Ageing Population with different resources and perspectives than in the past	Consultants’ Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a burgeoning older adult-senior (50+) population who choose to work part time or take early retirement. This represents a large pool of available volunteer expertise and experience that could enrich C.A. services. The older adults/seniors have time and resources to devote to developing partnerships, fund raising, public awareness, and shared leadership. Old adults don’t see themselves as “seniors”, are more active and resent being called “seniors”. Opportunities and marketing must reflect this perspective.
Citizens are shifting from accessing only local services to accessing both	Interview – Vancouver, Regina, Calgary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Richmond, a citizen survey revealed that people select programs based primarily on the type and time. Location was the third ranking consideration. Similar

¹ A National Thinktank hosted in 1998 by PERC and Jennifer Wilson Consultants Ltd. with Trend Information being regularly updated by Brian Johnston

² Richmond Community Needs Assessment prepared by Wilson & June Consultants and PERC

Societal Trend	Reference	Implications for services delivered/method of delivery
local and regional services	Richmond Community Needs Assessment Consultants' Experience	<p>findings about citizens wanting to go outside of their local community for recreation opportunities surfaced in focus groups in North Vancouver and Surrey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registration systems must be able to efficiently and effectively manage and distribute registrations and revenues for all facilities. Local facilities/C.A.s no longer “own” the registrations of local residents. There needs to be a framework to ensure local facilities/C.A.s don't compete with each other. Citizens prefer “one stop shopping” where they can register for any activity of their choice at their neighbourhood community center.
Seeking Experiential Hedonism	Illuminating Our Future Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The type of leisure experiences being sought by citizens is shifting towards the “pursuit of pleasure”. This has created an increased demand for shorter program sessions and one-offs rather than long term time commitments.
Desire for Spiritual Quests “What is life all about?”	Illuminating Our Future Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The desire to connect with one's spiritually (very different from religion) is translating into a trend towards eco-tourism, extreme activities, adventure challenges, yoga and meditation,
Declining trust in (big) institutions	Illuminating Our Future Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No longer are citizens content to rely on government and its bureaucracies to make decision on their behalf. This translates into the demand for more participatory decision-making and forums to make one's opinions known. While this is what citizens are demanding, the time they are able to spend to participate and contribute to solutions is declining due to time constraints.
Shift from Structured to Unstructured Activities	Illuminating Our Future Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organized Team Sports such as hockey have been declining significantly over the past 20 years. On the other hand, informal unstructured activities such as hiking, snowshoing, walking, birdwatching, gardening etc have increased dramatically in popularity. This shift reflects the desire for people to make choices at the last minute and for activities that don't require a long-term commitment.
Declining Volunteers	Illuminating Our Future Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statistics Canada (2000) reported that the number of volunteer hours has declined significantly. Those organizations that rely on volunteers will need to shift how they structure volunteer opportunities, the type of activities, and the description of the value to the community and the individual.
Volunteer Burnout	Interviews – Regina, Vancouver, Calgary Consultants'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People lives are so busy that communities are finding that it is difficult to find and retain volunteers. Therefore it is important to recruit appropriate

Societal Trend	Reference	Implications for services delivered/method of delivery
	Experience	volunteers, be clear about expectations and ensure a valuable experience.
Shift in Roles Volunteers Want to Play	Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizens are feeling time poor. There are more people who want their volunteer experience to be a shorter time commitment and a non-leadership role • Volunteers look for roles that are personally meaningful, which fit their need to feel connected with community, and which enable them to feel that they are making a difference. This requires different screening and matching criteria which will enable meaningful, rewarding volunteer roles, within supportive teams and a nurturing organizational community.
Declining Activity Levels in Youth	Illuminating Our Future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to PERC, in 1998 1/3 of Canadian children did not achieve the minimum amount of physical activity to sustain basic health. In 2000, the number rose to 2/3s. Our field must find ways to engage children in physical activity for the benefit of their health as well as for the benefit of our future health care system.
Shift in facility usage	Illuminating Our Future PERC ³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PERC states that facilities such as arenas, curling rinks, seniors' centre and sports fields are declining in use whereas pools, leisure pools, theatres, yoga/health/wellness centres, and trails/gardens/interpretative areas are gaining in popularity. • Leaders in our field suggest that facilities will continue to be a prime social gathering space for the community so the design of these spaces must be conducive to relaxation and conversation. • Facilities are being looked to provide areas that encourage health, education, private businesses and voluntary organizations.
Emphasis on Environmentally Friendly facilities and spaces	Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a greater expectation by the community for activities, outdoor spaces and facilities to be designed and maintained in an environmentally friendly manner
Requirement for Safe Environments	Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an expectation that both indoor and outdoor spaces are designed and upgraded in a way that protects those who uses them. There appears to be little tolerance around "accidents" and a greater propensity to sue if injuries occur.
Rising Costs and Ageing facilities	Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost to maintain buildings are increase due to rising utility costs and the fact that many supplies come from the US • Communities ageing infrastructure is putting pressure

³ PERC article, Winter 2003 issue of Parks and Recreation Canada magazine

Societal Trend	Reference	Implications for services delivered/method of delivery
		on capital budgets and the need for capital planning and investment strategies
Shift in facility design and operation	PERC ⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders in our field suggest that facilities must be flexible, adaptable and multi-purpose. Sustainable facilities are a priority when planning, building and maintaining buildings • Ease of access is imperative for people with mobility issues

⁴ PERC article, Winter 2003 issue of Parks and Recreation Canada magazine

Community Trends

There are a number of community trends (trends that are emerging in the communities we interviewed as well as the communities within which the Consultants have worked) that are seen to impact the way in which Partnership Agreements need to be structured and relationships need to be fostered.

Community Trend	Reference	Considerations for Partnership Agreements, Services & Relationships
Downloading Provincial responsibilities to Municipalities	Interview – Seattle, Regina and Calgary Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More provincial responsibilities are being taken up by Municipalities, resulting in Parks and Recreation Departments becoming key players to address social/recreational/health needs. Urgent social problems with disenfranchised populations (such as youth) put pressure on service delivery. The Agreement may need to build in a system to prioritize urgent system-wide needs and create a fair process for individual C.A.s to reallocate some of their revenues. It also requires staff and C.A.s to build effective partnerships with other sectors in order to pool their diminishing resources for common community goals.
Downloading traditional City functions /resources/ services to C.A.s	Interview – Vancouver, Regina, and Calgary Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial resources that used to be available to municipal governments are disappearing. Therefore, Community Associations are relied upon more and more to provide additional funding, services, and local buy-in. This can sometime cause Boards to feel resentful and/or with the greater degree of importance enable Boards to threaten to pull out of the agreement to get additional concessions.
Broadening of C.A. Role	Interview – Seattle, Regina, Calgary Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some cases, Cities in general or municipal departments who have not traditionally known how to connect with local communities are using C.A.s as an entry point to access the community and/or as vehicles to represent local issues for neighbourhood or quality of life issues. This increase in need is placing an increasing demand on C.A.s and their volunteer time. It also means that C.A.s need to know how to be more truly reflective of the community they serve or that the City provides support services to ensure this happens. • Some municipalities tend to refer to C.A.s as representing the voice of the local community. If the Board is not reflective of the community (age, ethnicity, etc) then the Board should be used as an entry point to engage the community, not the voice of the community.
C.A.s are expected to run in a more business-like fashion (be accountable)	Interview – Seattle, Regina and Calgary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the partnership arrangement where C.A.s are given resources by the City, there is the trend towards expecting C.A.s to prove they are achieving the expectations, outcomes, and provisions of the agreement and that they operate consistently with business

Community Trend	Reference	Considerations for Partnership Agreements, Services & Relationships
		<p>principles (i.e. good accounting, reporting, performance evaluation systems). The skills and abilities of Board members must reflect a more complex recreation service delivery context (accountability, shifting demographics, reduced funding resources, etc). This also creates higher expectations for more C.A. Board members to have business acumen, yet grass root volunteers also need to be heard. Staffs will need to jointly determine what are the key criteria for selecting well balanced C.A. Board members and devise appropriate recruitment/screening/orientation mechanisms. Seattle has developed some creative methods to re-energize Boards, including AC criteria, codes of ethics, and the ARC which is respected as a viable body to train and coach C.A.s and strengthen their partnership with the City.</p>
<p>The level of funding for C.A.s can be a self-fulfilling prophecy for non-sustainability</p>	<p>Interview - Regina</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In some situations, the amount of monetary support a municipality gives a C.A.s seems to create an organization which needs that infusion of money to survive. An example is where funding was provided to a C.A. to support it providing services and it was significant enough to hire a staff person, that position became unionized, the financial impact became greater, the ability to be flexible in terms of staffing was no longer an option, and another bureaucracy was created.
<p>Funding is no longer ongoing and sustainable from year to year</p>	<p>Interview – Vancouver, Regina</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lack of sustainable funding impacts C.A.s ability to plan long term and be strategic in its business and service planning
<p>Changing role of City staff to support C.A.s</p>	<p>Interview – Seattle, Regina and Calgary Focus Group – Vancouver</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The type of skills that City staff need to have is broadening to include excellent facilitation, leadership, community development, community engagement, knowledge management (qualitative/quantitative), volunteer development, conflict resolution, and communication skills.
<p>Partnership Agreements are more than operating legalistic agreements</p>	<p>Vancouver Focus Group Interview – Seattle, Regina, and Calgary Consultants’ Experience</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C.A.s want to be seen as equal partners with staff sharing a common vision, mutual respect, and principles of how they work together. They want access to key information, issues, and Dept strategies. This underscores the need for joint staff-Board visioning, determination of principles, and a communication strategy which ensures a transparent process and some means of regular dialogue between management staff and C.A. members. It also points to the opportunity to have Operating Agreement as a tool to set the context for the relationship i.e. start with the common vision, values, and principles which provide the foundation for the City-C.A.

Community Trend	Reference	Considerations for Partnership Agreements, Services & Relationships
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> partnership (i.e. Seattle and Roundhouse C.A.) It is also important to have agreements with standardized sections to ensure consistency in areas that make sense as well as language that reflects the unique nature of local communities and facilities
Parks, Recreation and Culture Departments are being recognized as major community contributors	Interview – Regina, Vancouver, Calgary, and Seattle Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local staff and facilities are seen as significant entry points to better understanding local community and neighbourhood issues that relate to quality of life. Parks, Recreation and Cultural facilities, services and special events are being recognized by City Hall as important contributors to the overall vitality of the city as well as important tourist attractions. Given increasing demand on resources beyond leisure and declining resources, there is the need to determine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What core services needed to be delivered across the City and within each community What are the best service delivery approaches and who are the best suited to provide and facilitate Where are there opportunities to increase efficiencies and better decision-making How can resources be leveraged
Parks, Recreation and Cultural Department are seen as part of an integrated system	Interview – Regina and Calgary, Vancouver Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a trend in which municipal recreation departments are working closely with cross-sectoral partners (in addition to C.A.s, such as health, education, social services, and police) to help create a healthier community. Citizens are in fact demanding that community service organizations be efficient and effective, leverage resources and ensure no overlaps in service
Consumer demands are more complex to understand	Interview – Regina Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the diversity of communities and the degree of change that is occurring, understanding one's community is complex. To ensure organizations are responding to these changes it is critical that regular strategic planning occurs and is grounded in current information on societal trends, local citizen needs, other service provider information and organizational information.
Decreased resources leading to increasing partnerships, alliances, and alternative service delivery models	Consultants' Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for partnership building requires both City staff and CA members to reach into their neighbourhood and greater community to build relationships and establish alliances and partnerships to address common issues.

Best Practices

The following section is a consolidation of all the information collected through the literature reviews, the Consultants' experience, the interviews and the Vancouver focus group. The information is grouped under 3 headings: Desired Outcomes (the results that are hoped for in an well functioning partnership relationship), Critical Success Factors (key elements that have been proven as necessary to support a well functioning partnership relationship; these have been stated in a way that provide a set of indicators against which a partnership's performance can be evaluated) and Best Practices (a description of how "model" organizations have integrated the critical success factors into their agreements or operating practices)

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
A great appreciation for other's contributions	1. Each partner has an appreciation for what each partner brings to the relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A critical factor for the successful implementation of a Partnership Agreement is a shared philosophy about the value of the partnership and a belief in each partner's capabilities and assets. Such a philosophy has to be modelled by senior staff and Board members and integrated into staff performance measures so that the entire partnership system develops a culture to embrace and embody it. Relationship building is key. • Seattle has accomplished excellent communication and mutual respect throughout this triangular partnership which has been cemented through the ARC Executive Director and their Board that coach C.A.s and connect with management staff on thorny issues; and most importantly, authentically supported from the Superintendent's level down through the system. Similar cultures have been established in Calgary, Regina and Saskatoon.
Work Well Together	2. Clear about rationale for partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is imperative to have clarity around why the partnership is important and what the value is for each partner and the community it services. • This can be done by documenting the rationale in the partnership agreement. As well, by jointly developing processes, systems, and tools, partners can be regularly reminded about the why each partner is important, what they contribute, and how they can better serve the community together. (Seattle, Regina, Calgary, Vancouver Roundhouse) • The GVRD Regional Parks Partnership Program began with an extensive vision building processes which included jointly establishing guiding principles, values, and protocols. • Calgary is currently undertaking a review of their partnership framework. As the demands on both parties are changing and the community expectations are

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
		different, the framework is being reviewed and the rationale maybe adjusted
	3. Partnership Approach is evaluated periodically	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even the most successful partnership models must be reviewed periodically by all stakeholders to ensure it reflects the way the partnership needs to function (Calgary, Regina, Seattle) • Calgary is currently undertaking a review of their partnership framework. Even through Calgary is viewed as a “best practice” in terms of its framework, it recognizes that circumstances have changed and their framework needs to reflect current needs and capacities. • Regina is also in the process of adjusting the way in which C.A.s are funded and supported. • Both Calgary and Regina are committed to engaging their community associations in the dialogue around what needs to be modified to best serve both partners.
	4. Board is composed to position it to be effective and best serve its community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boards need to have an election process that fosters motivated individuals who understand the “entire” local community and whose sole motivation is to provide benefits for their community (Regina). In Regina “some board members don’t even know they are burnt out and don’t have the ability to see different ways of doing things that will provide more benefit to their community” • Boards also need to have room for grass roots input, as well as for those with specialized, professional skills. Seattle staff is embarking on a “Board Renewal” approach which requires a fit between volunteer expertise and the role of the Board. Criteria reflect the diverse skills, commitment to neighbourhood, as well as to the broader Parks and Recreation system and function. The renewal process will screen out volunteers who cannot make that commitment. • In Regina, Saskatoon, Seattle and Calgary, staff’s skills in volunteer development is intended to assist C.A.s in recruiting volunteers who do reflect the local community
	5. Planning is collaborative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vancouver, Calgary and Regina all felt that it was extremely important that City staff, C.A. staff and C.A. Board members have a forum to discuss future planning around facility and program development. Ways in which this is done vary from C.A.s providing budget suggestions, to commenting on the City’s plans (when it is a city owned facility) to discussing facility development with the City and seeking their advice (when is a C.A. facility or initiative)
	6. City Staff and Association Members have a high level of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that management and front line staff, as well as C.A. members, and the system of C.A.s, connect to each other with mutual respect and a shared vision. Seattle has created an effective 3 way partnership

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
	mutual regard for each other	<p>between Parks and Rec staff, C.A.s, and the Associated Recreation Council. They have developed several processes and systems which ensured credibility in each other's eyes and ongoing respectful relationships.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In C.A.s that are working well, provide an adequate (or higher) level of service, have adequate funding (either self-generating or grants from the City), and feel supported by the City, there is a high mutual regard for each other. It appears that this might be more difficult in situations where there is a struggling C.A. and so mutual regard and appropriate support (grounded in pre-established principles) is even more important in these situations.
	7. Agreement has clarity around roles and responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City and C.A. staffs need clearly defined roles and responsibilities which are mutually understood and supported. They may use a common framework to develop their roles and responsibilities (Seattle, Saskatoon, Calgary), which ensures common guidelines and standards for how employees are treated and held accountable. (Seattle has a personnel manual applicable for both staffs; GVRD Regional Parks has a "Shared Decision Making" Template and Process for Parks staffs and Park Association Boards, as well as a Roles and Responsibilities Template, and a formal "Letter of Agreement" that clearly lays out roles and accountabilities)
	8. Clarity around staff allegiance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes C.A.s/ACs create pressure to retain staff whose leadership fits their particular community needs; their political advocacy may result in City staff being unable to transfer staff to suit City priorities and can leave City staff frustrated. (Seattle) Seattle is developing ways to realign City staff so that they are as "loyal" to the City as they have been to their C.A.s. In their efforts to support C.A.s, some staff identify more with them than with their City mandate, which leads to City staff taking on functions for C.A.s which are beyond their City roles. Such staff find they are "caught in the middle." Staff need to understand the broad public needs that they are hired to address, including and beyond individual C.A. priorities, and learn ways to manage their dual responsibilities.
	9. Agreement has clarity around expectations and indicators for success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Seattle "Programs through Partnerships" Guidebook was developed to clarify expectations and success indicators for their 1976 Agreement. This work is being updated, along with term limits for the Boards and clearer staff and Board responsibilities In Saskatoon, expectations and roles are clearly documented

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Calgary, the current work is focusing on addressing the confusion that has evolved out of so many Departments wanting to link with local C.A.s. They are also looking at matching specific staff with specific skills to work with specific C.A.s depending on the needs of that particular C.A. • Calgary is starting to implement performance measures and indicators. There needs to be both global and local indicators (reflect local context and desired outcomes). Currently they focus on budget, savings, facility and program opportunities, and value for \$ spent. • Benchmarking processes that highlight best practices within and between organizations is critical to celebrating accomplishments, measuring performance, supporting each other, learning from each other and fast tracking continuous improvement
	<p>10. City staff and Association members communicate effectively with each other</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is helpful to have a strong senior Parks and Recreation Management staff connection with the C.A.s at the neighbourhood and community level. The Seattle Model has accomplished this through a variety of means, including excellent leadership from one senior staff who is equally trusted by Parks and Rec staff and C.A. members to mediate differences, broker difficult problem solving, model effective communication, and enable the joint development of new ways to communicate. • The ARC, with representation from 37 AC's, has established a strong reliable presence that greatly improves City-C.A.s communication and shared resources. Their quarterly newsletter with a Superintendent's column, and various AC reports, plus the ongoing stewardship through their Exec Dir and Board keeps the AC's connected with each other and the City. Annual ARC presentations to Council regarding key Parks issues positions them as key partners. • In Regina, Community Consultants (City staff) are responsible for supporting a number of C.As. Some C.A.s actually have the Community Consultant's office onsite. Communication tools range from day to day interaction, meetings, emails, phone calls, attending monthly Board meetings and attending AGMs. • In Calgary, there are standards around what staff should be communication on and what type of information needs to be shared. • Seattle, Calgary and Regina support the concept of a Communication Strategy especially in situations where communication is not occurring in a timely and effective manner. In these communities, there is a history of communicating well together and there is a high level of

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
		<p>personal rapport. And, staff has been hired with strengths in these areas. All organizations believe that it comes down to truly wanting to “build relationships” and going to where the C.A.s are.</p>
	<p>11. Learn from the past and recognize and celebrate accomplishments together.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Today’s volunteers appreciate recognition that acknowledges the difference they are making for the organization or community. Both public (formal) and personal (informal) means are appreciated, including showcasing C.A.s at decision-making tables. (Seattle, Regina, Vancouver) • Recognition can be most powerful at the local level, such as the recent Seattle Model decision to have each Community Centre’s AC volunteers’ pictures and profiles on the Centre walls besides those of their City staff. This brings a living face to their Partnership. • Both Calgary and Regina believe it is important to collaborative discuss successes and challenges in a positive and supportive forum. Regina has attempted to do this but had mixed success. If properly designed it would have been very successful. • Calgary is looking at identifying performance measures and indicators and recognize the need to have indicators that reflect local context and desired outcomes. Currently they focus on budget, savings, facility and program opportunities, and value for \$ spent. Using indicators is an excellent way to celebrate and acknowledge excellence. • Regina noted there is a need to help C.A.s develop a way to communicate value to citizens to be accountable to them and to help recruit volunteers. • Benchmarking (as noted above under indicators) is an important tool that can provide a forum for celebration and learning from each other.
<p>Effective - achieving what set out to achieve</p>	<p>12. Agreement reflects how partners work together</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreements can only outline roles and responsibilities but cannot control for individual differences. Therefore the Agreements need to broadly reflect how partners work together on a day to day basis. “Due to personality and individual differences, not all roles and responsibilities are performed with equal consistency. There are gaps and lack of clarity; we work for performance within an acceptable range.” (Seattle interview: ARC Executive Director). • Calgary will likely move to one agreement with a way to recognize individual differences.
	<p>13. Agreement provides clear guidance, is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Agreement needs to be revisited regularly to ensure that the language is relevant to current realities and that it is understood the same by both partners. Operational

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
	utilized as reference point, and is understood by each partner	<p>tools to clarify the Agreement’s intent and improved practices help to make the Agreement a “live document.” (Seattle)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Calgary and Regina interviewees emphasized the importance of language – that it has to be simple and terms needs to be defined. • Regina has a very legal contract and their Community Consultants help to interpret it. • Calgary mentioned they need to evolve their agreement beyond financial and land matters to individual contexts, decision-making models around the lifecycle of a community and better utilization of staff resources (matching staff skills with community needs)
	14. Coordination and support services to the C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some models have effective mechanisms to coordinate and support the work of the partner associations. Such systems usually include representation from all member associations, with a staff liaison presence, and the system provides a way for issues to be heard with avenues found to resolve the issues through staff-association partnership. (Regina, Seattle’s Associated Recreation Council and the GVRD Regional Parks Partnership Forum). • When such coordinating mechanisms are viable and strong, partner associations can receive valuable support through in-service training, increased, more effective communication with City staff, and the development of tools and processes which address common needs (Seattle, Regina, and Calgary). Seattle’s Associated Recreation Council has been entrusted with major responsibilities by both staff and member C.A.s and is a major force that enables differences to be resolved and community associations to feel supported and equipped to become more successful. Calgary has staff who are mediators and are brought in to assist with conflict resolution.
	15. C.A. members are supported by City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both partners need to determine what the key informational, support and training needs are that are common across all C.A.’s and provide timely strategies to address these needs. • The City can provide a myriad of supports to the C.A.s, including facilities, utilities, citizen profiles, Volunteer Bureau, Instructor Registry, program planning, community connections, business planning, Board training, insurance, and legal counsel. (Seattle, Calgary, Regina) • Capable City leadership and expertise in developing relationships in partnership with C.A.s are essential and systems to orient new City staff to their facilitative

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
		<p>leadership requirements are imperative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seattle City staff has partnered with AC staffs to facilitate the “growing up process” which was required for AC Boards to become viable and productive. This has helped to set standards and achieve greater performance consistency: “ this has helped both partners to be a responsible partner.” • Seattle also reported that they were able to create meaningful processes and tools to support staff and partners because “the right people came along to work through the huge systemic “convulsions” that occurred through the early days of trying to operationalize their Agreement. Renewal became possible when the ARC Board became viable, when office staff were equitably addressing all AC’s needs, and when the volunteer leadership became more mature, and less special interest driven. • Seattle also provides marketing expertise to ARC through the appointment of a City Parks Department Marketing Director as an ARC employee, cost shared between the City and ARC. • GVRD Regional Parks provides Community Development Coordinators to assist Park Partnership Associations to build collaborative relationships with staff, community, and decision-makers. All Park Associations connect through a Regional Parks Forum which facilitates shared resources, system issue clarification, and training, including Organizational Workshop Leaders (partners and staff) trained to offer free organizational capacity building training to Associations and staffs (consensus, meeting management, participatory decision making, leadership building etc) • It is important that the type of support that the City provides is clearly outlined but not to the point where the City can’t contribute more than the agreement provides for (i.e. if more resources become available) • Seattle C.A.s also collect a 1.5% “Participation Fee” which is paid to the city to help offset city expenditures
	16. City is supported by C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.A.s provide a huge volunteer base, rich in resources, knowledge, and skills to help develop effective programs for all citizens and mobilize grass roots leadership. It can also provide political advocacy which can move issues forward, as well as promote and interpret benefits of City services to communities. C.A.s/A.C.s provide revenue for programme enhancement, improvement and other projects to be used within their communities. (Seattle, Regina, Calgary, Vancouver)
	17. Citizens are well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seattle, Regina, and Calgary believe it is essential to have

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
	<p>served; equitable services between different communities with different needs, capacities, and resources</p>	<p>a systemic needs assessment mechanism to determine community needs, preferences, and expectations. The ability to address unmet needs which is vital to communities, requires a strategy to reach the underserved community members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some form of benchmarking is required, in order to gauge the impact of current services and determine who is not being reached.
	<p>18. There is an approach to reach the “have not” communities in order to have equitable services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipalities are realizing that there is a need for procedures and systems which ensure that some C.A. revenues contribute to those communities with less revenue capability. (Seattle’s Associated Recreation Council administered an “Opportunity Fund” that included voluntary C.A. donations from community fundraisers, the donations to be pooled across the system and reallocated through an AC grant application process for projects such as a community computer lab. With \$15000 seed money from ARC, the fund doubled through the volunteer AC donations.) • Such an approach requires C.A.s to look beyond their neighbourhood to a wider community perspective. Need to train staff and AC’s in budgeting to allow for redistribution of some AC funds for priority system needs. • Seattle reports that a lot of work is required to enable “have not” communities to have equitable services; there is a need to find a way to re-allocate resources so that higher revenue producing facilities are not able to offer more services than can lower income neighbourhoods; “We are responsible for the whole City”(Christopher Williams interview). While Seattle is trying to instill a fair revenue sharing arrangement, they are insisting that all facilities keep uniform hours of operation, so that higher revenue communities do not have higher service levels. • “We need a higher level of accountability; a basic philosophical discussion needs to happen to build in equity; groups need to ‘think big’; the goal is not to make a profit; and, not all revenue needs to stay with the Association.” (Christopher Williams) • With the growth of C.A.s there is a need to establish fiscal efficiencies - both City-wide and at the community level. Seattle has undertaken a review of financial processing. • Regina has social development grants that they give to C.A.s in historically disadvantaged areas. Regina is thinking about moving to a formula (same as Saskatoon) which provides a base level of operating funds to all C.A.s and then additional funding based on low income

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> indicators There are also provincial grants that the inner city C.A.s can access (Vancouver, Regina, Seattle)
Efficient – making the most out of available resources	19. Clear process for handling revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If there are proper checks and balances/accountabilities, C.As/ACs appreciate financial autonomy (Calgary, Regina, Seattle). Seattle’s triangular partnership (between Parks and Rec staff, the Associated Recreation Council, and the community Advisory Councils) provides accountabilities, the AC’s revenues are managed separately from the City through the ARC. Seattle’s Associated Recreation Council’s staff is responsible to ensure accurate accounting of all AC revenues and expenditures and for seeing that all related legal requirements are met. The ARC also provides AC’s with financial reports necessary for them to monitor their programs and budgets. And ARC staff work with Parks and Recreation staff to define necessary procedures and responsibilities for the accurate and timely processing of revenues, disbursements and financial reports. For both Calgary and Regina, all revenues stay with the C.A.s as most are financially autonomous. Regina’s system for handling revenue from registration is not a best practice.
	20. Clear process for handling conflicts, differences, and problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to have clearly laid out guiding principles, codes of ethics, and conflict of interest clarifications, to ensure mutual understanding of acceptable ways to resolve differences (Calgary, Seattle). Seattle has codes of ethics for both the AC’s and the ARC, as well as documents which detail the interface between Parks and Rec staff and AC staffs and preferred codes of conduct. “Even if the issue is not open to change, communication prior to implementation keeps the partnership healthy.” (Bill Keller, Executive Director, ARC, Seattle) Regina doesn’t have a formal process and it should. Conflicts are handled quite well because of the personalities involved. There are also some instances where the City should have jumped in earlier to provide leadership around resolving issues. In Calgary, there are many options and people know what to do. Staff have tremendous skills in this area i.e. staff groups that specialize in mediation
	21. Each party is held accountable for their areas of responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misunderstood expectations often cause staff conflict. It is important that each party clearly know their roles and responsibilities and that there is mutual agreement between the City and the C.A.s. Seattle and Saskatoon have a document that describes in detail the roles and relationships for and between the AC’s, the ARC, and Parks and Rec staff.

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Regina and Calgary, the C.A.s are not formally required to go beyond financial viability and they should be. Both organizations agree that the City should provide guidelines for governance and for financial accountability.
	22. Monitor the City's investment in C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Saskatoon there are established service level standards. Both Seattle and Saskatoon have regular annual audits on each C.A.. In Regina, Community Consultants (City staff) work so closely with each C.A. that they would see a decline in programs, hear community feedback about the responsiveness of programs and services, and be part of C.A. Board discussions around any organizational difficulties. In addition, C.A.s that have had accounting issues (fraud) are required to submit financial information on a yearly basis and apply for funding. In Calgary, C.A.s are required to submit an overall business plan including a demonstration of their financial viability Be aware that the level of funding can in fact be a self-fulfilling prophecy. In Regina, C.A.s that have never been funded don't feel they need funding to survive.
	23. Be accountable to the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both partners need to develop a way to communicate value to citizens to be accountable to them, to check assumptions and to help recruit volunteers (Calgary, Regina)
	24. There are tools and resources to support the partnership model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A variety of resources are required to ensure mutually understood roles, protocols, and processes to support positive relationships, smooth decision making, and effective daily operations. All organizations mentioned that the documentation is not all in place and they struggle to backfill what they do with documentation. Personnel manuals, Board protocols, cash handling procedures, and more have all been developed by the Seattle Model. ARC plays a substantial coaching role to support AC's and help build their capacity, including an ARC Liaison Committee which connects one ARC member with 2-3 C.A.s for continual, in-depth support and resources. In December, 2002, Seattle Parks and Recreation, the Associated Recreation Council, and the Advisory Councils jointly produced a "Baseline Standards Check List" as a quick reference for staff and the AC's. This resource includes a library of reference materials: The AC Quick Reference Guide; the Dollars and Sense Cash Handling Manual; Programs Through Partnerships operational document; ARC Personnel Manual, AC Minute Book, Recruitment Packet and Business Plan. Clear roles and responsibilities are laid out for AC's, the

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
		<p>ARC, the Facility (staff) Supervisor, and Seattle Parks and Rec within the following areas: partnership, governance, financial, personnel, and record keeping, with clear delineation of required procedures and general guidelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2001, the GVRD Regional Parks Forum, a coordinating body for all of their Park Partnership Associations, conducted an evaluation of the Partnership Approach/Initiative through a joint staff-partner group that surveyed all Park Associations, staff, and Forum members. Findings were very helpful to target key areas that needed further focus. • Saskatoon has tools around standards and levels of service, city staff roles, and volunteer development • In Calgary, the Federation of Calgary Communities provide a range of support services (financial, legal, process) to local C.A.'s
Responsive to Community Needs	25. Services from Partnerships are responsive to changing circumstances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for ensuring that services reflect changing demographics, societal trends, gaps in services, and urgent priorities. To do this, a needs assessment strategy and ongoing plan to take the pulse of the community is required (Richmond and Calgary/Regina through profiling and Regina CA C.A. - neighbourhood surveys). Relying on informal communication/feedback, individual perceptions, or continuing services which receive registrations means that the wider community needs are not served. Mechanisms to reach out into the community, discover who is served and who isn't, and determining if the services provided fit the leisure needs of the entire community – all ages and abilities, are required. • In Calgary, citizens are not bound by geographic boundaries so the notion of community based programming is not as central. In Regina, neighbourhoods evolved around C.A.s boundaries. In Saskatoon, C.A.s were located in areas within established neighbourhoods. The whole concept of local needs is changing. • In Regina, they have an “economic disadvantaged formula” and in Calgary they have “Need and Impact Graph” to help rate services that need to be subsidized.
	26. Board/Staff are truly plugged into local community needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Calgary and Regina noted that the community associations only serve 19% and 20% of their local population (respectively). They have determined this from the membership lists and from neighbourhood surveys. • They recognize that much needs to be done to ensure they are providing services that meet local needs and that local residents do go elsewhere for recreation

Desired Outcomes	Critical Success Factors	Best Practice Considerations for Partnership Agreement and Services
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Census Profiling and Community Needs Assessments are cited as important. • Election procedures for Boards to encourage Boards to be reflective of the local community was also noted as being an important way to ensure local needs are addressed
	27. Respect Lifecycle of C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In situations (Regina and Saskatoon) where a C.A. was faltering, staff would go out to the community to confirm whether or not there was still a need for a C.A., help with fundraising, or assist the faltering C.A. to amalgamate with another C.A. • In Calgary, there is the feeling that there are too many C.A.s in established areas and that resources are focused on sustaining them versus letting them disband with dignity. • In Seattle, they are instituting a review of all CA's and the viability of their Boards, with the understanding that some Boards may need to be totally restructured to ensure that they are effective. Or, there may be some instances of needing to create a brand new Board to more fully serve its community.

Strategic Recommendations

In this final section, a set of strategic recommendations (that are consistent with the parameters of this projects) are outlined to position the JOA Task Force to effectively respond to the information collected. The recommendations are as follows:



1. Ensure the JOA Task Force and Park Board staff and encourage Community Association partners to become intimately familiar with the **trend information** to ground these key groups in the external factors that will impact the context of the partnership in the future.
2. Ensure the JOA Task Force and Park Board staff and encourage Community Association partners to become familiar with the **detailed notes from the Interviews and Vancouver Focus Groups** to garner an in depth understanding of the context for, and details behind, the 27 critical success factors presented in this report. It is emphasized that “best practices” research is intended to inspire you to look at different ways of achieving your desired outcomes. But “best” is contextual – it must fit for your circumstances and your community.
3. Undertake a **community engagement process** to hear first hand from citizens what their expectations and priorities are for service delivery and facility development. This process is crucial. It will serve to ground the development of the partnership parameters in the citizens’ perspective. This in turn will ensure that the services and facilities are relevant, responsive, and deliver value and benefits for all citizen
4. Have the JOA Task Force undertake a process that will enable both staff and Community Association partners to 1) **collaboratively discuss** the trend data, best practices information and community expectation information and 2) **foster a commitment to establish a model** that best serves the community and values the contribution of both partners. It is particularly important to create an open, transparent, and collaborative process in light of the approach the City of Richmond is taking with respect to their Community Associations.
5. Begin immediately to define and **implement strategies to foster mutual trust, respect, collaborative thinking and a “team” attitude** between Park Board and City staff and Community Association Board members and staff.

6. Train Park Board staff and Community Association Board members/staff in **partnership and community development techniques** to foster stronger community relationships, more effectively leverage community resources, be in touch with changing demands and opportunities, and be better positioned to engage citizens and partners in activities.

Appendix I

Background Research and Recommended Partnership Models for Further Research (Steps #3 and #4 in Work Program)

Desired Outcomes:

- To identify potential organizations that appear to have “best practices” which can inform the Vancouver partnership approach
- To create a selection process based on the Task Force’s selection parameters that yields 3 (in addition to Vancouver) approaches to study in more depth
- To broaden our understanding of how the Vancouver approach currently works

Selection Process

1. Step One:

Undertake a literature review, web search, and interviews with colleagues and leaders in community and partnership development to reveal organizations/municipalities that have effective and progressive partnership approaches..

The following organizations emerged as potential best practices:

1. Saanich, B.C. ⁵
2. Portland, Oregon⁶
3. Brandford, Ontario⁷
4. Battlecreek, Michigan⁸
5. Baltimore, Maryland⁹
6. Savannah, Georgia¹⁰
7. Richmond, BC
8. Coquitlam¹¹
9. North Van Recreation Commission ¹²
10. Calgary
11. GVRD Regional Parks
12. Toronto
13. Ottawa
14. Regina
15. Philadelphia¹³
16. San Bernadino¹⁴
17. Seattle
18. Burnaby¹⁵
19. Vancouver

⁵ Broadly based community issues/quality of life focus with no real focus on parks, recreation and culture

⁶ Broadly based community issues/quality of life focus with no real focus on parks, recreation and culture

⁷ Broadly based community issues/quality of life focus with no real focus on parks, recreation and culture

⁸ Broadly based community issues/quality of life focus with no real focus on parks, recreation and culture

⁹ Broadly based community issues/quality of life focus with no real focus on parks, recreation and culture

¹⁰ Broadly based community issues/quality of life focus with no real focus on parks, recreation and culture

¹¹ City wide issues with committees reporting to City wide staff, an informal partnership that functions as advisory

¹² One agreement with ParkGate is serving as a model for NVRC but hasn’t been implemented across whole system

¹³ Has a long established and what appears to be very progressive partnership approach. Has been impossible to find contact people to interview. Given more time and more resources, this organization should be investigate for future phases because the literature indicates a depth in tools and support systems that enable the model to work and be sustainable.

¹⁴ Broadly based community issues/quality of life focus with no real focus on parks, recreation and culture

¹⁵ Burnaby does not have community associations and has a reputation for playing a “provider” only role

2. Step Two:

Finetune the list by removing organizations that didn't meet the following foundational selection criteria:

- i. a community based service delivery system for leisure services (organizations that primarily focus on neighbourhood issues and did not have a focus on leisure service delivery were removed)
- ii. an approach that involved a government partner and a volunteer based partner
- iii. a framework that governed a number of communities/neighbourhood and community facilities

This yielded the following list:

- 1. Saanich
- 2. Richmond, BC
- 3. Calgary
- 4. GVRD Regional Parks
- 5. Toronto
- 6. Ottawa
- 7. Regina
- 8. Seattle
- 9. Vancouver

3. Step Three:

Conduct additional research to more fully understand specific aspects of each approach. Based on the agreed to selection criteria, organizations were assessed in terms of the degree to which their approach met the selection criteria (in addition to the criteria used in the previous step). Having an overall coordinated approach to managing partnership is a foundational criterion. Therefore, if an organization didn't meet this criterion no other criteria were assessed. A “-“ means the criteria is not met, “+” means criteria is somewhat met, “++” means criteria is well supported. The selection criteria are outlines along the top row. Our research is summarized as follows:

	Overall Coordinated Approach	Investment in support mechanisms	Variety of communities served	Responsiveness to local community needs	Complexity of C.A.s (number and length of time in existence)	Similar Demands and Facilities	C.A.s for both special interests and geographic	Diversity (reps on boards reflect community)
Saanich	-							
Richmond	-							
Calgary	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	
GVRD	++	++	++	++	+	-	-	
Toronto	+	+	++	+	++	+	+	
Ottawa	-							
Regina	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	
Seattle	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	

Organizations at a Glance:

	Population	# of Community Associations	Length of time C.A.'s have been in existence for	Degree of Autonomy (i.e. Report to a City Dept, a Commission or Department	Staff funded by City/ C.A. or mix	# and type of facilities run by C.A.	# of leisure facilities run by municipality	Way revenue is handled
Vancouver	545,600	20	1979	Report to Park Board	The majority of staff are funded by City; occasionally supplemented by C.A.s funding for additional Programmers.	22 Centres operate under the JOA; 2 centres are twinned with another centre and are jointly operated between Park Board and Association. Full range of facilities including small centres in schools, large stand alone centres, and major recreation complexes.	200 parks, beaches, golf courses etc. The JOA relates to Community Recreation Centres. There are 24 of these and they are all operated in partnership with a local community non profit Association/ Society. 2 of the Centres (Britannia and Ray Cam) have unique operating agreements which are different from the JOA.	Revenue is handled by the City and by the Associations for joint service. It is handled by Park Board for Park Board services. There is a billing between the two.
Saanich	105,393 1996 stats	Several special interest Associations like Cordova Bay Community Association for seniors; also are 20 neighbourhood based Community Associations to "make Saanich a better place to live."	various	Various. Some are autonomous NFP's, with no formal ties to Government; some receive Municipal grants such as the Neighbourhood Development grants; the Community Associations liase with the Saanich Police Dep't.	Various arrangements	0	11	Unclear
Richmond	166,219	Community Associations – 19 of which 8 are geographically community based. The city is working towards updating the operating principles to guide the relationship.	1958 – First operating agreement signed with Steveston. Current approach established in 1980's	Very Autonomous – Community Associations are part of an Association Board which City staff liase and support. Associations provide input into policies that impact	Mix - City staff supervise association employees, oversee planning and delivery of programs, maintenance of buildings. Association staff – financial,	Approx 17 - facilities run by associations ranging from 9 Community Centres, 1 Senior Centre, 1 Arts Centre, 1 Gallery, 1 Theatre and 1 Heritage site, Cultural, Heritage, and 2 Arenas with 8 sheets	Pools (2)	C.A.s keep revenue

	Population	# of Community Associations	Length of time C.A's have been in existence for	Degree of Autonomy (i.e. Report to a City Dept, a Commission or Department	Staff funded by City/ C.A. or mix	# and type of facilities run by C.A.	# of leisure facilities run by municipality	Way revenue is handled
				association activities.	programming and administration. All revenue goes to Associations			
Calgary	904,987	123 Community Associations which participate in 32 District Councils. Community Associations are organized into a federation.	Some groups have been in existence since the early days of this century. The federation was formed in 1961. The current partnership model was implemented in 1996.	Autonomous - 2 types of partnerships; (1) "community organizations" are arms length as operate programs in smaller city owned facilities through a licence of occupation agreement and a nominal fee for service; "Alliances" operate major city owned facilities and collaboratively set context of relationship, hire a CEO, set outcomes, approve fees and capital .	Mix – (1) Parks and Recreation provides staff support i.e. 1 FT Community Resource coordinator for every 3-4 C.A., land for facilities, and leadership workshops. C.A.s develop or maintain neigh rec facilities. Some also focus on neigh issues (2) Jointly hire CEO, have a board rep or a business unit (staff) contact	All areas in Calgary have a Community Association or are in the process of forming one. Some have recreation facilities, some don't. These are operated through Community Association agreements/fee for service. There is a federation of Community Associations that provides support to C.A.s 3 Regional Recreational Centres operated through Alliances	2 Arts Centres, 1 Skate Park, 12 Arenas, 12 Pools	C.A.s manage their own finances and keep their own revenue. City only reviews financial viability of the C.A.s
GVRD	1.8 Million	10 Regional Park sites have Park Partnership Associations (out of 23 Regional Parks). The Parks Partnership Associations participate in the Regional Park Forum, to share resources, address system-wide issues, and provide training and support.	First Park Partnership Association founded in 1997. The Parks Partnership Initiative which was the original context was formalized into the ongoing Parks Partnership Program in 2002.	To the GVRD Parks Area Manager who oversees the park with which they're associated, to the overall Parks Department Manager , and ultimately, to the Park Committee.	Staff funded by Regional parks, with a few exceptions of additional staff (clerical, volunteer coordination etc) funded by a few Park Associations.	Staff and volunteer partners co-manage some facilities, such as visitor centres, trail development, butterfly gardens, hatcheries, field management etc. Shared decision making processes established + effective mechanisms to conduct joint planning. (including Regional Parks Forum). Numerous partner led educational, interpretative activities and special events.	23 Regional Parks, with 10 picnic shelters, 4 group camps, 10 fields, 2 ball diamonds	Most Park Associations can fundraise, and retain their own monies for approved projects or designated uses to enhance resources they have developed. An independent body, the Pacific Parkland Foundation , has been established to help fund raise (from private donors and private sector and charitable foundations) for

	Population	# of Community Associations	Length of time C.A's have been in existence for	Degree of Autonomy (i.e. Report to a City Dept, a Commission or Department	Staff funded by City/ C.A. or mix	# and type of facilities run by C.A.	# of leisure facilities run by municipality	Way revenue is handled
								<p>projects in parks and seed funds; partners can apply for funds for projects. Also, there is an Allocation Committee of GVRD composed of partners, politicians, and the Partnership Staff Administrator who adjudicate partner applications for resourcing funds. Two different Park Associations have recently received resourcing grants.</p>

	Population	# of Community Associations	Length of time C.A's have been in existence for	Degree of Autonomy (i.e. Report to a City Dept, a Commission or Department	Staff funded by City/ C.A. or mix	# and type of facilities run by C.A.	# of leisure facilities run by municipality	Way revenue is handled
Toronto	3,840,000 1996 stats.	16 Board-run Community Centres and 66 Community Advisory Councils	First Board-run Centre formed in 1974; Community Advisory Councils were formalized in 2002	Board-run Centres have dual accountability to the City, which provides Centre core funding, and the community via the local Board of Management, appointed by the City. Also connect with the Assoc of Community Centres. They were established by City by law and organized in response to 1992 Task Force on Neighbourhood and Soc Rec Serv. Community Advisory Councils are responsible to the Parks and Rec. Div of the Econ Dev and Parks Com through the Commissioner of Econ Dev, Cult and Tourism..	Board-run Centres' staff hired by local Board of Management, appointed by City. Staff are City employees. The Community Advisory Councils are advisory to the City Parks and Recreation staff, who are hired by the City. The CAC's provide ongoing public input to and dialogue with Parks and Rec staff, where community interest exists.	16 Board-run facilities; there are no Community Advisory Council run facilities. CAC's are advisory only and operate in city owned/community operated community centers or significant park resources. There are also community and recreation centres solely run by City Parks and Rec staffs and community centres that are independent, NFP organizations with various funding sources.	Unable to locate this information at this time.	Board-run Centres' revenue is handled by the Centre Boards and staff; they receive city core funding which helps leverage funds. Community Advisory Councils do not handle revenue, but do give input through one of 3 feedback options that staff and community select..

	Population	# of Community Associations	Length of time C.A.'s have been in existence for	Degree of Autonomy (i.e. Report to a City Dept, a Commission or Department	Staff funded by City/ C.A. or mix	# and type of facilities run by C.A.	# of leisure facilities run by municipality	Way revenue is handled
Ottawa ¹⁶	791,300	Staff work with approximately 75 major Community and Recreation Executives Association Executives. There are about 11 different municipal approaches with the largest ranging from delivering through community organizations (Gloucester) being staff driven (Nepean) and a mix of both (Ottawa). Currently, there are “a range of agreements “ and no overall overarching operating agreement. The city has planned to do a purchased service review to look at current agreements and to harmonize approaches. This all operates within a Ward system which can be seen as fostering competition for resources between wards.	Very long time	Mix – Dovercourt is the “best practice” very autonomous - Report to staff and provide an annual report that focuses on financial position, population served, in-kind services, and special projects. Other relationships are more staff driven.	Mix – some situations the facility is staffed by the city (Director and maintenance staff) and the C.A. operates programs almost all the programs. In other situations the City has a purchase of service agreement and the Association/Organization runs the facility, and designs and operates the programs. (Dovercourt). In some cases the revenue is totally kept by the C.A. and in other cases if the profile exceeds 10% that goes back to the city. There is funding support to keep programs inclusive.	City of Ottawa delivers programs through 10 major recreation complexes, 33 libraries, 37 arenas, 37 swimming pools, and 73 recreation or community centres, 3 wave pools, 10 outdoor pools, 69 wading pool, 51 spray pads, 3 supervised beaches, 217 outdoor rinks, 40 indoor ice pads, 360 ball diamonds, 300 sportsfields Over 200,000 program registrations per annum. Over 234,000 facility rental / booking transactions per annum. High demand on prime time hours for all facilities. There is a great deal of interest to move more facilities to the Dovercourt approach (totally autonomous and all C.A. staff)		Each community association manages their own revenue
Regina	190,400	City is divided into 5 zones with 28 Community Associations through local community centres, school and other community	32 years of experience with their decentralized model.	Very autonomous - 5 Zones with 2-3 C.A.s. Each C.A. represents a number of neighbourhoods. Each Zone has a Zone Board. A member of Zone	Mix – City staff perform centralized functions (aboriginal, com dev, marketing, IT) Staff are a resource and	5 Community Centres are run by the community as well as 23 other C.A.s that operate through local facilities	6 Community Centres plus 22 skating rinks, 8 arenas, the Sportsplex, Arts Centre and 2 Leisure Centres	C.A.s receive funding

¹⁶ On January 1, 2001, the new City of Ottawa was created with the amalgamation of the Region of Ottawa-Carleton and 11 local municipalities: Cumberland, Gloucester, Goulbourn, Kanata, Nepean, Osgoode, Ottawa, Rideau, Rockcliffe Park, Vanier, and West Carleton.

	Population	# of Community Associations	Length of time C.A's have been in existence for	Degree of Autonomy (i.e. Report to a City Dept, a Commission or Department	Staff funded by City/ C.A. or mix	# and type of facilities run by C.A.	# of leisure facilities run by municipality	Way revenue is handled
		facilities		Board sits on Commission which also includes Councillors.	support to C.A.s capacities. Conduct leadership/com dev workshops and assistance with city wide marketing and promotion. C.A. provide community recreation programs, outdoor rink supervision, organize coach and instruct sport opportunities, organize community events, and represent community concerns in broader issues.		are run by City	
Seattle	540, 500	37 Advisory Councils, all of which belong to the Associated Recreation Council.	Since 1964; expanded role 1971.	To City Parks and Recreation and also, the Associated Recreation Council	Funded by Advisory Councils, but shared personnel management, Parks and Recreation staff supervise the local AC staff.	Recreation facilities where most AC programs operate are owned by the City. DPR and AC share those facilities for their programs.	23 community centres, 2 boating and sailing centers, 12 concession facilities, 7 historic buildings, 2 museums, 151 outdoor tennis courts, 6 performing arts and visual arts centres, 8 indoor swimming pools, 2 outdoor swim pools, 27 wading pools, Zoo, Aquarium, 3 environmental education centres, tennis centre and 400 parks and open	The AC's can retain and preserve all fees, revenues and funds in the local community for use in operating local AC programs. Local AC funds are considered public funds but are managed separately and apart from City budgetary and financial processes, although DPR approved AC budgets. ARC provides uniform financial, payroll

	Population	# of Community Associations	Length of time C.A's have been in existence for	Degree of Autonomy (i.e. Report to a City Dept, a Commission or Department	Staff funded by City/ C.A. or mix	# and type of facilities run by C.A.	# of leisure facilities run by municipality	Way revenue is handled
							areas	and accounting services to the AC's. Advisory council financial activities are only processed through ARC.

4. Step Four:

Task Force selects 3 organizations to interview and conduct Focus Groups with (in addition to Vancouver) and to round out the information that the Task Force has indicated an interest in. We recommend further investigation through interviews and focus groups for:

- Regina
- Calgary
- Seattle
- Vancouver

We believe this combination of approaches constitutes considerable variety in approaches which in turn will enrich the learnings.

Interview Notes from the 3 “Best Practices Organizations - Seattle, Regina, Calgary

Interviews were conducted in February 2003. They were facilitated by the Consultants and recorded by the Task Force Members



City of Vancouver Joint Operating Agreement Task Force

Interview with Christopher Williams, Seattle, Recreation Operations Division Director

Outcome	Indicator	Question: (For each Question, probe how important is this concept to you? How well is it working? Why?)	Christopher Williams, Seattle, Recreation Operations Division Director
A great appreciation for each other’s contribution	Each partner has an appreciation for what each partner brings to the relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For staff: what do you appreciate and value most about the members of the C.A.s and their contributions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Christopher was recommended by the Superintendent as the key Management resource for our interviews. He has over 20 years management experience; supervises managers whose staff work with 37 AC’s; works closely with the ARC Executive Director and also with all AC Board Chairs. <p>Respect: level of passion people bring to table: re- programs & opportunities to serve their neighbourhood; commitment to services and to the system, even when they do not see “eye to eye” with staff</p>

Outcome	Indicator	Question: (For each Question, probe how important is this concept to you? How well is it working? Why?)	Christopher Williams, Seattle, Recreation Operations Division Director
Work well together	Clear about rationale for partnership (mutual benefit and shared purpose)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the purpose for your partnership? What value does it provide for the City, for C.A.s, for citizens? (Is there common agreement around the value of the partnership?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff <p>To: offer programs and services that would not otherwise happen; enrich system; make it possible to have high low cost/high quality programs across system</p> <p>City provides base level of funding; enables facilities to be open and run: coordinator/reception/maintenance; no program staff</p> <p>Advisory Councils provide strong advocacy/ political muscle/dedicated coalition of support; they can go where staff cannot in the support of neighbourhoods. Volunteers may not understand the clout they have with the politicians; haven't really maximized it yet.</p> <p>People have different ways of seeing what the value is:</p> <p>Issues: Park Dept is accountable to whole city: local Advisory Councils only see their responsibility to their neighbourhood: disparity of incomes in the different communities leads to inequity in program offerings; Parks Dept, going through paradigm shift: moving towards a centralized system; growing the system so that people understand the need to re-allocate resources throughout system; Advisory Councils need to see their "mission" as the whole system [at the moment:37 councils; 37communities and neighbourhoods]</p>

Outcome	Indicator	Question: (For each Question, probe how important is this concept to you? How well is it working? Why?)	Christopher Williams, Seattle, Recreation Operations Division Director
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who manages the agreement? Does this process work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff <p>Currently: No one manages the agreement. However, the Association of Recreation Councils (an umbrella policy-making arm for the AC's which is a major partner with both the AC's and with City Staff), does address some issues and create systems to address some of them. Staff support at arms length. In many other instances, staff has taken the lead because of poor functioning of some Councils; lack of business skills on the boards Councils want to be consulted and resent the lead taken by staff Need: periodic re-evaluation of agreement a bi-annual strategic plan; joint city/governing organizations work planning process; and a new vision of "values of the partnership"</p>
	City Staff and Association members collaboratively plan services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How important is it to you have collaborative planning around services and facility improvements between City staff and C.A. – at the city wide level, at the local level (so as to not foster competition i.e. one's success at the expense of another)? Is this been done well? Why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff <p>In terms of services more important than ever. Yet collaborative planning is not where we would like it to be.</p> <p>big advances in the last 5 years (ARC became 360% more effective in managing over 8 M \$ revenue) huge amount of work to do still poor financial management on the part of some councils & no vision for the future</p>
	City Staff and Association members have a high level of mutual regard for each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would you rate, in general, the relationship between C.A.s and the City (very good, good, it varies between communities, poor, very poor) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Good –to it varies

Outcome	Indicator	Question: (For each Question, probe how important is this concept to you? How well is it working? Why?)	Christopher Williams, Seattle, Recreation Operations Division Director
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there consistency between roles and responsibilities of City versus Association Staff in different facilities? • Do you think consistency is important ? • Are there overlaps or gaps or lack of clarity in areas of responsibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff <p>Consistency very important A set of basic standards[expectations] for the organizations and the coordinator are currently under development;[18 points] ie: regular meetings/conducting elections according to bylaws/ basic requirements for good financial management etc.</p> <p>Parks Dept. has expectations of paid staff to be natural leaders and interact with the community according to certain standards Coordinators have a role in communications and information flow</p> <p>Are instances of the staff being more loyal to the AC than to the City which interferes with partnership work</p> <p>Basic leadership responsibilities will be set out: Are creating Basic Standards for both staff and for AC's, as well as a "Report Card" for AC's to evaluate their progress.</p> <p>Key point: Advisory Councils will not function at any other level than staff!</p> <p>Park Dept has a role in laying these out</p>
	City Staff and Association members communicate effectively with each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What forms of communication are used most frequently? • Which are most effective? • Do you have a communication strategy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff <p>Face to face, "up front" to be proactive Telephone Until 6 mos ago they had a quarterly newsletter/budget cuts have forced new methods: Interface with people at the highest level more frequently Advisory councils are called together to meet with high level staff Managers are to have breakfast with the Presidents And monthly Coordinator meetings with AC Presidents</p> <p>There is no formal communication strategy</p>

Outcome	Indicator	Question: (For each Question, probe how important is this concept to you? How well is it working? Why?)	Christopher Williams, Seattle, Recreation Operations Division Director
	Effective partnerships learn from their past and recognize and celebrate their accomplishments together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you take time to acknowledge/recognize the achievements that result from your partnership and the areas that require some attention? If so, why? In what ways? If not, why not? Do you think this is important? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Dept Superintendent hosts a major social event for the whole system [association members] twice a year [dessert nite] Annual ARC Board meeting; celebration of successes of past year and what is working everyday Thinks it is vitally important
Effective – achieving what set out to achieve	No Gaps between operating agreement and actual practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your operating agreements truly reflect how the partners work together? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff “I don’t think so” people are in it for the wrong reasons we need to reinforce: <u>these are public dollars</u> Operating agreement is 28 yrs old need to: build in a requirement for a 10 year review/validation
	The agreement provides clear guidance, is utilized as a reference point and is understood by each partner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your operating agreement provide the kind of guidance and language you need? Are there areas where the agreement is vague or is not consistent with what actually happens? What are these? What would you like to see instead? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Agreement is so vague No boiler plate language/so loose People are operating all over the map So many Park Dept changes; agreement does not reflect current reality Need to: build in guiding principles/compelling requirements for how the boards should operate
	C.A. members are supported by City	<p>How does the City support the success of its C.A.s? (Probe as follows)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program planning Business planning Training Insurance programs Employee benefits <p>Is this what you need?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff ARC board meeting is staffed [council of councils] Senior staff attend board mtgs Staff have developed: work planning process; Conflict of interest guidelines; Renewal process for boards; Analysis of fees across system; Cash handling procedures; ARC needs to develop a Strategic Plan
	City is supported by C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What information, resources, etc do C.A.s provide the City? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Councils provide programming Activities and staff the programmes Need to: build coalition among the councils Create a voting block among association members

Outcome	Indicator	Question: (For each Question, probe how important is this concept to you? How well is it working? Why?)	Christopher Williams, Seattle, Recreation Operations Division Director
	Citizens are being well served Equitable services between different communities with different needs, capacities and resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you identify your community's recreation needs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff No assessment of programming by the boards; Programs are being perpetuated; Boards have a long way to go to be more representative of cultural diversity and of local community interests; Community building needs to happen
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know you are achieving this? (form of evaluation/measurement) 	Park Dept gets direct feedback from citizens Need to do systemic analysis as well as site feedback.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know if there is any segment of your community who is not accessing your services ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff We don't have systemic way to know who is not served Some people feel Advisory Councils are elitist and people are shut out Councils do not reflect their community's demographics
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does your approach enable "have not" communities to have equitable services to the communities that have more resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff A lot of work is required to enable "have not" communities Need to find a way to re-allocate resources so that higher revenue producing facilities are not able to offer more services than can lower income neighbourhoods; We are responsible for the whole City; Trying to keep AC's with uniform hours of operation to keep it fair until is revenue sharing arrangement.
Efficient – making the most out of available resources (financial, physical, human)	Clear process for handling revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the revenue handled? Does this work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff A basic philosophical discussion needs to happen to build in equity: Groups need to: "think big"; Subsidize quality programs; The goal is not to make a profit; Not all revenue has to stay with the association Needed: A whole level of responsibility/accountability and guidelines

Outcome	Indicator	Question: (For each Question, probe how important is this concept to you? How well is it working? Why?)	Christopher Williams, Seattle, Recreation Operations Division Director
	Clear process for handling conflicts, differences and problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is conflict between the 2 parties handled? Is this effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff <p>Some staff don't understand philosophy or mission of Dept; Coordinators take side of volunteer group; Management often called in to smooth over differences between Coordinators and AC's; People get angry at Park Dept.; Coordinators are stewards of the relationship/have to manage the relationship; Staff are their own worst enemy; Staff need to remember they are part of a system; Conflict resolution is not particularly effective/other mechanisms are required</p>
	Each party is held accountable for their areas of responsibility?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask both questions for each interview: • What aspects of your agreement is the City held accountable for ? • How is it measured? • How well does this work? • What aspects of your agreement are C.A.s held accountable for ? • How is it measured? • How well does this work? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff <p>Staff are accountable for day to day operations; employee appraisals; accounting procedures; AC's have advisory roles for operations; recent document lays out their distinct roles and responsibilities but needs to be updated</p> <p>[see above]</p>
	There are tools and resources that are in place to support the partnership model	What tools and resources are effectively used to support your partnership relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff <p>Staff have performance appraisals; City role is to provide the day to day operations; Coordinator oversees all staff in workplace; Not all councils understand this role Councils hire and fire their own staff; Role clarification required; Set of behaviour oriented guidelines in process now' Is a recent document: "Criteria for behaviour and conduct during meetings"; ARC assists with "quality interaction enabling quality relationships"</p>
Responsive to Community Needs	Services from Partnerships are	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do C.A.s and the City collaboratively assess 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff <p>Jointly? "No"</p>

Outcome	Indicator	Question: (For each Question, probe how important is this concept to you? How well is it working? Why?)	Christopher Williams, Seattle, Recreation Operations Division Director
	responsive to changing circumstances	<p>changing community needs and organizational capacities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What trends are you seeing in your community that affects how your partnership needs to operate? i.e. change in needs, change in time to volunteer, disposable income, etc 	<p>Goal: to get the councils to work more in “community” and build organizational capacity</p> <p>Trend in Seattle: further reduction in resources; and a demand for increase in services; and increasing cultural diversity and changing service needs.</p> <p>We need to accelerate change/embrace the changes</p> <p>This is not a high functioning relationship</p> <p>Need: to centralize the finances for the good of the system</p>
(Summary)		In general, what works well/less well? (Top 3 areas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff <p>Works Well:</p> <p>Programs: childcare provision [before and after school]</p> <p>Intention of partnership is good/has sustainability</p> <p>Provides a rich tapestry of people involved in community life/ community centres are ”safe places”</p> <p>Works Less Well:</p> <p>A LACK OF SHARED VISION</p> <p>NO STRATEGIC PLAN FOR 10 TO 20 YRS</p> <p>No clear guidelines for recruitment of volunteers</p> <p>No business plan for the future</p> <p>Summary: need to embrace change on the part of staff and volunteers;</p> <p>Open up discussion with members of the public;</p> <p>Christopher is going to take our questions back to staff and propose a review process with ARC using these as the basis for discussion. He found it very clarifying for him and helpful.</p>



CITY OF VANCOUVER JOINT OPERATING AGREEMENT TASK FORCE

Interview with Bruce Bentley, Chair, SW Advisory Council, Vice Chair, Associated Recreation Council (ARC), and Chair, Seattle Parks Commission

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Bruce Bentley, Seattle, Chair, SW Advisory Council, Vice Chair, Associated Recreation Council (ARC), and Chair, Seattle Parks Commission
A great appreciation for each other's contribution	Each partner has an appreciation for what each partner brings to the relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For C.A. members: what do you appreciate and value most about City staff and their contributions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruce Bentley – Seattle – Board • Chair of South West Advisory Council for 10-12 years, Chair, Seattle Parks Commission and Vice Chair, of Associated Recreation Council • Board: • Staff are open and professional, caring, understand that people are volunteering – mutual appreciation between staff and volunteers
Work well together	Clear about rationale for partnership (mutual benefit and shared purpose)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the purpose for your partnership? What value does it provide for the City, for C.A.s, for citizens? (Is there common agreement around the value of the partnership?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board • Provide programming to enrich the community at individual cc and at-large sports organizations for community. Advisory Council at the local neighbourhood level. • Youth example - teach basketball, teamwork • Seniors example – bought whirlpool • At their centre – they have a pool, centre, computer lab • Staff handle facility role, the AC is in charge of programming and additional staffing for professional staff. • Professional staff supervise other staff • There is common value. • Sometimes we (Associated Recreation Council) help AC to see the bigger picture. There are 36 AC. Revenue comes mainly from 5.

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Bruce Bentley, Seattle, Chair, SW Advisory Council, Vice Chair, Associated Recreation Council (ARC), and Chair, Seattle Parks Commission
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who manages the agreement? Does this process work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board 1976 agreement Managed by the Superintendent of Parks. Last year we looked at core programming and set standard criteria for AC eg. Meetings once per month, Robert's Rules, 12 – 15 members, review term limits to reenlist and cycle term lengths, bring in new people, recruitment. They are at a renewal stage started this year – including revenue sharing. Overall support Liaison roles on Associated Recreation Council. Members go out to AC groups to share information, learn and get input
	City Staff and Association members collaboratively plan services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How important is it to you have collaborative planning around services and facility improvements between City staff and C.A. – at the city wide level, at the local level (so as to not foster competition i.e. one's success at the expense of another)? Is this been done well? Why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board Huge value Staff has to go out to neighbourhoods, AC and other service providers – eg. YMCA. Keeps finger on the pulse Parks Dept is personality driven – good leadership of staff will help AC to thrive and be involved. There have been instances of variation in styles and concerns and Superintendent and other key staff (Christopher Williams) can be effective in smoothing things over. They really understand volunteers and many AC really appreciate that which creates a synergy to get more things done. There also is an ARC Liaison Committee formed from the 15 member ARC Board, whose members relate to 2 AC's for in - depth coaching.

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Bruce Bentley, Seattle, Chair, SW Advisory Council, Vice Chair, Associated Recreation Council (ARC), and Chair, Seattle Parks Commission
	<p>City Staff and Association members have a high level of mutual regard for each other</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you rate, in general, the relationship between C.A.s and the City (very good, good, it varies between communities, poor, very poor) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board • Very good relationship • The 3-way triangle relationship : the ARC was seen as elitist in the past and there was an upheaval from the AC. Now it is more user-friendly and accessible and seeks input, provides training. Credibility over the last 4 years with AC and staff has changed tremendously. Communication has opened up. • ARC meets with Council members and does Annual Report to Park Commission. • ARC is a responsible partner. The city is now coming to them with new issues eg. Golf • AC relationship has also transformed related to the changes in ARC relationship. Defenses have come down, collaboration is increasing. • The ARC is modeling and reinforcing the values and principles of what the partnership is all about which is having a positive effect on all the partners.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there consistency between roles and responsibilities of City versus Association Staff in different facilities? • Do you think consistency is important ? • Are there overlaps or gaps or lack of clarity in areas of responsibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board • Yes – professional staff supervise the added manpower of the AC staff. Staff manuals have been developed along the same guidelines as the city has which creates consistency in roles, responsibilities, standards and expectations. This was part of the “growing-up process” and has helped in smoothing out conflicts if ARC employees think they should be treated differently. • They have a personnel manual applicable for both staff and AC’s, which would be available for sharing. Employee guidelines are similar for ARC members. • This has helped both parties to “be a responsible partner.”

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Bruce Bentley, Seattle, Chair, SW Advisory Council, Vice Chair, Associated Recreation Council (ARC), and Chair, Seattle Parks Commission
	City Staff and Association members communicate effectively with each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What forms of communication are used most frequently? • Which are most effective? • Do you have a communication strategy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board • Communication has really opened up these past 5 years. • For AC – verbal communication with site coordinator (2) about once per week (eg. Signing off cheques, budget meeting), some meetings, e-mail • This works really well, especially e-mail because I can view it at my pace and reply • For ARC – quarterly newsletter, Superintendent column, ARC President and AC reports.
	Effective partnerships learn from their past and recognize and celebrate their accomplishments together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you take time to acknowledge/recognize the achievements that result from your partnership and the areas that require some attention? If so, why? In what ways? If not, why not? Do you think this is important? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board • Parks Dept has a volunteer recognition program eg. ½ off events throughout the year. Yearly desert event for AC. • Very important • No discounts for volunteers to register for programmes • New initiative for recognition at site planned for this year – eg. Picture of volunteers and their role and pictures of staff • ARC meets on a quarterly basis and then an Annual General Meeting/Dinner. One AC member can attend and then \$25 for any additional persons. This is part of the recognition program as well. • Annual ARC presentations to Council regarding key Parks issues are another “invisible” way that the AC’s are acknowledged and respected.

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Bruce Bentley, Seattle, Chair, SW Advisory Council, Vice Chair, Associated Recreation Council (ARC), and Chair, Seattle Parks Commission
Effective – achieving what set out to achieve	No Gaps between operating agreement and actual practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your operating agreements truly reflect how the partners work together? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board Yes – City ordinance passed the process. Blueprint for 3-way relationship “Programmes through Partnerships”. In opening up the agreement to clear up a few gray areas - it opened up other important issues. (eg. Suggestion of having 36 Board members rather than 15 members). Whenever you open up a dialogue who are passionate about parks – it is a good thing. We are in the process of defining roles more in a quiet way. AC want to give opinion and if there is consensus then volunteers want something to happen – it’s not just advice – change the words.
	The agreement provides clear guidance, is utilized as a reference point and is understood by each partner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your operating agreement provide the kind of guidance and language you need? Are there areas where the agreement is vague or is not consistent with what actually happens? What are these? What would you like to see instead? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board Some words need to change – eg. “advisory”
	C.A. members are supported by City	<p>How does the City support the success of its C.A.s? (Probe as follows)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program planning Business planning Training Insurance programs Employee benefits <p>Is this what you need?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board ARC takes the lead, the city helps in the recruiting process through the site coordinators. City staff connect with wider community and key community agencies City supports in grant writing Insurance coverage and legal services if needed
	City is supported by C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What information, resources, etc do C.A.s provide the City? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board AC and ARC provides huge volunteer base, equipment which becomes city assets (eg. Van, tables & chairs), promotion through hiring teens to distribute flyers

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Bruce Bentley, Seattle, Chair, SW Advisory Council, Vice Chair, Associated Recreation Council (ARC), and Chair, Seattle Parks Commission
	Citizens are being well served Equitable services between different communities with different needs, capacities and resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you identify your community's recreation needs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board Being out in community – talking to people, asking questions about programming, connecting to high school and middle school (eg. ESL classes for specific cultural groups)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know you are achieving this? (form of evaluation/measurement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board Not sure if we know how well Very little complaints Work from core programming – there is a waiting list for piano – know it is successful – or that we are on track.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know if there is any segment of your community who is not accessing your services ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board The site coordinator would probably have a handle on that by going around to different groups and service providers. They bring that perspective to the AC.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does your approach enable “have not” communities to have equitable services to the communities that have more resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board ARC had this as a long term goal – to look at the system as a whole. If you can raise \$ from a fund raiser you can keep that \$, pool it and redistributed it across the system. “Opportunity Fund” from ARC - \$15,000 and asked AC to contribute – ended up at about \$30k. AC then apply for initiatives (not brick and mortar) eg. Sustain computer lab at one location
Efficient – making the most out of available resources (financial, physical, human)	Clear process for handling revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the revenue handled? Does this work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board \$ is handled through ARC and AC get monthly statements. AC can set up separate sub-accounts (eg. Park play equipment project) Generic programmes (eg. Pools) go through city
	Clear process for handling conflicts, differences and problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is conflict between the 2 parties handled? Is this effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board ED and Executive Board is normal path Superintendent can get involved but this is not typical Board members and senior staff work together on policy to make things smoother

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Bruce Bentley, Seattle, Chair, SW Advisory Council, Vice Chair, Associated Recreation Council (ARC), and Chair, Seattle Parks Commission
	Each party is held accountable for their areas of responsibility?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask both questions for each interview: • What aspects of your agreement is the City held accountable for ? • How is it measured? • How well does this work? • What aspects of your agreement are C.A.s held accountable for ? • How is it measured? • How well does this work? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board • City accountable for providing staffing, leadership for AC, advise, provide facilities, pay portion of energy bills, insurance, legal services. The site coordinator is ultimately responsible for programming • ARC provides insurance to AC • AC – to be at meetings, be involved, provide input, ear to the ground, sit on other neighbourhood Boards can provide a bigger perspective • It all works really well
	There are tools and resources that are in place to support the partnership model	What tools and resources are effectively used to support your partnership relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board • Personnel manual, protocol for Boards • Parks Dept has Marketing Director who has been shifted to be an ARC employee. ARC pays half • City came up with “core programming” which helps us to implement programmes
Responsive to Community Needs	Services from Partnerships are responsive to changing circumstances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do C.A.s and the City collaboratively assess changing community needs and organizational capacities? • What trends are you seeing in your community that affects how your partnership needs to operate? i.e. change in needs, change in time to volunteer, disposable income, etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board • Collaborative at the community centre. For ARC we work with Parks Dept looking at demographics, facility expansion, changing trends, baby boomers. • Trends – teens. Got into levy to add teen centre in response to gang violence and the unstructured young people.
(Summary)		In general, what works well/less well? (Top 3 areas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board • Really well – 1)communication level between the 3 groups 2) Parks appreciate the partnership (volunteer base and \$98m levy) 3) partnership well received by all • Less well – 1) new coordinators (5-6) taking new roles and responsibilities too rigid and shutting out or minimizing AC Christopher Williams has done a great job in working with this and is a great cheerleader



City of Vancouver Joint Operating Agreement Task Force

Interview with Katie Gray: SW District Manager, Parks and Recreation, City of Seattle

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Katie Gray, Seattle, SW District Manager, Parks and Recreation
A great appreciation for each other's contribution	Each partner has an appreciation for what each partner brings to the relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For staff: what do you appreciate and value most about the members of the C.A.s and their contributions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Katie Gray – Rec Manager for south West Seattle – 6 centres and parks in area has worked with city for 20 years including working at a facility and now overseeing district from management point of view. Time and energy of volunteer service Connection to community and ability to share at local level so staff get a good perspective and better serve needs
Work well together	Clear about rationale for partnership (mutual benefit and shared purpose)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the purpose for your partnership? What value does it provide for the City, for C.A.s, for citizens? (Is there common agreement around the value of the partnership?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Provide programmes at cc that the city wouldn't otherwise be able to provide. Local community identify what is needed and then provide it Value to cc is to direct and have input into what is provided and provide additional funding which can be put directly back into their community eg. Playground equipment, special event or for scholarship into recreation programmes There is common agreement that this is a valuable way to offer services. There is not always agreement on what the AC role is and who is the overseer – who has the power to make decisions. The AC role is advisory – not decision making and usually the city takes the advice but sometimes has to say no.

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Katie Gray, Seattle, SW District Manager, Parks and Recreation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who manages the agreement? Does this process work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Site staff manages the day-to-day interactions and ARC manages the overall under a separate agreement. Right now we are going through redefinition and a new basic standards for AC, which clarifies roles. I can e-mail to you.
	City Staff and Association members collaboratively plan services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How important is it to you have collaborative planning around services and facility improvements between City staff and C.A. – at the city wide level, at the local level (so as to not foster competition i.e. one’s success at the expense of another)? Is this been done well? Why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Key to partnership. Volunteers want to know that they are making a difference. EG. Issue in neighbourhood can’t afford extra-curricular activities so staff and volunteers are working together to develop strategy and share responsibility. Staff could write grant and AC could oversee.
	City Staff and Association members have a high level of mutual regard for each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would you rate, in general, the relationship between C.A.s and the City (very good, good, it varies between communities, poor, very poor) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Good but there is some variances across the city. Some AC don’t recognize their role and there has been an adversarial relationship, mistrust We are very committed to a consistent approach and we are firm about the AC’s role. We are instituting a renewal process at each local site– asking each Board member to reapply. Some may be asked to continue in the Board and the partnership and some may be asked to volunteer elsewhere.

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Katie Gray, Seattle, SW District Manager, Parks and Recreation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there consistency between roles and responsibilities of City Staff in different facilities? • Do you think consistency is important ? • Are there overlaps or gaps or lack of clarity in areas of responsibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Yes, consistency is very important • We need to give advice and support to staff in what their role is on a consistent basis. In the past staff developed their relationship on their own and were sometimes put into the middle between the AC and the city. • Sometimes staff go beyond what they should be doing in taking on responsibility that should the AC's (eg. Fundraising for scholarship fund for summer day camp)
	City Staff and Association members communicate effectively with each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What forms of communication are used most frequently? • Which are most effective? • Do you have a communication strategy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Management invited to AC meetings sometimes. I try to attend 1-2 times per year at their monthly meetings • 1-2 city-wide information sharing meeting with Superintendent/directors to have an open dialogue. This has gone a long way in building trust. • What to put together a newsletter (quarterly or twice per year) • Information sharing meeting once per year at district level– have them set the agenda. Superintendent sharing current city wide issues, and AC's appreciate getting information in timely manner.

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Katie Gray, Seattle, SW District Manager, Parks and Recreation
	Effective partnerships learn from their past and recognize and celebrate their accomplishments together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you take time to acknowledge/recognize the achievements that result from your partnership and the areas that require some attention? If so, why? In what ways? If not, why not? Do you think this is important? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Info sharing meeting with Superintendent, we identify 2-3 AC to bring something to share with other AC as a way to say “good job” ARC has quarterly meeting which highlights good things that the AC are doing It is working but we can always do a better job Say “thank you” regularly
Effective – achieving what set out to achieve	No Gaps between operating agreement and actual practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your operating agreements truly reflect how the partners work together? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff The 1976 agreement probably needs some work, which ARC is going to look at. Many AC probably have never seen agreement
	The agreement provides clear guidance, is utilized as a reference point and is understood by each partner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your operating agreement provide the kind of guidance and language you need? Are there areas where the agreement is vague or is not consistent with what actually happens? What are these? What would you like to see instead? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff The agreement is not a living tool “Programmes through Partnership” Guidebook is more of the living document. She may have an e-copy which she could send. It was developed in partnership. Need term limits for the Boards and clearer roles and responsibilities. Staff need clearer roles and responsibilities as well

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Katie Gray, Seattle, SW District Manager, Parks and Recreation
	C.A. members are supported by City	<p>How does the City support the success of its C.A.s? (Probe as follows)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program planning • Business planning • Training • Insurance programs • Employee benefits <p>Is this what you need?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • The AC provides programmes in city facilities and they don't get charged for permit, utilities, staff. All the revenues go into AC account. We have a surcharge of 1.5% "Participation Fee" which is paid to the city. If they go after hours they have to pay for staff time. • Insurance within city policies and procedures. For events or special trips we ask them to get their own insurance • Professional staff at no cost to the AC • AC provides revenue for programme enhancement, improvements projects, scholarship funds which are used right there in that community • City can influence how the revenue gets directed to deal with city priorities. AC participate on a voluntary basis. Future may suggest more influence from city (eg. Child care consistency for quality standards)
	City is supported by C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What information, resources, etc do C.A.s provide the City? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • See above
	Citizens are being well served	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you identify your community's recreation needs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff <p>Surveys, AC input on needs</p>
	Equitable services between different communities with different needs, capacities and resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you know you are achieving this? (form of evaluation/measurement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • We don't have a really good system

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Katie Gray, Seattle, SW District Manager, Parks and Recreation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know if there is any segment of your community who is not accessing your services ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Last year we had a big budget cut and we have to cancel “kidspace program” which was a very important program for high needs communities and the \$ was redirected to scholarship fund. We have to really listen to communities who don’t have access to the same resources. One of AC roles is to identify issues and stand up to say “think about this” Need to train staff and AC’s in budgeting to allow for redistribution of some AC funds for priority system needs Some AC’s voluntarily offered some of their revenues to assist staff with system needs Staff are trying to get more influence on AC revenues, especially for child care, which has huge revenues.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does your approach enable “have not” communities to have equitable services to the communities that have more resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff See above
Efficient – making the most out of available resources (financial, physical, human)	Clear process for handling revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the revenue handled? Does this work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Staff need to budget for programmes and make a small profit to sustain the AC Reviewing financial processing (eg. cash handling training) Each AC is responsible for their own bookkeeping ARC also has audit of revenues it processes from 37 AC’s Staff registers clients and receives \$ Looking for efficiencies city-wide It is key to be able to recognize where efficiencies can happen

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Katie Gray, Seattle, SW District Manager, Parks and Recreation
	Clear process for handling conflicts, differences and problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is conflict between the 2 parties handled? Is this effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Local level staff and AC work through the issues. Management will be brought into a resolution meeting. System issue is brought to ARC and they will make a recommendation to Superintendent It is cumbersome but it builds up the relationship EG. Staff transfers, frustrating for management when staff influenced transfer through their connections with AC, other organizations in community and it got political
	Each party is held accountable for their areas of responsibility?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ask both questions for each interview: What aspects of your agreement is the City held accountable for ? How is it measured? How well does this work? What aspects of your agreement are C.A.s held accountable for ? How is it measured? How well does this work? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Accountability is not a fit with the current agreement
	There are tools and resources that are in place to support the partnership model	What tools and resources are effectively used to support your partnership relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff See earlier comments
Responsive to Community Needs	Services from Partnerships are responsive to changing circumstances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do C.A.s and the City collaboratively assess changing community needs and organizational capacities? What trends are you seeing in your community that affects how your partnership needs to operate? i.e. change in needs, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Not done intentionally but staff and AC check in with each other Trends: Economic downturn, every time there is a new mayor the trends change. Now assessment and outcomes are priorities and will likely affect programmes in future. Even though the AC \$ is theirs, the city is ultimately responsible for what is accomplished. Teen

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Katie Gray, Seattle, SW District Manager, Parks and Recreation
		change in time to volunteer, disposable income, etc	programmes
(Summary)		In general, what works well/less well? (Top 3 areas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Working well: 1) good model of having AC at each site with local input 2) AC generate revenues separate from city budget which can be earmarked for that particular neighbourhood. • Less well: 1) communication 2) role clarification and being held to those roles



City of Vancouver Joint Operating Agreement Task Force

Interview with Debra, Regina, Cathedral Village (Community Association Staff Member)

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Debra Bell, Regina, CA Staff Member
Context		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8,000 people • Inner City Area – at one time low income, now rising but still have % that is low income • Inner City is a locational reference – qualify for social dev grants and because low income, high single parent families, rentals and aboriginal people tend to be located here • Challenges – affordable housing which translates to affordable services • 20 % of local people who come to local facility, very well used • Annual festival - get 30,000 festival • Go else where – tend to 10% from other communities and some citizens go outside area because are limited in terms of services that can break even • Break even means limits programs would want to have more diverse programs and tend to rely on volunteers and where there are volunteers tend to drive the type of programming (don't tend to get higher quality because would have to pay more) • Description of the facility • City of Regina owns building and share it. Don't pay any rent, have an office, gym, and a pool room and kitchen. Use for free and only get charged when using for fund raising • Interviewee is a staff person – was a volunteer and now a staff person hired by board; does community work (full time shared by 3 people (1) Office admin; (2) financial admin (3) editor of community / communications) and also overall arts festival coordination
A great appreciation for each other's contribution	Each partner has an appreciation for what each partner brings to the relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For staff: what do you appreciate and value most about the members of the C.A.s and their contributions. • For C.A. members: what 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CA staff person about CA's contribution • Time • Expertise • Local knowledge • CA Staff person about City Staff

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Debra Bell, Regina, CA Staff Member
		do you appreciate and value most about City staff and their contributions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support services • Communication skills • Resources provided
Work well together	Clear about rationale for partnership (mutual benefit and shared purpose)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the purpose for your partnership? What value does it provide for the City, for C.A.s, for citizens? (Is there common agreement around the value of the partnership?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City gives money and CA's provide services, special events, sense of identity and tourism to local community • This CA is an anomaly as work hand in hand with City • Rely on City for information and help with project (consultation – expertise on legal, planning commission re housing and planning issues, zoning) • City leans on CAs for local expertise – decisions are influenced by Board • Recreation wise - City helps with registration nites • Any rec programs are advertised City wide as well as locally • Registration done locally and then the next day it gets sorted by area • Only take money for own programs and City collects for skating. Programs from other CA areas don't take money but contact citizens to pay afterwards • CA wouldn't survive without the funding • Value to the community - local programming and affordable programming and part of the local identity
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who manages the agreement? Does this process work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have an agreement ? • Yes – have a contract for 3 years and do a report • This CA has a proven track record therefore don't apply every year • If had a decline in Board membership or fraud would result in having to reapply. • City manages the agreement • Agreement – CA required to show that in need of social development money – did a survey of need in community for recreation and what is here versus what is provided by us • City required to give money • It works well but City would like them to eventually be self sufficient. • How to improve the agreement? • Centre programmers are now more involved with C.A.'s – not just sitting in a central office, located in same building. • Agreement contains a lengthy list of what not going to do and this list makes sense • City of Regina maintains this building

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Debra Bell, Regina, CA Staff Member
	City Staff and Association members collaboratively plan services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How important is it to you have collaborative planning around services and facility improvements between City staff and C.A. – at the city wide level, at the local level (so as to not foster competition i.e. one’s success at the expense of another)? • Is this been done well? Why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely important • Does this happen – yes; through consultation and meetings. If City has no they often provide staff time • No annual planning – on an as needed basis. • Facility planning happens as part of capital planning process and CAs come forward with ideas • Process to ensure no competition – informal meetings between inner city CAS but the staff didn’t have enough time to participate so didn’t work as well. Another process quite successful (see notes later on) where United Way come together as a pilot project and facilitated a forum to discuss gaps and overlaps in services provided by CA and others • City attempted to coordinate collaborative planning around recreation – too short a session (3 hours) and too many people there. The success is questionable – resentment between CA because different capacities and it turned into a “complaint session”
	City Staff and Association members have a high level of mutual regard for each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you rate, in general, the relationship between C.A.s and the City (very good, good, it varies between communities, poor, very poor) 	Relationship very good – comes down to staff and have really good people that can talk to as needed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there consistency between roles and responsibilities of City versus Association Staff in different facilities? • Do you think consistency is important ? • Are there overlaps or gaps or lack of clarity in areas of responsibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different between different CAs– some areas struggling to keep Board and Board staff • There needs to be flexibility as others need so much more help • Staff should step in more with different areas as needs arise • Clarity around roles – yes there is. And it is important • Board learned allot when staff did orientation. Half of Board members are new every 2 years. There is max of 6 years and then step down for a year (and then can seek re-election for next 6). Some there since 1984 • Every CA has different bylaws • In this situation Board members have to live locally – and this is important – and stepping down is a good requirement and maybe allowed to stay too long (don’t even recognize that they are burning out

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Debra Bell, Regina, CA Staff Member
	City Staff and Association members communicate effectively with each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What forms of communication are used most frequently? • Which are most effective? • Do you have a communication strategy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant (City staff) works on site – informal communication happens all the time • Board meetings - staff come too • Annual General meeting – staff and community attend • Other forms that are important – forums are valuable so that everyone meets from other organization to share successes, challenges and solutions • City Hall staff – meetings and letters (letters are good because you can pass them onto appropriate members) – not everyone has email • People’s personalities foster communication – tends to work well and have lots of success (because of financial position) there they have good communication
	Effective partnerships learn from their past and recognize and celebrate their accomplishments together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you take time to acknowledge/recognize the achievements that result from your partnership and the areas that require some attention? If so, why? In what ways? If not, why not? Do you think this is important? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get allot of verbal acknowledgement as this CA is used an example of how you can change a community from falling to pieces with no businesses to a vibrant community. • Recognition is given in meetings and City reps tell them and tell other community associations about the success to inspire • Invited to volunteer appreciation awards dinner– this is valued • Annual report to the City about meeting grant requirements • Annual GM report – functions as a report to community • No City feedback on CA performance which would be helpful and then CAs could put into annual report at AGM to report back to community • A forum (every 2 months) between CAs would be a useful way of giving recognition and setting expectations
Effective – achieving what set out to achieve	No Gaps between operating agreement and actual practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your operating agreements truly reflect how the partners work together? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract is a legal document – pretty formal • Zone consultants working closely with CA staff to help clarify (rely on this more than the agreement) and if there is a problem they are aware of it first hand. • Staff Consultants – have to have strong skills
	The agreement provides clear guidance, is utilized as a reference point and is understood by each partner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your operating agreement provide the kind of guidance and language you need? • Are there areas where the agreement is vague or is not consistent with what actually happens? What are these? What would you like to see instead? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be more clear • More clarity around ways City provides support would be helpful (although the city might feel more obligated) • Needs to have provision around flexibility i.e. if the City has additional resources it should be able to provide it without having the agreement get in the way

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Debra Bell, Regina, CA Staff Member
	C.A. members are supported by City	How does the City support the success of its C.A.s?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding • Training opportunities • Staff onsite • Resource to consult with – staff always willing to answer questions around various issues • City Hall expertise • Locally – with festival CA rely on arts and culture/consulting staff to help with planning, and installing artwork. Staff Consultant – more recreation programming focused – will help set up programs and makes sure financial assistance in place • Also City offers allot of training courses that might pertain to C.A.s (event planning, volunteerism) but there is a cost • This is useful
	City is supported by C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What information, resources, etc do C.A.s provide the City? 	CA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local knowledge and involvement • Tourism – the festival is a tourism draw
	Citizens are being well served Equitable services between different communities with different needs, capacities and resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you identify your community’s recreation needs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rec Programmers are approached by customers and if the program is successful then will do it again • Do surveys of whole neighbourhood – about every 3 – 5 years – because pop changes – and get a lot of ahahas in terms of what citizens want • Recently did a survey of what all the service providers do and looked for gaps and overlap (Y’s, boys scout and church groups) • Otherwise could be an insular bubble • Also did a “future search conference” to do a plan for the community. This spawned new committees to address opportunities. Challenge – when recreation opportunities were identified to find someone to do the programming
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you know you are achieving this? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Evaluations • Neighbourhood Surveys
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you know if there is any segment of your community who is not accessing your services ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at the numbers • Look at demographics of your community and people who are coming • Look at who comes to the festival (which draws everyone) so can compare
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does your approach enable “have not” communities to have equitable services to the communities that have more resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Development Funding

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Debra Bell, Regina, CA Staff Member
Efficient – making the most out of available resources (financial, physical, human)	Clear process for handling revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the revenue handled? Does this work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registration nites – CAs collect money for their programs and City collects money for their programs. Money collection deferred for other CA programs Next day all registration information is sorted through and distributed to appropriate CAs. CA only Yes
	Clear process for handling conflicts, differences and problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is conflict between the 2 parties handled? Is this effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No formal process Yes this should be done but works because of personalities CA Board members have ties with counsellors and the mayor
	Each party is held accountable for their areas of responsibility?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ask both questions for each interview: What aspects of your agreement is the City held accountable for ? How is it measured? How well does this work? What aspects of your agreement are C.A.s held accountable for ? How is it measured? How well does this work? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you prove that is serving community? – program inventory reports – Classes offered, attendance and how much programs costs, how much money goes towards paying staff, and number of committees that set up (what is the need) and actions taken Evaluated for ensure that spending money on what say going to Board health indicators – no – always have people to fill positions Fraud is big and so City put into place accounting processes City held accountable for maintenance (staff looks after upkeep), grants and support Would be clearer if this was outlines (roles and responsibilities) and this what we do (lots happens behind the scenes)
	There are tools and resources that are in place to support the partnership model	What tools and resources are effectively used to support your partnership relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above
Responsive to Community Needs	Services from Partnerships are responsive to changing circumstances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do C.A.s and the City collaboratively assess changing community needs and organizational capacities? What trends are you seeing in your community that affects how your partnership needs to operate? i.e. change in needs, change in time to volunteer, disposable income, etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tried to through forum but wasn't as successful as could be Trends Volunteer burnout Required to work like a business and fiscally self-supporting School does more programming and this takes the pressure off of CA – so more shared Demographic – more immigrants (not that many before) Not going to be inner city anymore (spreading out throughout the City)
(Summary)		In general, what works well/less well? (Top 3 areas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well Communication between parties Support Services – education Committees work well Concept of funding works well

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Debra Bell, Regina, CA Staff Member
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the building • Community Identity – they care and therefore they want to be involved • Less Well • Resources for staff (i.e. wages / staff put in allot of volunteer time to make it work) • City owns the building – so restricts what can do – and restricts ability to change the building • Accountable – would be ideal if City reported to CA – i.e. state of the nation, how they view them and how they are performing (financially, community outcome and value add)



City of Vancouver Joint Operating Agreement Task Force

Interview with Ladette Fuchs, Regina, Chair of Albert Park Community Association

BACKGROUND

The Alberta Park Community Association is a 30 year old association and was one of the first community associations in Regina. The revenues it earns go back into the community. It arranges community events and is an affluent area in the south end of Regina. It is one of the four community associations in the south zone. There is a city-owned facility in the Albert Park area. Other community associations do not have city-owned facilities in their areas, and use schools or other facilities for their programs. Because of the affluence of their area, they run fewer social programs and more recreational programs.

APPRECIATION FOR PARTNERS' ROLES

The community association's contribution is primarily its community knowledge. There is not great diversity on their board, but their members have interests in particular programs. They have skills and experience in various areas, so their contribution is the benefit of the residential perspective and their specific experience. The staff/City contribution is consultation and input into programs the association is seeking to develop. They provide access to the City facility at reasonable rates. They provide the association with a "program partner rate" for the use of the city facility. They provide the community association with advertising and liability insurance. The City also provides access to grant funding, expertise in landscape and engineering issues, and fundraising assistance. They would like the City to help contribute by training and volunteer development, governance assistance and providing information on recreational trends to help their program planning.

VALUE OF PARTNERSHIP

There's a clear understanding of the relative responsibilities of the partners. The City staff fund the facility and the City simply books them into the facility for their programs. The instructors come from the community association and the community association does the registrations. The community association publishes its own newsletter, handles the registration and contracts with the instructors. The community association collects money for programs. The community association has primary access to booking the programs, and gets preference over other users, such as Girl Guides and other community groups. Where a community association does not have a City facility to use, there is a different process for booking the schools and other facilities used by those groups. They have no written agreement with the City. The City offers certain facilities from a central site – example, swimming. The City has carved out certain programming areas for their own use. A formal agreement with the City would not matter much, and she does not see much need for a formal agreement. There is an agreement with the south zone board, which is an umbrella group over four community associations. Grant funding is provided to the zone board, which then is available to the community associations at the zone's discretion. The zone board is another level of administration and can have different priorities than the community associations. The zone programs are broader than just the community association programs. There have been issues where the zone programs have competed with the community association programs.

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING

Where the city has plans, the community association would be asked to comment on it. Where the community association has a plan, such as their water park, they were able to enlist the City's assistance.

QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP

The relationship between the community associations generally and the City varies. The Albert Park relationship is good/very good. The City is generally lenient and helpful when they request assistance.

COMMUNICATION

City staff attend their community association meetings. City staff also attend the zone meetings. The president of the community association sits on the zone board. Reports from each of the community associations are given to the zone boards. The zone board is non-profit. There is no city staff on the board of the zone. City gets financial statements monthly from the associations.

RECOGNITION

There are some city-wide recognition events. The community association can nominate people for volunteer recognition. The zone board puts on a dinner. There is no real indicator of the success of the volunteers.

COMMUNITY NEEDS

There is no formal process to assess the community's needs. There is just discussion at board meetings where they brainstorm ideas for recreational programs.

Some segments of the community are not well-served (i.e. teen programming). Generally this is because the C.A. depends on volunteers to run programs. There may be times where there are no volunteer for a specific age group, or type of program, and that is when there are gaps (i.e. craft programs). It continually looks for programmers to fill those gaps so that a full range of programs can be offered.

The have-not areas of the City are served more by the City and through provincial grants.

REVENUE

The community association does not share any revenue with the City. It is financially autonomous. The revenue is their own. They provide equipment for programs at the City facility and update some of the general usage equipment.

CONFLICTS

The community association had some conflicts with the zone board related to jurisdiction for programming. The City gave advice, helped guide the resolution, but acted as an observer and did not specifically become involved in the debate. If an agreement could not be reach, the City would have had to get involved. The City gave it advice but didn't guide the resolution or give any leadership.

ACCOUNTABILITY

The community association shares its financial statements and Minutes of its meetings with the City. However, there are no formal requirements to do so. The City should give guidelines for community association board governance and financial controls.

RESPONSIVENESS TO COMMUNITY NEEDS

The City could be more responsive by providing information regarding demographics and trends. The City community recreation coordinator works with four community associations and shares information between them. The City provides contracts for the instructors. The City's job is to help the community associations fulfil their functions. The City's role is less direct involvement than it has been in the past.. The Community Association Board is elected at its AGM. There is no residency requirement or no guidelines with regard to the maximum duration of board members.

SUMMARY

The three best aspects of the relationship are:

- (a) the City community recreation coordinator attends their meetings to provide a liaison for city services;
- (b) the support that is given by the City;
- (c) the support for large projects and access to grants.

The problems that are encountered are as follows:

- (a) a) the City's administration assistance and information sharing could be better (ie. provision of standard volunteer manuals for all community association volunteers, and providing information to the community associations in areas such as volunteer recruitment and retention techniques).
- (b) the City should provide information on recreational trends;
- (c) the zone board structure creates an extra level of administration, and limits the pool of available volunteers. The City could administer grants directly without using the zone board.



City of Vancouver Joint Operating Agreement Task Force

Interview with Janet Schultz, City of Regina, Staff

Two key points:

28 neighbourhood community association boundaries each could have 5 schools – related to land development plan – this changes the picture. Population could be 2,000 – 10,000 – changes volunteer base. In Saskatoon, they could combine neighbourhoods by going to planning.

Second point – they have zone Boards first (back from the 70’s) and they have funding from City and they were to give money to Community Associations – before Community Associations. Today they have reps from CA and they also have reps from “at large” on Zone Boards. C.A. outside of the inner city areas were developed for recreation services whereas the inner city CA were not. The inner city C.A.s were eligible for social development grants from the city for social and community development purposes (up to \$60k and they hire a full time staff). Now there are grants for all CA – based.

Therefore, the infrastructure is in place at local level to deliver neighbourhood recreation but it isn’t always. We have many sports governing bodies. Saskatoon is more of a template for land use development and community association development (i.e. governance and the consulting services role for city staff).

The Zone Boards is a delivery agent at the zone level. They can compete with neighbourhood level programming through city and also through community groups. The real partnerships are between City and zone Board and City and CA and Zone Boards and CA (a triangle). One and half years ago they started to rebuild the role of the City in supporting community development, not just help in program development. We need to strengthen the partnership through support functions (eg. Organizational Development, funding). The neighbourhood is the best delivery agent for sport, recreation and culture programs. Other reasons for their existence: representative body for geographic area for input into other city matters – they don’t necessarily represent the whole community but they can facilitate a public meeting for example. Our role is to interpret city affairs and facilitate. Many community leaders have come through the neighbourhood and into politics.

Agreements: We have come mainly regarding money. We also have agreements with other groups for facilities. We have other agreements than just CA. We have an agreement with CA when they operate centre (5 of them) and we also have an agreement with Zone Boards. Currently reviewing agreements. Some of their roles should be staff roles.

Example Cathedral Centre – it is City run and the CA is active and operates a successful festival.

Of the 5 which are operated by CA, there are 3 or 4 which are run by a separate Board – not the CA. Arcola East is run by the CA, it is between 2 schools. The agreement is based on what we pay them. We pay for utilities 24 to 30k. The CA fund raises for facility improvements and expansion. We are not consistent in our approach.

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Notes – Janet Schultz, Regina, Staff
A great appreciation for each other’s contribution	Each partner has an appreciation for what each partner brings to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For staff: what do you appreciate and value most about the members of the C.A.s and their 	

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Notes – Janet Schultz, Regina, Staff
	the relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contributions. For C.A. members: what do you appreciate and value most about City staff and their contributions. 	
Work well together	Clear about rationale for partnership (mutual benefit and shared purpose)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the purpose for your partnership? What value does it provide for the City, for C.A.s, for citizens? (Is there common agreement around the value of the partnership?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The neighbourhood is the best delivery agent for sport, recreation and culture programs. Other reasons for their existence: representative body for geographic area for input into other city matters. They don't necessarily represent the whole community but they can facilitate a public meeting for example.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who manages the agreement? Does this process work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have some – mainly re money. We also have agreements with other groups for facilities. We have other agreements that just Community Association. We have an agreement with Zone Boards. Currently reviewing agreements
	City Staff and Association members collaboratively plan services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How important is it to you have collaborative planning around services and facility improvements between City staff and C.A. – at the city wide level, at the local level (so as to not foster competition i.e. one's success at the expense of another)? Is this been done well? Why? Probing Q – Competition between zone and CA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be but we don't have a facility plan. We want to. The CA should be providing input into programmes – as advisors. It is another form of needs assessment. We would seek their input and would consider whether it is neighbourhood, regional or city wide. It happens and depends on what representatives sit on Zone Boards. They should only be providing programmes only if they can't be made available at the neighbourhood level. It works for such things as sports where leagues could be operated at the zone level.
	City Staff and Association members have a high level of mutual regard for each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would you rate, in general, the relationship between C.A.s and the City (very good, good, it varies between communities, poor, very poor) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally good with CA. They see city as support. We can strengthen it. It is particularly strong in recreation rather than in social development. In the inner city the city is seen as a funder only and an adversarial one at that. The CA is independent organization.

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Notes – Janet Schultz, Regina, Staff
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there consistency between roles and responsibilities of City versus Association Staff in different facilities? • Do you think consistency is important ? • Are there overlaps or gaps or lack of clarity in areas of responsibility • Probing Q – was there support for this change? • Critical Success Factors related to consistency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before when staff was programme specialists and were probably running the programmes. Now our role is to help them help themselves – with our support – eg. We have an instructor registry, booking the schools, consulting such as needs assessment, plus we deliver directly such things as after school programmes. • Yes – staff welcomed, we consulted with Association and they were glad to be asked. We still have flexibility to customize the support offered at different neighbourhoods – based on principles (eg. Economic disadvantage formula) • Absolutely need to provide the same support services for everyone but their work is different depending on what each needs and their work load.
	City Staff and Association members communicate effectively with each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What forms of communication are used most frequently? • Which are most effective? • Do you have a communication strategy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Got to go where the volunteer is. Staff have to go to meetings and be there at least 6 to 8 times per year. You need to call them and follow-up. A good community consultant will follow-up immediately after the meeting.
	Effective partnerships learn from their past and recognize and celebrate their accomplishments together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you take time to acknowledge/recognize the achievements that result from your partnership and the areas that require some attention ? If so, why? In what ways? If not, why not? Do you think this is important? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interesting debate. My view – the city doing something is not as effective as the community recognizing but some people love the city thing. • CA like to talk to each other. I found volunteer conferences to be successful. The benefits are through budget and our Value for \$ audit. We translate their contribution into money (eg. 1.5 m value to citizens). Tell Councilors and the people about this value. We need to help CA to tell what they contribute to help them get volunteers.
Effective – achieving what set out to achieve	No Gaps between operating agreement and actual practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your operating agreements truly reflect how the partners work together? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Notes – Janet Schultz, Regina, Staff
	The agreement provides clear guidance, is utilized as a reference point and is understood by each partner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your operating agreement provide the kind of guidance and language you need? Are there areas where the agreement is vague or is not consistent with what actually happens? What are these? What would you like to see instead? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	C.A. members are supported by City	<p>How does the City support the success of its C.A.s? (Probe as follows)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program planning Business planning Training Insurance programs Employee benefits <p><i>Is this what you need?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We provide advice and insurance. We should ask for programme plans. They become members locally but there is reciprocity with other neighbourhoods where they can trade.
	City is supported by C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What information, resources, etc do C.A.s provide the City? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Citizens are being well served Equitable services between different communities with different needs, capacities and resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you identify your community's recreation needs? Probing Q - Gaps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have just hired a consultant. We don't have a city-wide needs assessment. Only as they come forward. We have some stuff happening.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know you are achieving this? (form of evaluation/measurement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know if there is any segment of your community who is not accessing your services ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does your approach enable "have not" communities to have equitable services to the communities that have more resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shifting grants to provide equitable distribution
Efficient – making the most out of available resources (financial, physical, human)	Clear process for handling revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the revenue handled? Does this work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	Clear process for handling conflicts, differences and problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is conflict between the 2 parties handled? Is this effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Notes – Janet Schultz, Regina, Staff
	Each party is held accountable for their areas of responsibility?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask both questions for each interview: • What aspects of your agreement is the City held accountable for ? • How is it measured? • How well does this work? • What aspects of your agreement are C.A.s held accountable for ? • How is it measured? • How well does this work? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountable to communities – not to us. They have to communicate community. Open transparent process..
	There are tools and resources that are in place to support the partnership model	What tools and resources are effectively used to support your partnership relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Responsive to Community Needs	Services from Partnerships are responsive to changing circumstances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do C.A.s and the City collaboratively assess changing community needs and organizational capacities? • What trends are you seeing in your community that affects how your partnership needs to operate? i.e. change in needs, change in time to volunteer, disposable income, etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •



City of Vancouver Joint Operating Agreement Task Force

Interview with Candy Lannon, Calgary, Staff

1. Board

- Volunteers and their level of commitment
- Interest in Community
- Local voice for land use and social issues

Staff

- Provide window into City's operation
- Network with Community & City Staff
- Provides lots of training opportunities
- 1st link to City's operation
- Special event planning
- Equipment purchases
- Provide Community & Neighbourhood Services

2. Purpose - to provide services/programs at the local level. Provide forum for issue exchange. No operating agreement. Have land and lease license agreements that cover land and financial issues. Outlines what can be done on municipal land.
3. All collaborative planning needs to go through the City's structure and their approval process. Submission of an overall business plan including financial viability is required.
4. Relationship between C.A.'s and City is very good. There is the odd exception which needs specific attention.
5. Communication between C.A. and Staff will vary depending on the situation. If the issue is important the issue will go to the local alderperson. Development of effective networking system is important to develop personal rapport which will lead to more trusting relationships.
6. Lots of policies and historical information is available with all positions.
Yes....acknowledge volunteers. Celebrate the partnership. Changes from area to area.
Talk about success and challenges with Alderman and Ward reps. Newsletter put out by General Manager. Have a best practices session (40 C.A.) To provide opportunity to share successes 60% of invitees attend.
7. Language is of major importance. Terms of any agreement needs to be clearly defined. All need to be on the same ground. Adapting 1 agreement for all is important as long as it identifies individual differences and needs.
Agreement needs to deal with nuances of situations. If any particular C.A. asks for anything the City will partner them up in the right areas.

8. Hot-topics include:
 - Volunteer Management
 - Volunteer burnout and training
 - Financial information

 - Facility Management
9. C.A.'s provide the City more immediate feedback re: resources needed in any particular area. They act as a commercial link.
10. Community needs are determined by trial and error. Listen to the vocal members. There are on-going evaluations and trends are considered. Needs are looked at by demographics
 - economic breakdown and consider the Federal census profiles. There are lots of people in local Communities who do not access services. Ethnic segment not participating as wanted. C.A. represent 19% of the local citizens. Needs improvement. Equitable services relate to the squeaky wheel syndrome. Use a graph to determine needs and impact rating of services. C.A. need to re-visit the areas of:
 - Financial sustainability
 - Human Resources
 - Volunteer
 - Staff
 - Organizational development & strategic planning
 - Communication with the City
 - Facility management
11. Lots of checkpoints with respect to conflict between C.A. and City. Regular process re: talk to individual, supervision etc. Audit of situation can be requested. Alderman for particular Ward could become involved. Use "Community mediation group" for tougher/required issues.
12. Just getting into the area of performance measures. Have not done a real good job to this point.
Measured by political involvement and financial status
Geared more to outcomes and could be better
C.A.'s are accountable for the financial status of their situations and the state of their facilities.
13. Citizens are not bound by geographic boundaries any longer.
Trend to areas of specialization. Role of C.A.'s was provision of sports and recreation but is moving towards land stewardship, life long fitness and lifestyle changes.
Community based programming not as central to operation.
14. Works well
 - Maximize volunteer involvement
 - Facilities at local level....provided by C.A.'s as opposed to the City
 - Communities can change with the wind. Outcomes are benefit based.

Less well

 - Don't work with strengths as opposed to weaknesses.
 - Role clarity
 - Learn from success vs failures
 - Infrastructure design vs common formation
 - Responsibility up vs down

Overall need to be effective and efficient.

Appendix III – Interview with JOA



City of Vancouver Joint Operating Agreement Task Force

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver JOA Interview
A great appreciation for each other's contribution	Each partner has an appreciation for what each partner brings to the relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For staff: what do you appreciate and value most about the members of the C.A.s and their contributions. For C.As: is there anything you would like to add? Missed? • For C.A. members: what do you appreciate and value most about City staff and their contributions. For City staff: is there anything you would like to add? Missed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff on C.A. contributions • Time spend for the benefit of the organization • Their perspective and their experiences from the community • They bring knowledge of the community, what their interests are, neighbourhood issues, pulse of the neighbourhood • Helps staff understand the issue and the context for it • Commitment and passion for the community and for the delivery of parks and recreation services which connects staff to the community and provides another source of energy to what we offer • Are advocates for parks and recreation services and help to understand priority needs • Balance and perspective on holistic basis – i.e. in the broader community context for where leisure fits in and fosters partnerships with other social services i.e. police • Skills – if did an inventory of skills there is a tremendous range that is available to the service delivery system. In particular fundraising abilities (small scale to large scale) • Challenge is to have diversity on board – not necessarily representatives but awareness of the diversity and its implications • What staff missed – C.A. comments • Can use associations name for large grants – opens up many doors – and apply for grants that government can't • Large lobbying group and have the ability to link with politicians • Can make points in front of Park Board in ways that staff can't • Adds community legitimacy to the delivery system • A real grounding in what is best for the community • When all these things happen and when it works well the whole system works well. The lack of communication and lack of respect leads to a downward spiral • C..A. perspectives on Staff contributions • Expertise in field, they are trained and are educated before and during, they share information between jurisdictions and Board members rely upon this broader information • Resources – access to resources beyond expertise i.e. physical resources such as facilities • Commitment of staff to what they are doing and their level of competency, their good spirits, have an energy that keeps everyone going, commitment to the programs and projects that are being pursued • Staff are ambassadors between community and associations as they are on the front line, first contact and how they are treated is important • A tremendous link between what is going on within local, provincial and federal governments • Staff – what missed • ability to manage resources, equipment, physical plant, and association staff (hiring, coaching, discipline) • accountability with full time staff • skills around community development – training of boards, recruiting, training, leadership development outside C.A. boards (i.e. youth, public meetings) • Leadership and direction by staff • Problem solving abilities – when there are issues staff find ways and options for handling it • Dynamic tension between both parties leads to creative solutions

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vancouver JOA Interview
Work well together	Clear about rationale for partnership (mutual benefit and shared purpose)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the purpose for your partnership? What value does it provide for the City, for C.A.s, for citizens? (Is there common agreement around the value of the partnership?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.A. • No agreement – one perspective is only valued for what you can give and staff do it anyway. Should be mutual regard – not a partnership – parks board wins – tug of war and bottom line C.A.’s don’t have a say. We are advisory only • Share a vision for providing community based services through a partnership approach (except for city wide swimming, skating and sometimes fitness) • There is no agreement or shared understanding about the relationship between C.A.’s, the Charter, and the areas of demand. Comes under the Vancouver Charter and also constitution under Society’s act to delivery recreation services – delegated authority piece vs joint agreement relates to the fact that it is on City property. • Sticky point because some C.A.s feel they have invested significant money into the City’s assets. Therefore the notion of delegation versus partnership has perceived implications for how C.A.s feel their role is. Other situations are different in which the City is contributing operating money. • Hot spot about where money comes from and each have an “interest” (financial versus invested commitment) • It’s how its being done that is the problem i.e. agreement doesn’t talk about mutual respect
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who manages the agreement? Does this process work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A. • Nobody manages the agreement and therefore it can’t work well • Lack of awareness of the agreement and not referenced • Hasn’t been established as a true “partnership”

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vancouver JOA Interview
	City Staff and Association members collaboratively plan services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How important is it to you have collaborative planning around services and facility improvements between City staff and C.A. – at the city wide level, at the local level (so as to not foster competition i.e. one’s success at the expense of another)? • Is this been done well? Why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Very important and it depends about which levels – needs to be customized i.e. there are other groups that might need to be collaborated with • C.A. • Imperative – this has to be about equals at this because of all the different expertise to share in the vision together for the community • This is the best way to show respect • Extremely important • Includes other City staff to get involved especially with facility development
	City Staff and Association members have a high level of mutual regard for each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you rate, in general, the relationship between C.A.s and the City (very good, good, it varies between communities, poor, very poor) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both – full spectrum
		Who is responsible for what aspects? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Programs • Facility maintenance • Revenue • Marketing • IT • Other? Are there overlaps or gaps or lack of clarity in areas of responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Staff would like there to be consistency and for the most part it is as it relates to staff relating to liability, WCB, insurance, criminal safety checks, training, gender equity, etc. • Staff thinks the structure is very similar but different ways it is practiced and different perspectives about what the structure • C.A. • Need to have competency at all staff and board levels • There is no common structure – C.A.’s don’t feel there needs to be consistency and followed • Respect between board members and staff and then the wall go up and staff get defensive • Tone that is gets set by Com Rec Coordinator/Supervisor • There is no common understanding about staffing

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	
	City Staff and Association members communicate effectively with each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What forms of communication are used most frequently? • Which are most effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vancouver JOA Interview • Staff • Telephone, email, minutes of meetings, meetings, one on one, • Senior staff gives a written report – highlights on a monthly basis • C.A. • Tends to be piecemeal • Staff person on each committee, verbal • Effective - Small committee meetings and regular dialogue with staff
	Effective partnerships learn from their past and recognize and celebrate their accomplishments together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you take time to celebrate the achievements that result from your partnership and the areas that require some attention? If so, why? If not, why not? Do you think this is important? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • At the local level this happens but at senior staff levels – they support C.A.'s and then as part of Park Board and this role isn't necessarily acknowledge by local C.A.'s • C.A. • Both said • For the C.A.s that work well there are social events, festivals, give out pins • Volunteer appreciation dinner
Effective – achieving what set out to achieve	No Gaps between operating agreement and actual practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your operating agreements truly reflect how the partners work together? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A. • No and need to have one and then if did then would have a process for staff to know about C.A. members and visa versa
	The agreement provides clear guidance, is utilized as a reference point and is understood by each partner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your operating agreement provide the kind of guidance and language you need? • Are there areas where the agreement is vague or is not consistent with what actually happens? What are these? What would you like to see instead? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A. • Need to have an end date of when agreement will be reviewed because no one looks at it because it was written in 1979 • No evaluation of the partnership agreement no indicators • Need to orient C..A.'s about staff's other roles
	C.A. members are supported by City	<p>How does the City support the success of its C.A.s? (Probe as follows)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program planning • Business planning • Training • Insurance programs • Employee benefits <p><i>Is this what you need?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A. • No agreement about how program are planned and delivered – some C.A.'s are advisory and approve what staff bring
	City is supported by C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What information, resources, etc do C.A.s provide the City? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A.

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vancouver JOA Interview
	Citizens are being well served Equitable services between different communities with different needs, capacities and resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you identify your community's recreation needs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Some do some don't use different tools – hap hazard • C.A. • Do surveys on own – not cone City wide • Full buses mean more services • Need to stay on top of the demographics and community changes • If local knowledge is important then why in the agreement aren't board members required to live in their area – are they current and they still linked with their community
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the priority needs that your community has ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are you meeting these needs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Having board that doesn't stagnate and have a board that was evolving as the community changes • C.A. • C.A.'s have to be accountable for knowing what their community wants
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you know you are achieving this? (form of evaluation/measurement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A. • Don't really know • Some C.A.s are approached by people if a served not available • But some people don't go there because there isn't something for them • Some of the indicators are not useful – i.e full buildings don't mean local people are in the building
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any segment of your community who is not accessing your services ? Why not? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does your approach enable "have not" communities to have equitable services to the communities that have more resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A. • No mechanism
Efficient – making the most out of available resources (financial, physical, human)	Clear process for handling revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the revenue handled? Does this work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A. • Supervisors oversee the bottom line and reports to Board. C.A.s can have bookkeeper. • There are different approaches • Each Associations handles own revenue • What's lacking is that when its not working nothing happens to correct.

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vancouver JOA Interview
	Clear process for handling conflicts, differences and problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is conflict between the 2 parties handled? Is this effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A. • Both said – There is the JOA process and then goes to Parks Board Supervisor (which doesn't exist) and there is no third party to resolve issues. There are not any well defined processes and creating communication tools for creating respect or addressing issues (HR and resource issues)
	Each party is held accountable for their areas of responsibility?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask both questions for each interview: • What aspects of your agreement is the City held accountable for ? • How is it measured? • How well does this work? • What aspects of your agreement are C.A.s held accountable for ? • How is it measured? • How well does this work? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A. • Lack of clarity around roles and responsibility • Some mechanism – auditing statement but not checked • Park Board information doesn't provide the information that need to • Processing and passing on of information doesn't happen – have to keep asking for information • More mechanisms outside the C.A.s for accountability i.e. in Park Board corporation • Don't relate to partnership • C.A.s have to rely on honesty of Park Board • Revenue that comes in stays within local community and can be prioritized within local needs • Some negative is that not distributed to have notes
	There are tools and resources that are in place to support the partnership model	What tools and resources are effectively used to support your partnership relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Responsive to Community Needs	Services from Partnerships are responsive to changing circumstances	Do C.A.s and the City collaboratively assess changing community needs and organizational capacities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A
		What trends are you seeing in your community that affects how your partnership needs to operate? i.e. change in needs, change in time to volunteer, disposable income, etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • C.A.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	
(Summary)		In general, what works well/less well? (Top 3 areas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vancouver JOA Interview • <u>Works well</u> • Revenue going back into community • Have community centres and richness of opportunities • Feeling of local ownership and pride • <u>Don't work well</u> • Trust and Respect • Accountability and where go when not working • Collaboratively planning • Clarity of Roles and Responsibility and Education staff and C.A.'s about roles • Person that is answerable to C.A.'s that don't have a bunch of hats – duality of role Parks Board and C.A. – C.A.'s can't hire or fire and they are not accountable to the C.A. • Models consumes alot of time to manage relationship that don't work well – an expensive model – meetings versus energy to provide services – tenuous thread in between C.A's and Park Board is the Supervisor



CITY OF VANCOUVER JOINT OPERATING AGREEMENT TASK FORCE

Appendix IV

Vancouver – Focus Group

Goals for this process:

- Make this process as transparent as possible

Goals for the model:

- agreement is dated and want new life to it – it is a document that is rarely looked at
- clearer in language and more reflective of relationship
- so many changes since the original document – it needs to be updated and form the basis for a meaningful orientation for Board
- be principle based
- reflect the uniqueness of each C.A. and local community (i.e. keep some of the addendums)
- needs to include a joint mission and vision – very administrative and very little application as a living document – need an arrangement that means something and reflects current situation
- some agreements have mission and vision, are current, and therefore work well
- must look at the relationship between PB and community associations and if it is not a healthy relationship then the agreement won't be
- ensure that the interpretation of future agreement(s) can't be at mercy of individual interpretations (which can change as people change and is therefore confusing to defend to customers/citizens)
- needs to outline the spirit of the partnership – make sure there is clarity around roles and that affects what can do about in building and vulnerability of board and staff members.
- Must describe principles around how treat each other
- Must have processes outlined to guide how issues are worked through

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver Focus Group
A great appreciation for each other's contribution	Each partner has an appreciation for what each partner brings to the relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For staff: what do you appreciate and value most about the members of the C.A.s and their contributions. • For C.A. members: what do you appreciate and value most about City staff and their contributions. 	<p>Staff about Board members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedication and Commitment • Tireless hours of expertise • Eyes and ears of our community which leads to great service to our community • Ensure aren't centre focused but community focused • They are the community, wouldn't have a sense otherwise and each is very different • Input brings life and relevance to what doing • Bring political clout to what happens in the community, help to advocate issues. Things wouldn't happen as quickly without their participation • Diversity and range of life experience and reflects a collective range of knowledge that wouldn't happen through a recreation professional team • Board members prevent "mandate creep" for certain functions i.e. they understand what specific staff roles and functions are • Appreciate scrutiny from the local perspective – provides accountability <p>Board Members (additions to list)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring in huge financial assistance i.e. fundraising • Lobbying <p>Board Members about staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incredible skill converting ideas into reality, the variety of opportunity, the creativity • The dedication • Sense of fun • Ability to take a bunch of ideas and flip them into fantastic programs • Long hours and passion • Customer service in challenging environments and conditions • Keep the place alive • In awe when I look at the brochure • The tremendous range of skills – facility maintenance, psychology, legal issues, etc. • Very committed to making the system work and making the boards work and boards can be difficult (not an easy model but enables good critical thinking and challenging ideas to lead to better ones) • Staff additions – none

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver Focus Group
Work well together	Clear about rationale for partnership (mutual benefit and shared purpose)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the purpose for your partnership? What value does it provide for the City, for C.A.s, for citizens? (Is there common agreement around the value of the partnership?) 	<p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centralized – enables services to be tailored to the uniqueness of the neighbourhood – pipeline back to the Park Board; and get really important feedback from the Community. City is starting to get those local connections Provides a voice for local community Fundraising beyond what the City can do and expands services to those in need Provides allot of flexibility in services and neighbourhood based Enables \$ to back into the system versus a whole convoluted and cumbersome process for essential services Enables us to be more reactive Decision-making is faster through the C.A.s Source of sober second thought and refine what we are doing Couldn't operate without the JOA – Boards put so much revenue into the facility Offers more diversity and services <p>Board Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the above Societies allows more to happen/flexibility outside the City's staffing process Huge amount of lobbying with citizens so lobby up (politicians) and lobby down (citizens) Continual education around historical contexts due to length of time staff have been around JOA – prevents centralization which is a natural tendency of bureaucracy <p>No common agreement understanding between value throughout the whole system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The communities know Different interpretations around the agreement creates difficulty People forget who pays them Collision course between Park Board and the community

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver Focus Group
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who manages the agreement? Does this process work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong agreement between Staff and CA members No one manages it and 3 of them have different agreements Killarney uses it a lot and quotes it Others use it when there is an issue So legalistic and no guiding principles. Would be used a bit more if it had principles and was a living agreement Needs to reflect the uniqueness of each community – principles, policies and practices Principles around the partnerships could be the same and then all the specifics could be customized (depends on and should reflect the sophistication of the local system) Roundhouse is a different type of agreement – is very personal to the Roundhouse and supports the mission, the vision and community’s cultural development. This is very crucial Lots of variety because of when they were entered into it
	City Staff and Association members collaboratively plan services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How important is it to you have collaborative planning around services and facility improvements between City staff and C.A. – at the city wide level, at the local level (so as to not foster competition i.e. one’s success at the expense of another)? Is this been done well? Why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong agreement between Staff and CA members Vitaly important It is a joint operation “partnership i.e. equals” Functions best that way because each comes to the task with different perspectives All kinds of coordination at the local level – this happens quite well There is none at the City wide level but CAs find it difficult to influence planning at City Hall and this is critical because of the local knowledge and support required for planning
	City Staff and Association members have a high level of mutual regard for each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would you rate, in general, the relationship between C.A.s and the City (very good, good, it varies between communities, poor, very poor) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong agreement “varies between communities” Some don’t have a relationship because there is no contact

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver Focus Group
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there consistency between roles and responsibilities of City versus Association Staff in different facilities? • Do you think consistency is important ? • Are there overlaps or gaps or lack of clarity in areas of responsibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement on the following: • No consistency in the staffing • Don't want a cookie cutter approach (that one size fits all) yet there are similarities and these need to be outlined • The local dynamic is always changing so staff need to be reflective of skills needed • But should be core competencies – some discussion around whether or not that exists • Supervision, support to Board, leadership, skills around effective meetings, conflict resolutions for example are key core competencies • Moving staff around is healthy because you can spread their enthusiasm and expertise around • There is inequality of staffing between different centres. But equity doesn't translate into # of staff per volume nor does it reflect what practically has to be done (even though the "title" is the same but the experience to handle what's going on is different i.e. transferring from a slower centre to a high volume situation). • Need consistent principles we operate by but there are huge structural differences (i.e. staff per volume is one, facility size is another and the size of community served is another) • Start the agreement with the broad principles and then move into a description of the local context

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver Focus Group
	City Staff and Association members communicate effectively with each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What forms of communication are used most frequently? • Which are most effective? • Do you have a communication strategy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is the standard Board Meeting and it comes down to how well the president and coordinator work together, chairing skills, and setting effective agendas • Decision-making – different centres have different spending limits that Coordinators can make decision around • Beyond that it is phone calls and other forms. • Email is good, very effective, and very quick - there doesn't need to be a person at the other end (and can work better with people's different schedule) • Killarney tends to use face to face and no email • Have to build trust first • Very different depending on levels of staff • Not all the same staff attend Board meetings • No communication strategy - and needs to reflect what ever works better at the local level – as long as communication is working – need to ensure there is an evaluation system to ensure it is working and highlights the issue – focus on “what” needs to be communicated - don't focus on the “how” • Communication can foster trust and transparency
	Effective partnerships learn from their past and recognize and celebrate their accomplishments together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you take time to acknowledge/recognize the achievements that result from your partnership and the areas that require some attention? If so, why? In what ways? If not, why not? Do you think this is important? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have joint social functions • Once a year – associations are acknowledged at a volunteer function • At local level it gets acknowledged • Need to focus on whether or not achievements include respect, inclusion, honesty, and living up to commitments • Lots of little bits of recognition (Roundhouse) at Board meetings and workshops • Acknowledgement is really important and when people are functioning well it needs to be happen so as to foster more of it • Some staff tend to get most of their recognition from the Associations - they fill a void that upper management doesn't fill
Effective – achieving what set out to achieve	No Gaps between operating agreement and actual practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your operating agreements truly reflect how the partners work together? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No – strong agreement

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver Focus Group
	The agreement provides clear guidance, is utilized as a reference point and is understood by each partner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does your operating agreement provide the kind of guidance and language you need? Are there areas where the agreement is vague or is not consistent with what actually happens? What are these? What would you like to see instead? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No – strong agreement Newer the facility, more so The older – not so Pretty much vague all over Need a more professional agreement Doesn't touch on some of the issues that are new areas human rights as it applies to tenancy in the building (society's relationship to building and surrounding property), legal responsibility for noise complaints, advertising and posting notices, legal liability of Board Directors (is in the indemnity agreement), Labour standards act, Occupational safety – should be some notes of how to deal with Helps to define perspective (the practice right now can range from bending over backwards to accommodate people to a very legalized limited approach) Need to address division of power and this impacts responsibilities (they are intertwined) and this will be impacted by the Charter And there are some agreements i.e. Roundhouse and other municipalities that are best practices
	C.A. members are supported by City	<p>How does the City support the success of its C.A.s? (Probe as follows)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program planning Business planning Training Insurance programs Employee benefits <p><i>Is this what you need?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elected Liaison between local CAs to City is poor Unique opportunity to take more interest in hearing from communities politically Can support through respect, transparency, honesty as mentioned before Difficult to get advice from the City i.e. situation required legal assistance and person felt very unsupported. Needed help and it was something that impacted a number of centres, people quite disinterested in helping PB support for Board Development and this could really help the effectiveness of boards and a true foundation for partnerships
	City is supported by C.A.s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What information, resources, etc do C.A.s provide the City? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Didn't ask

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver Focus Group
	Citizens are being well served Equitable services between different communities with different needs, capacities and resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you identify your community's recreation needs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Really don't know – hoping that we are Probably through surveys, evaluations, suggestions, asking them, program success, and some monitoring If done not done the same way – some do it formally some informally No community wide assessments Puts brochure out and ask for input Programmers bring networking ideas together from the region BCRPA conferences Look for segments that are missing Sometimes talk to other partners i.e. local schools
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know you are achieving this? (form of evaluation/measurement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programs are full and this is subjective Serving the people that like programs Kerrisdale – look at demographics of community versus membership every couple of years
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know if there is any segment of your community who is not accessing your services ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are people missing who face language and financial barriers Try to look for cultural/ gender/geographic segments that are missing Try to serve the whole community and try to make it accessible but know we are missing some Try to look at where the population is by age and where the resources are allocated
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does your approach enable “have not” communities to have equitable services to the communities that have more resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have to identify through different agencies to id kids and parents and then have them refer people Acknowledge that it is alot more complicated than just providing programs Leisure Access Card – only Parks Board programs are eligible and the community associations programs are not so depends on the number of PB programs and there are segments that due to pride won't access it The model works very well in the wealthy areas (fees) and the poorest areas (because they have other funding sources) but those in between, these have greater difficulty

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver Focus Group
Efficient – making the most out of available resources (financial, physical, human)	Clear process for handling revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the revenue handled? Does this work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Association \$ is handled by staff, each CA has a bookkeeper, money is couriered via City accounts and then gets divided into various accounts Park Board Operating budget funds is inflexible and there is no input into that amount and Park expectations around revenue - might not be realistic All Park Board revenue goes to PB. How PB spends money affects the success of services
	Clear process for handling conflicts, differences and problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is conflict between the 2 parties handled? Is this effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not very well Festers Depends on staff and how the relationships work, who gets to the Commission Not a mutually understood process – some general language and this doesn't work Poor staff performance appraisal process – currently staff are moved on and nothing is done about it and when there is a history of non-performance there is no documentation Need a proper performance appraisal system and mechanisms Variation between have and have-not. If don't have a Board that has some sophistication and committee processes around these issues then the process doesn't work Board competencies around advocacy, framing issues, and resolving issues is important Board wants to be equal partner around hiring because they are responsible for the staff and this may be due to union environment – this situation needs to be clear

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver Focus Group
	Each party is held accountable for their areas of responsibility?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask both questions for each interview: • What aspects of your agreement is the City held accountable for ? • How is it measured? • How well does this work? • What aspects of your agreement are C.A.s held accountable for ? • How is it measured? • How well does this work? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAs are building up surpluses – through successful programming – and money gets put into capital improvements without being necessarily demand driven • CAs are fortunate in that don't have to cover the operating fund. • When there are PB cutback somehow the CAs have to make up for it. • All Park Board revenue goes to PB. How PB spends money affects the success of services • For the rink and pool, moneys goes to PB and there is no revenue sharing • Needs to clear about how money moves and how budgets and expectations are set • CA revenue depends on staff and therefore core competencies are really important and more input by CA into staff (the reality is that we don't) and know if get a really good staff person it is at the expense at another centre • It is year to year so some security over the long term support would be beneficial i.e. some formula to help meet the minimum standards for staffing • Process needs to be transparent • Needs to be incentives to be financially accountable
	There are tools and resources that are in place to support the partnership model	What tools and resources are effectively used to support your partnership relationship	Didn't ask
Responsive to Community Needs	Services from Partnerships are responsive to changing circumstances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do C.A.s and the City collaboratively assess changing community needs and organizational capacities? • What trends are you seeing in your community that affects how your partnership needs to operate? i.e. change in needs, change in time to volunteer, disposable income, etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No formal process • Funders – want to know if involvement is token or real • Trends – didn't ask
(Summary)		In general, what works well/less well? (Top 3 areas)	<p>Very well</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource generation • Staff Board relationship at local • Connection to community <p>Less well</p>

Outcome	Indicator	Question:	Vancouver Focus Group
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity issues • Relationship/ Access between local and City level and different vision • Lack of respect of each other's vision • Board development and orientation (and this could be done consistently) <p>Needs to be Trust, respect, full disclosure, transparently, flexibility</p>