

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT

TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

INTRODUCTION

At its meeting on June 29, 2011, the Community Development and Recreation Committee directed the Executive Director of Social Development, Finance and Administration (SDFA) to provide a report updating the Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy. Over an eight month period, between June 2011 and February 2012, SDFA engaged key stakeholders, partners and residents involved with the City's place-based work to assess the various initiatives and processes used to implement the Toronto Strong Neighbourhood Strategy and to gather learnings to inform how the work proceeds.

CONSULTATION METHODOLOGY

A range of feedback techniques, including surveys, consultation sessions, meetings, and on-going conversations, were used to gain insight into the experiences and opinions of those most affected by Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy. The consultation process included:

1. A survey of 102 participants in the City's 13 Neighbourhood Action Partnerships (NAP) during summer 2011.
2. A series of focus groups were held during Fall 2011, in which:
 - 72 residents attended nine resident engagement sessions
 - 107 service providers attended eight sessions for community partners
 - 44 staff of participating City divisions and City agencies attended two City sessions
3. Ten councillors and eleven councillors' staff participated in two consultation sessions for City councillors – one for councillors with priority neighbourhoods in their wards and the other session for councillors without priority neighbourhoods.
4. Meetings were also held with key institutional partners, including the Toronto Board of Trade, Toronto Police Service, Toronto Public Health and CivicAction.

KEY CONSULTATION FINDINGS

During the consultation process, local residents, City councillors, service providers, and key stakeholders acknowledged the benefits that have resulted from targeting investments in the 13 neighbourhoods since the implementation of the Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy in 2005 and indicated areas where improvement is required in order to proceed with a stronger place-based strategy. Their responses have been categorized under the following themes:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Community Engagement (p. 2) | 6. City Leadership (p. 22) |
| 2. Capacity Building (p. 8) | 7. Evaluation & Accountability (p. 34) |
| 3. Service Planning & Delivery (p. 11) | 8. Outcomes (p. 36) |
| 4. Collaboration and Communication (p. 14) | 9. Neighbourhood Designation & Boundaries (p. 40) |
| 5. Networks and Partnerships (p. 19) | |

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
1. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NAP is resident-driven. NAP is always thinking of residents as priority #1 • I feel welcome and every idea is welcome. All resident ideas are explored. Concerns of the residents are important • Because of the NAP I'm so much more connected with everything, including the City • Residents are comfortable at the table • Redirected funding directly to citizens • Gave validation to residents feelings about lack of resources/programs – someone is listening • It's a fluid process that captures people who has not been in the table • Meetings asking for residents input to see what we can offer one another • Engagement of young people • Having youth and residents from the beginning who came out and had a voice • NAP served as a good connector to make relationships with adult allies we would not have known before • Residents are given an important role and their ideas are taken in consideration • Provided a platform where residents can contribute their 2 cents • Created a resident friendly approach • Projects that included residents in leadership positions • Involvement of residents in the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child care during programs is a big way we can engage more people, so that we are engaging parents and kids simultaneously • Translators needed to support engagement • Language barriers – interpreters & translators are needed in agencies • Residents are finding themselves repeating the same issues, because of lack of funding they aren't being resolved. Rights of community members are being breached because of a lack of resources i.e. hunger, lack of maintenance of elevators in buildings. Need for a Rights-Based approach • Food is something that attracts people to come and allows them to participate in programs but there is no budget for it • Festivals, summits, BBQs etc. needed to better engage the larger community – a great way to share information and outreach for programs • Residents not at the table • Apathy towards participation is an ongoing issue, there is a need to break that barrier • Travel time for community members to get to and from work hindering their ability to be active in the community, which hurts the whole community • Big companies with locations in Scarborough Village transfer people far away/ interview people far away, makes employing locally a real challenge • Outreach as simple as showing the boarders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing child care during meetings and programs. Food packages might help • The issue is defined by the community, they need work to be able to participate in NAP • Special event/ holiday celebrations • Get residents involved in the formation and branding • Translation services • Create flyers in additional languages beyond English • Encourage residents to bring their friends/ family to expand, strengthen and grow NAP • Offer community service hours for youth • Use schools as a resource for sharing information • A town-hall style approach to engage and involve more community members in Neighbourhood Action immediately • Need to actively outreach to more residents in a more timely manner in order to get things completed and implemented faster • You need residents clearly defined process, what part you are playing, you need to know that • We could be creative, no budget no anything, ideally I think word of mouth is the best is to get out to people, get a team of outreach residents to talk to the people in all the communities, pay and give them an honorarium to recruit, youth and adults to bring their goal to the meeting, that's what

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>helps to identify issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aboriginal community, though not involved constantly has been involved at varying times, the open door approach let many residents and agencies come and go according to their resources and schedules • Mobilize and engage young people • Seeing the positive, critical movement of youth • The ability to access bus tokens has allowed participants to come to our free programs and services • Investments like tokens, food have allowed the City to bring people together. That vision helped to bring people together. • More opportunities for youth engagement • Created opportunity for residents. • Local initiatives and unique needs to meet them • Hearing more from residents • Residents can bring issues to the table – will be able to talk to people who can get things done • Increased the resident's trust • Increased residents access with councillor's office • Brought citizens' engagement • Youth engagement • Brings residents' needs to the table • NAP –brings residents needs to table – open lines of communication • Service fair, going to community meet and greet, BBQ 	<p>of Scarborough Village to residents so they know their neighbourhood, and where the ANC office is on a map so they can better navigate (several residents reported stumbling on ANC accidentally, wouldn't have known it existed otherwise)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There must be a respect for residents for these programs to work • Outreach to resident and participants would be easier and more effective if we had had a collective newspaper, flyer, that all residents would have received and not only a random part of the residents • To have impact, this is my opinion, people leading general idea of how to get there, bring the youth up, this is where they have to be on board, what is the first step, might not be the most direct, but youth will have the ownership and the program will flourish, word will spread, biggest thing if you are building a project, you are investing it, youth need to have a leadership role • The last two people who took over our meetings were scheduled from 1-3 not accessible for residents I missed a part of the NAP due to the time of it, I got nothing, I actually heard "these meetings are for service providers, if residents want to have meetings they should have on their own time", this was bad • Childminding-parent in building • More residents are needed. How to get the community more engaged • Residents participation (food need to be 	<p>you would have to do.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve residents who don't live in the TCHC • Talk with youth and engage them in dealing with issues • Try to get at least one youth involved to expose us to matters we don't know about • We need to get creative with residents who don't live in TCHC buildings and have huge challenges • Monthly meetings with communities • Residents part of decision making (paid) • Work more with residents and respect them • Provide outlets for youth to have a voice, e.g. an after-school program filled with Black leaders that can teach Black history • Perhaps better resident engagement strategy • Volunteers are only one person so how can we approach things differently to work on an ongoing mentorship to encourage others to come on board for different things but to engage people in the ways that they want to be engaged. • Are we doing enough to encourage youth to find their passion • A Storefront type model paid, resident to have a place for their voice • Being selective in what we want to get involved in • Remove barriers: provide food, child mining, translation and TTC supports • Get youth together across neighbourhoods to speak and hold a big event • Different types of meetings or more different

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good effort to involve residents, e.g. Crisis Response use to bring people to community centres. Extra length to get people to attend • At the beginning I was hesitant to come to the table because I'm not a working parent and I was worried about discrimination. I like it now • Younger tenants and second generation Canadians grasping this and that is hopeful. It will take time to build capacity • Place-based and focused on neighbourhoods. Encouraged local residents to participate 	<p>provided in meetings/forums)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility issues especially for people with scooters • More work is required in civic engagement as the voter turnout is still low • Getting the word out to residents-need to devise better ways to reach residents • No recognition by larger organizations and current city administration that residents can make a difference and an analysis on the impact residents have had on the neighbourhood • Trust from residences thinking that Qty services were there to meet their needs. Why are you here? You are paid. What are you doing here? How to build trust. Could be done with dialogue followed by action • A lot was achieved but it needed to continue in order for trust to begin and to continue, • Giving power to residents in setting their own goals and priorities • People move in and out; this is their first stops, while there are a few who have been here for a while, most move out and the family structure changes, and it's hard to get its own vibe • Not accustomed to neighbourhood friendly approach. Disconnect from being part of communities actively to contribute or be part of community-based work. Plenty of access to information, tenant capacity not there yet to engage beyond the building and into the rest of the community/neighbourhood 	<p>events, fun activity that youth can enjoy: drumming, team building activities, and find a way to facilitate conversation between youth and organizers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are not reaching youth who have something to say and are ready to say it. We need to find ways to reach them and involve them • Have residents to come to the group and work with them, who would like to work for community. More residents not only agencies. Usually it's only agencies speaking • Use a full family – mom and child approach to engage youth by accessing family members who are specifically accessing services • Develop relationships with residents in a different way, informal way • Concrete results are the way to connect to residents and youth and engage them. • Share success points with residents, youth • Some superstar youth receive perks and creates potential dependency and expectation among youth who come only for honorarium. However, there is a reality for many residents and young people for basic supports like transit, food, child minding. • Experiment with facilitation – build in resident leadership • Find ways to hear youth beyond typical ways. Understand that youth workers are not speaking from personal opinion but a reflection of what we have heard from youth. • Hire residents with skills and qualifications to

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NAP not well known in the neighbourhood, common person on the street doesn't know this work exists. Not likely to know. Connection available through ANC and Youth Alliance • Our meeting times prevent resident participation • Residents not accustomed to friendly approach • Residents not ready yet • Trying to get translators for the Chinese population in this area • Missing link in the community • Challenge to consistently engage residents without resources • Resident involvement is macro and micro, we need to better utilize resident needs, skills, and wants. • Use community members' motivations, interests and priorities to engage them • Better awareness to engage youth, having youth commit to a two hour meeting isn't the best use of their skills all the time, the system isn't youth friendly, how can we adjust it for them and engage them in different levels of the process • Not enough focus on connecting residents – they need a chance to voice issues together and share themes across priority neighbourhoods/ Toronto • Challenges are in the process, often we don't have the education of the different ideology of how youth and adults function, own limitation 	<p>support community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruit community organizers • Develop outreach and communication • Model that uses resident expertise to engage community builders and connect them to jobs and honorariums – show that there is a value for their engagement • Find fun and engaging ways to involve members outside of the meeting structure • Animating community members recruiting actively –outreach, connecting engaging residents to come out to be involved. People who don't already know. More creativity you have, doing more community member recruiting • Involved in the community from the beginning—City staff will still need to caucus as well as agencies and residents will need to be supported to do the same • Unfettered organizers to support resident engagement • Use engaged, empowered residents in priority neighbourhoods to involve/ empower residents from outside the priority neighbourhood • Give ownership to residents and support them • Regular engagement of residents • Engage 1 person from each city division to advocate for community issues (with payment) • More planning related to residents, community and agencies engagement • Engagement for all youth and families

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
	<p>policies, organizations, process to inform the youth and city framework, that's a part of the process to digest things, we undermine the process and don't get the end processes, residents will come on and off, how do we get consistency of how to have people as a part of the process, what kind of support do they need , TTC, consistent support, timing, etc. childcare. Having a meeting on a regular basis to have an outcome but make that happen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sure people want to do that, needs to be lead by the residents, process is safe and equitable and have the same weight to make a difference for the residents to have a voice to build on • Resident engagement: money is an issue for the residents; we burn them out • Creating a balance of being involved (residents) • Volunteerism is from a class perspective- need to create a balance between volunteerism and paid work to allow participation, when do we honour this? • Need to develop strategy to engage residents (target group)- Find a way to work with residents beyond meeting participation- develop strategy and be clear about the impact we want from them (offer opportunity for skills development) this is a two way relationship • Example of resident engagement model that worked "neighbour to neighbour" Ruth Morris hired residents (Ambassadors) to recruit 10 residents each 	<p>throughout GTA, each community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to empower residents across City • Fostering and building relationships between residents • NAP – getting buy-in from variety of cultural groups – some competing value systems – coming to common ground can be an issue • Where does resident engagement get resourced Budget for transport, honorarium for residents • People need to see their roles clearly • Are concerns of non TCHC residents reflected? • Want to make sure organizations send 1 person to NAT table that residents recognize • Finding mentors for people in the community to help them maintain their communities • Consider having residents lead process • Assess resident-driven process • Poverty, housing and employment need a macro response • Resident's driven process • Residents need to connect to decision makers • Include faith communities as a powerful source of information • Use the Ethnic newsletters to spread information in the community

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OW clients who volunteer being told they need to work now – pressure from TESS • Creating "buy-in" with residents and business. • Creating/encouraging/sustaining a sense of "ownership" within the community • Lack of residents in the table. How much can we ask of residents? • On the down side the residents allowed the experts to do most of the work and to take the lead • Everything has to be residents' inspired rather than resident led • Some neighbourhoods are organized and could use light touch to strengthen connection to the City • How you feel with residents sitting and speaking at the table, each has to search for themselves, they come you sense it but you know I am not coming back because, it is a comfort zone. And see how welcoming and comfortable sitting amongst residents, everyone on one level no matter whatever you have. Major barrier • UW has funded the resident-driven piece through ANC; I'm not sure like the resident piece has worked from a City perspective because it is so distance from the City despite being at the same table; greater integration is needed to drive the priorities • Residents try to take more ownership, authority sometimes being misused • Underrepresentation of residents; bringing new residents to the meetings 	

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
2. CAPACITY BUILDING		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life changing opportunities from NAP - Networking skills developed, relationships built (professional and personal) • Efforts to engage residents, giving them skill building and collaborative opportunities • Gained confidence in all aspects, skills were used personally and in the community. • Building skills around gathering funds and initiating programs. • Skill building and capacity building to improve employment opportunities and make a stronger community • Learning about different careers and potential-youth funding, getting help with writing successful grants • We come together as a community and talk about issues the community is facing and what we can do to improve the situation. That works well • Grassroots organizations received capacity development supports • We are trained, police reference, CPR and first aid training, clearance to work with children, documents in good standing, we have 5-6 people to work with us, building the skills to network • Bridges the gap between community and its government • Ability to see all the different parts of the City • Local organization funding local initiatives • Residents could engage and build community • More people from Priority Neighbourhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need more training for adults. There is too much focus on youth who already get more supports than adults • Civic engagement can be done better; we need to find ways to educate • More investment on residents and youth • Resource binder in ANC is available to residents looking for supports, but residents don't know it is there, even volunteers don't know it exists – why does that happen? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educating the community to speak. Enabling them to be able to speak back to those coming into the community to "help". Some way of educating the community on how to speak on behalf of themselves and to advocate on behalf of themselves • Use popular theatre and popular education tools for planning with residents and people who are placed differently with language, access, etc. Can facilitate participation of residents in more meaningful ways using these approaches • "Resident driven and youth-led" require capacity building piece as not all are at the same level. Sometimes the capacity deficit is us – community agencies and city. • It should start right off the bat with all the partners, not just the City • Focused on education of community partners • Being a part of it youth-right person, skill development, leadership to enable youth to take on leadership roles, build the capacity of youth and residents in the community. • Educate community about how they will be impacted when they make political decisions • These people involved would need training. What are other cities doing? • What successes of others can we learn from? • Capacity building would be good • Residents need to be given some education/instruction about what NAP is for – need to be briefed

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are working for the City • Powerful learning from process • Training opportunities made available through NAP • The Malvern and Youth training program helped youth move forward and build better community. Youth is being employed and these people are networking with other young people in helping • Good feedback from the community because youth have profited a lot. Community speakers in different meetings have been amazing and presenting different issues: violence, youth and safety issues • Built capacity in stakeholders • Structure of Neighbourhood Action helped to quickly learn the key players and their roles in the community, as well as the gaps in service. Even City staff found it helpful to better understand other City workers roles • Lunch and learn capacity building for front line workers with youths • Increased critical thinking of youth • Opportunities for employment trainings, arts, mentoring enhance • Learned how to access services in our community. • NAP helps residents know which programs and services are out there. • Training opportunities made available through NAP. • Useful tool for training staff in Community Engagement how city works 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helping residents to better understand the jargon and lingo when people are speaking. Speak clearer so that everyone can understand what is being conveyed, so people can understand why you are here.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newsletter has been distributed, important to the community for communication. • Knowing who can help with what issues opens doors for community members. • Increased knowledge about services and what happens in the community • Learning about different processes like City • Community agencies received assistance with projects events outreach (Jane-Finch) • Finding out how many agencies were in the community • City staffs learn more about neighbourhoods they work in. Holding meetings in community based spaces informs City Staff of the reality residents face, explore gaps of City services meeting resident needs and proximity • Increase of holistic approach. Good for City staff and consultants to know other staff working in the community • Directors have learned through Neighbourhood Action as well • TESS has improved its understanding of community resources and the needs of the community • The sharing of information and increased knowledge on issues and services • People hears what's going on • Increased knowledge and activities • Updates from all partners at least once a year works well • Access to City information presented by City staff via NAPs gives agency direct link to information. 		

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
3. SERVICE PLANNING & DELIVERY		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People gaining access to services • Programs for youth • Investing In Neighbourhoods getting residents on OW in job experience at SVANC office • Support that came from the knowledge and the activities of the community advisory for Service Canada • Plugging into 13 NAPs meant our City wide agency was able to connect to local planning across the City – allowing us to focus on coverage from a youth service perspective between agencies across neighbourhoods as large organizations. Avoid duplication and rationalize resources in a better and coordinated way. • NAP members are better able to respond and refer residents to appropriate agencies and take advantage of opportunities, making it productive • Homework Club in ANC, which engaged both youth and parents • Programs like "Live Arts" is very beneficial especially for young businesses • Job search resources are very helpful, availability of ANC office is great • Increased coordination of services to specific groups • "Breakfast Club" offered at the Recreation Centre and programs geared towards low income residents. • Made agencies/divisions more sensitive, i.e.: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureaucratic barriers, community members not knowing how to navigate systems, some partner agencies create barriers to completing certain processes • How do we measure and look at the value added to the residents, and the duplication of programs? • Bureaucracy is a hindrance to both service providers and residents • Don Montgomery Community Centre Youth Priority Space – PFR does not have enough experience of how to deal with this situation. PFR don't – it's new and a pilot. PFR staff are still learning how to work with a youth- led process; we don't have 9-5 mentality; developed by City, adults professionals to work in a certain way. Creating a new framework to work in a youth way, when they are younger 14, things need to be different for older youth–need to be friendly • A lot of agencies work 9-5 wants to work within the framework; they have a job to do and get it over with. I am gone, that's it, we feel like that it is a paycheque so why bother • Where does our neighbourhood go to? To which organization/service do people go? • PRF services are not free because there is not community centre in Weston-Mount Dennis • Kids in priority neighbourhood are not accessing them. Kids in other neighbourhoods are able to access the free programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job searches need to come from a place based approach to be effective for the community • Community Service Hubs would be needed in each area in order to succeed • More programs for school ages children, especially in the summer (ANC had a summer program available to all kids, it was successful but they had more participants than they had anticipated, there is a need for more programs to support the number of kids in Scarborough Village) • Toronto Vital Signs Report demonstrated a need for youth and employment services • Local employment • The powers that be could have done a little bit more e.g. Service Canada could have explained better where their hands are tied • Focus on a more regional area versus neighbourhood area • Reduce gaps in programs and resources • Enhance a coordinate service throughout communities • Issues of boundaries: e.g.: Investing in Families coupons for library fine forgiveness: postal code didn't coordinate with local branch • Libraries should continue to expand their programs to accommodate the community needs • Encourage library staff to go out into community • Need for coordinated social development plan for implementation that includes community

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>accountability to neighbourhoods for programs/ services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrepreneur based initiatives (Youth Enterprise Network) • The support from community partners: SCHC, St. Stephens Church, Tides Canada • Better efficiency of service delivery • Get nurses out in communities. • NAP allows some City departments to reach out to the community – leaving their offices • TESS is more support for employment needs at community • Serving the individual within their own community • Linkages have really enhanced the service delivery • Hot spot of poverty : Housing – knowledge about unsupported residents – not part of the TCHC – this has worked well • Provided a structure in TPL allocating resources, hours expansion program • Library identified where to go in community to provide programs • Neighbourhood Action allowed us to target programs to local communities. • TPL – placement of programming through community consultation • Promote services – TPH – partnerships with organizations to provide free services, e.g. Malvern partner with TAIBU • NAP table helped new project - Tower Renewal 09 - to start up, enhance, success new projects; able to quickly move to action 		<p>services, libraries, recreation, infrastructure, employment, Tower Renewal and City planning. It should all be one inter-divisional plan for an area so links are clear</p>

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Libraries are more engaged with community, provide more diverse range of community gathering place, open space, more partnership possibilities due to visibility, presence • Local services can be provided • In many NA's TESS has supported and at times led the planning and delivery of employment programming. A number of financial initiatives were introduced under the Enhanced Employment Funding program to assist youth with their education, prepare for employment including education scholarships. We have also worked with younger youth to assist them in obtaining part time employment by way of resume preparation, accreditation and counselling. • Improved services and programs in the area • Recognize where gaps in service lie • Better understanding of people's need from city divisions • Break down barriers at divisional levels – this filters down to staff going to local meetings • Increased familiarity of services • Learning about gaps and overlaps 		

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
4. COLLABORATION & COMMUNICATION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working together for getting funds and implementing new programs • New relationships, new programming and groups were built, as well as events such as Dorset Park Day • Neighbourhood Action has become a wonderful vehicle for coming together of agency members of the community stakeholders in general • Collaboration between the City, residents and local agencies works really well • Collaboration with agencies, hearing from different perspectives makes for a strong collaboration (i.e. Youth Service Providers Network) • Organized community events together: Summer festival • Youth working with adult allies towards certain goals together • The collaboration is amazing • Different people working together • Resident led organizational collaboration • Increased cooperation between stakeholders • The ABC's were more productive due to the work of NAP • City services, divisional staff to connect with other groups you would not have had the opportunity to connect with otherwise. • Connections could perhaps have been made but would have taken longer and not as timely • Opportunity to work with other partners and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for better cross-cultural communication • Youth put the proposal in for the grant, let the youth need to use it • Building consensus around an issue • Provide authentic opportunities to influence decision making, instead of consultations after decisions have been made, consultations with little notice, or consultations that are only about PR • Provide opportunities for residents to be involved in planning • Agencies coming with specific agendas the community had their concerns the agencies came to find out where they can get funding from. It did not translate into what the community needed • Better communication and communication that can be trusted • Bring Children Service agencies together for strategic focus. • Balancing resources, time and commitments of different members is difficult • Dependence on agencies to do the work without funding, working collaboratively can be a hindrance as there is no NAP "backbone" agency to be responsible, no official person designated, or funds to maintain structure • ANC and NAP are too separate – having them work collaboratively can assist both • Large organization needs to step back and respect the fact that they were developed by residents- validation of grassroots groups and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication and info, we have to improve to reach each and every neighbourhood and what is going on it is not reaching every group, contribution of real neighbours, community activities, what is the contribution of residents should contribute more, needs to reach outside of the community needs to be improved. • Better communication between residents and the City • Being realistic in what is being proposed ensuring that the right people from the community is there to ensure that things are being done for the benefit of the community. • There needs to be better follow up if you consult with people or get them to share their ideas • Welcome different views not being resistant to change. Listen • Arts community can be better partnered with to find newer approaches to impact local planning and political processes. IE –NYA level • Different tables and different works. Need to think on the outcomes of everyone • Check in with workgroups ahead of meeting to identify key questions to focus on moving to action • It was determined as it evolved, ANC, United Way, City Neighbourhood Action created separately – place based approaches – should have done it together more holistically

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>share resources made some initiatives possible and better</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doing real projects: youth services, food strategy • Regular face to face connection rather than myriad of emails. Fosters connection and relationship building. Keeps relationships strong and vibrant to accomplish collaborative work • In the work groups most of the time we are really good that what groups are doing is what is important to those on it and motivated to focus on our decisions. Challenge is when we assign actions/tasks without commitment and buy-in in our workgroup. Only time it has gotten rocky is when we haven't focused on why something may become an urgent priority and build buy in together. • Food security brought together ANC with other partners and to implement this • Different organizations of NAP is different and this was responsive to each particular neighbourhood, based on their specific needs • Community agencies worked together • Support for community problems: youth employment • Worked together well from discussion to action • Shared leadership role between Community Development Officers and agency staff • Mandating some members to be a part of this process at first forced participation, after the structure started they became invested and 	<p>their advocacy work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to communicate more clearly about the contribution residents can bring to their community agency competition for youth "not all agencies compete for youth, some work together" • A local collaboration lost their funding as a result of NAT coming-NAT is perceived as being more powerful-community need to fit, more collaboration needs to happen • Consistency of attendance to meetings, despite conflicting schedules/priorities, and high staff turnover. • The ability to go beyond meeting/having discussions. Lots of continuous research done, but where's the action? • City needs to collaborate with agencies • One division wants to go in a direction and not take into account the views of the other divisions • Silos - Funding fight • Missing key players from city divisions: TDSB, TCHC, Police, Hospitals • Information on success of programs isn't shown enough, and when it is many parties are claiming ownership • Information on success of programs isn't visible • Communication within agencies is not adequate, internal info sharing needed • E-mail is not the best way to communicate for all community members – what else can be done to share information? For flyers, we 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More opportunities for grassroots conversation • Community agency champion to facilitate and give resources in partnership with the CDO (need a backbone structure to invest in facilitative process • Integrate strategies from agencies – understand others roles • Youth-adult: we need to think of the outcome, working groups to work toward s the outcome, mixture, agency, residents, anyone with a heart that wants to do good in the community, there is a lot of red tape getting \$, we need access, a steering committee to steer the red tape, the working group earns all the stuff to get to the end result • Work in a friendly environment to see things happen. • Inform policies for long term, tower renewal, came up with recommendations to look at by-laws to development in this neighbourhoods, they are from the 40's and 50's is the City looking at changing the bylaws for re-development, should be piloted in the priority neighbourhoods to attract local business,, development –economical, transit, Eglinton west Transit City, where's the change going to come from. • Willpower-who is making the decisions-will our recommendations move forward • How equal is the playing field à help those with the least, who is benefitting from city funding—City funding for the Opera and

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>continued the process willingly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger scale initiatives (i.e. Ontario government involvement) starts locally, bottom-up approach • The balance of structure/fluidity made it very attractive for agencies to contribute, as they knew it was there when they needed it, but weren't mandated to come • Youth piece for my agency is new since the NAP, engaging and partner has been beneficial, receive funds for employment pieces we could not do before, developing the youths services. • Working together on new programs • Working in partnership • Partnerships worked well when participants follow through on their commitments • Provided a forum for information sharing and collaboration across municipal divisions. Made it easier to identify gaps and duplication of efforts and services • "Meeting of the Minds" • Lower competition and more collaboration • Facilitated collaboration between local agencies and residents. • Working together and solving local issues. • Small coordinating table meets to discuss projects involving numerous agencies and residents • Provide effective communication and coordination at the table. • Empowered and enabled branch head, know • Facilitated the collaboration between local 	<p>need more translation/ distribution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take advantage of the schools in the community to distribute information and offer opportunities for students to complete their community service hours • Not enough broadcast to the community, more information to the community (agencies need to get more into the community, e.g. Flyers, newspaper) • Sharing information outside the meetings, in communities • Not knowing how other NAPs functions • How could we do it differently or better? Move to a social media strategy that would effectively work for each of us. Need a balance. • Info overload – need a concise and connective way to access information. Speaks to the relevance of the information we put out as a NAP. • NA Newsletter format does not print well • Youth is not being heard. How do we get youth to be heard Youth need to know more about where that can find answers for specific issues; lack of information of where to get information Youth is not being heard because youth workers change every three months and they build relationships with only one youth worker Having actually youth people speaking directly at NAP table • More information on what other neighbourhoods do. We have a lot to learn from each-other. We can get more ideas from 	<p>Museums</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community collaborations more regularly, not just when there's money or "we" want something. More proactive support. • Example – One concrete project (with Community Consultations) at a time. At each of these tables have one person assigned to make sure it happens, it would be their job • Bring residents and youth needs to networks • Bring the employers to the job fairs • Repeating previous work plans and strategies to news staff • Reminders of update • Divisions presence inconsistent – how divisions fit – they don't always recognize this • Gap in communicating experience back to division • Mentoring people in neighbourhoods so they can maintain communities • Mixed expectations from residents who want access to city staff • Encourage communication • City needs to collaborate with agencies • Level of commitment from organizations • Open meeting process with partners • Improve the connection between ANC and NAP • Improve coordination between city divisions based on neighbourhood needs • Coordination among different planning tables • Need for stakeholders, TCHC, City Divisions and Cllr Offices to work in coordinated way • NAP and workgroup meetings to be

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>agencies and residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worked together and solved local issues. • In Kingston-Galloway/Orton Park, strong community people working together very well, 40-50 attend meeting, show case programs and network. • Small coordinating table meets to discuss projects involving numerous agencies and residents • Less "bouncing" around – empowerment, increased speed in getting things done can see results • SNS has enabled TPL to reach out and to be more sensitive and anticipatory of common needs • Opportunity for service providers to collaborate on community safety • Collaboration when all divisions feel they have a common goal – on the same page • Willingness of people to contribute to joint efforts • Collaboration of City Divisions to work collectively in neighbourhoods helps build equitable process of meeting identified needs rather than squeaky wheel gets the oil model • Bringing service providers together is a useful thing for collaboration, service planning and integration. Bringing service providers together and info sharing useful thing • Help TPH meet mandate. Focus work in prioritized neighbourhoods. Collaboration with other Divisions. • Reduction of competition, duplication and 	<p>each-other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information is not accessible for others in the community who do not attend the meetings. • Lack of communication and coordination between agencies • Difficulty to talk about the community to the schools outside of the school community – they aren't viewing it as holistically as other agencies • Have cross-community communication, in an engaging way to have city wide information and strategy sharing from different neighbourhoods – conference style, grant needed. • A need to ask United Way for more funding and resources to support a conference and for ongoing work • Many strategies are impacting the same people, we need better communication • Lack of engagement of whole community and its stakeholders, they need to communicate and work collaboratively • Lack of awareness and promotion of the work NAPs and residents do 	<p>communicated in the newsletters that have far reach like a local Councillor website/newsletter. At least disseminate key information that is wide-open through political representatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use different media. Commercials for Televisions during evening soaps and general communication strategy. DVD – 5 minute overview that can be used at various local meetings that may be outside reach of NAP. Expand reach of programs available in the community. TTC bus and subway ads. • Once a year tap into a broader neighbourhood dissemination – many residents with needs. 211. • Messaging is key – profile. Build and share awareness across the City. Promoting flu shot is a public health announcement is a legitimate promotion – could be done regarding resident engagement. May stimulate and promote proactively. Costly but may serve over time. • Use flat screens in waiting rooms and agency spaces to promote City's neighbourhood work. • Get youth together across neighbourhoods to speak and hold a big event where different youth committees come together and discuss, once in a while • Sharing experiences through speakers from NAP to NAP • Map out and share assets and resources (database/inventory), it is the natural expression of collaboration • Website page inputting what is going on,

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>fragmentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better ways of working together • Increased collaboration between different City divisions • The sharing/exchange of ideas and info as well as being a catalyst in leveraging resources among stakeholders A+ • Ability to disseminate information to other agencies, sharing information • More information shared among others having specific faces to names • Sharing and exchange of ideas and information • The process helped us to learn a lot about the community as a whole • Synergy of agencies – sharing of programs and resources, examination of duplication while working together towards common goals as a community. • Those who care for and are invested in the community have a chance to have input, facilitating a caring approach • Info sharing about youth program resources such as HYPE program – which engages youth in community events to show them the impact of community development – grant writing etc • Sharing experiences, and building on shared experiences. • Forum of information sharing • Awareness of roles and work of different departments • Learning about work of other divisions / resources of other divisions 		<p>everyone is on the same page, that is shared, not enough support and expectations are unrealistic as there is so much to do, sets them up to fail as one in a community, sharing of resources and information, gap of education piece of processes and time steps to take</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge we have with other neighbourhoods so far • Share models, training materials, tool kits • Share best practices, creating a staff forum • Enhance the communication: involve residents, build trust, websites, brand and promote) • Transmission of good experiences in other divisions • Sharing best practices in a regular way • Promote programs with other stakeholders • Emphasis on building relationships is key to productive work. • ACTION IDEA: bring TCHC members and stakeholders into meetings so we can clarify roles and stop hindrance of programs • Talk to politicians on all levels, let them know they need to offer something more concrete to Scarborough Village and work for their vote to make sure our voice is heard

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising awareness for community Service • Agencies to recognize City resources, e.g. City Planning –What does it do?- awareness of benefits • NAP facilitates communications of different groups in the community, we need to reach out to many different and diverse communities to start conversations • Brought agencies together at the table – don't have to compete for funding – collaborative, coordination • Communication worked well – eliminates overlap 		
5. NETWORKS & PARTNERSHIPS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety committee for example, is a good example of the network and spread of information of what is discussed in the table. Every representative in the table does good job in spread the information to other groups • Connection to other partners locally and residents was easier by tapping into the NAP's existing table Helpful information and connection for newcomers via LIP connection to NAP • Focus on the on-the-ground work may be extra work but actions are complimentary to what we already do so it strengthens and enhances our work's effect through extended partnerships. Impact is greater than going it alone • Tenants have voice at the table and allows agencies to have a tenant perspective to items discussed. Keeps tenant lens alive. Able to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of communication/ information around relationships • Power relationships negatively impact initiatives i.e. stopping room bookings, saying no to suggestions • Agreement between stakeholders and residents is vital, as is proper communication • Same group involved with many programs and other s don't get access, personal opinions and favouring of family/friends • Churches and faith groups missing • TCHC staff participation is inconsistent • Bringing the TDSB in the table and churches • More participation needed from the boards and faith communities. Needs clearer definition when, how and who participate. There may be institutional capacity issue that prevents full consistent participation • We are a big and diverse NAP. Poses a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural associations have a large impact and influence as well, reach out for them to join. • Involve local business owners in NAP and in employment initiatives • Invite businesses to meetings for networking, engage them • Advocate for big businesses to hire locally, talk with new businesses looking for big hires to organize job searches i.e. Wal-Mart • Take a look at the companies making money off of Scarborough Village, and ask how they will give back • How do you get the schools involved in the nap and how did we go about getting them here. We had a teacher who wanted to be here. We need to have the other cultures in, have food, have a social with small agenda, you invite different people to be involved as a social piece, to start it over

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>access Councillors to address specific issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity of who is represented • Building relationships among service providers • Having residents seat together with other agencies • Building solid partnerships, ex: work together regarding youth, we went deeper in working together not on surface level • Bringing everyone in the table • A great network which involved residents, agencies and community partners • WA wonderful vehicle who brought together agencies, residents, stakeholders and city staff • Appreciative Inquiry sessions in Dorset Park & Scarborough Village helped to bring communities together and build capacity in stakeholders – it facilitated partnerships • New frontline workers were given an opportunity to network and meet partners fast, speeding up the relationship building process • Diversity of people in this group had a large impact – faith groups, businesses etc. • Engagement of Toronto Police and counsellors made a positive impact • Faith groups approached and invited to better serve community • Worked well personally as what services for youth were out there, able build a strong bridge between library and services available, enhance our role as a connector, refer a youth appropriately, very effective-more youth and organizations that work with youth are aware 	<p>challenge when thinking of sending a different staff person to the table. The right level of representatives means we can sift through information and contribute to action planning in an effective way. Not as many opportunities for the large big conversations we need in relation to what we face in our neighbourhood. May be a challenge we can live with.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TDSB is missing at the table. Not sure why either. Community agencies would like to know why TDSB don't make it to the table even though they are part of the membership list and kept up to date via emails. • Number of people are on the workgroups though not on the NAP table • Changes in organizations – especially for smaller organizations. As NAP we should stay committed and connected to know what our agency membership is facing. • TCHC is missing at the NAP table meeting • Staff turnover from different agencies. New people that come have no idea and don't give anything. That impeded some of the networks which include also residents • Involving schools and faith groups • Bringing together different community initiatives (ANC, EW and NAP) • Need to involve businesses – sustainable involvement <p>Need to bring in more faith groups and build stronger partnerships with them Bring more people to the table and emphasize involvement in neighbourhood improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who we need at the table: Transit here, and for-Im the businesses we need them, TTC, TCHC, TDSB, TCSB, Economic Development CD, Police, outreach in subways with YOWs was a great fit, revitalizing and expanding BIA –councillor response –creating business to come together • Engage religious associations perhaps through a local scholarship sponsored by the NAP with religious groups as partners • Get corporate support • A committee consisting residents and the city to meet once monthly • Creating partnerships with businesses • Involve all sectors at the table. Open the table to more voices, allow support for the different values being shared. It takes all factors including social business, property health etc • Those community workers with flexibility in their roles - the pressure falls on them to pick up the load of partnership/network work. • NA work should start right off the bat with all the partners • Build relationships beyond limitations of “proper City protocol” • Engage more businesses and make them partners of what we do • Build partnerships with all levels of government • Involve members in a friendly, not mandated way • Follow-up with networking – not just a one-

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>of the library and have the opportunity to use the library as a space and to come together as small groups, space key strategy-provide a neutral and safe space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One big force coming together and work together, TPH, Library, PFR, workshops to be prepared for the application process, for the first time, connect them through jobs for youth • Voice of residents connect them to service providers, leverage the opportunity to connect with agencies and ANC staff bring the voice of residents to the nap table, it is very customary to have partnership and collaboration at this scale is new, leveraging resources, bringing programs, support, PFR limitations, partnership is getting easier and relationships are build person to person • identifying gaps build partnerships to fill gaps, develop more services to get the needs to come together and identify instead of being separate entities, and where to partner • Relationship in Firgrove with residents and the city • Strong success in bringing different agencies together to share information/common goals. Successes are tangible. • Youth network/conferences – Friday Night Café, partnership with TCHC. • Why it includes calibre of knowledge and commitment among members • Pulled together neighbourhood communities • Included neighbourhoods that were excluded as being designated priority 	<p>versus bringing them to sit in to meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize Neighbourhood Action for the TDSB – different neighbourhoods have different relationships with the school boards • Neighbourhood Action is very dependent on relationships, that determines who is sitting at the table and who is involved – too accidental. • How do we get more involvement without making it a cookie cutter approach or mandating agencies/ stakeholders to come? • Agencies working with youth need to work together • Large agencies are concerned that one resident cannot represent their community; however one staff from a community agency can represent a community. • It gave opportunities for network to develop but it was uneven • Missing key player from different divisions – TDSB, TCHC, Police Hospitals • Emerging needs can be identified based on partnerships around the table • Fostering and building relationships between residents • Build relationships with other community led initiatives in the community • Frontline staff/part time staff are not involved • Outside Nap there are many community led initiatives – How do we connect with them and build a relationship? • Fostering and building relationships among residents • Commitment form agencies. • Balance 	<p>time connection, actively communicate and build relationships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the structure of Neighbourhood Action better understood, and involve people who are already invested • Need to express the value of city partners participation and keep them involved • Power imbalance, trust and relationship building, are we bringing corporate world in to be partners, not a one time, a meaningful partner with us, everything in the neighbourhood is healthy and will support our community and business, PAYE corporate world is incorporated, incentives for businesses to sit at the table. What is the natural connection, right consumers, we need to look at the BIA, look at the table, they have the comm. Involvement piece, need to contact right beyond that, banks giving donations, how can we look at a local business, to work with the neighbourhood to be viable, • Dedicate a special day to visit agencies, or other potential partners • Connect with all, police, TAVIS, built a good relationship with police and community. • Presence of City Councillors or representatives at meeting • Commitment from school boards – more consistently at all levels, from local principals and teachers to boards • Engaging local businesses, including small established and larger franchise. • Sufficient support for networking among

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowed communities and agencies for a collective voice Gave TESS an opportunity to participate in Community more Getting to know decision makers (ED + Directors) Opportunity for residents/youth: to meet service providers and voice needs + gaps Strength of partnership is what makes or breaks a neighbourhood Created partnerships and community consultation. Breaking doing silos/barriers. Mixed level of staff at meetings Listening –linking up with existing groups actively involved in all 13 NAT/Ps plus Regent Park from the beginning and has contributed both at the steering committees, sub-committees and NA Champion Directors At the simplest level the NA's brought together most City human services staff, facilitating inter divisional dialogue on community issues 	<p>number of members at the table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get buy in from a variety of cultural groups Gaps in representation – e.g. TDSB Need to find ways to get all players around the table. NA Survey says School boards, Public Health, TCHC, ethno-space organizations lacking at NAP tables. Hard to attract non-City, smaller agencies Lack of commitment from some divisions – e.g. Transportation TESS - Often the NA tables do not have consistent and/or senior level participation. Decision makers enable the fast tracking of initiatives ensuring appropriate resources are made available. Involve more partners at NAP tables such as: TPS, TCHC. Connecting strategically library, schools and other ABC capital investment with priority neighbourhoods 	<p>partners. More lead time/development opportunity to understand the needs of the community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More planning related to residents, community and agencies engagement Community agencies would be able to come together. Create partnerships and new opportunities Interagency groups – still exist, still work (have existed for years) Bring in local community college/universities to table Take what we have learned plus expand networks Let more communities be connected to City staff and services Bring in corporate sector to bring opportunities to access employment, possibilities – BIA – local appointments Neighbourhood based investment would attract business development also
6. CITY LEADERSHIP		
<p>PROCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created a resident friendly process Allowed for sharing ideas and resources Focused on demographic and statistics Focused on particular neighbourhoods and those in need Director-Champion model gave members a chance to speak to people with power – having directors talk to one another helped to break 	<p>PROCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City services didn't meet all residents' needs Same goal for City divisions Sometimes not clear about the NAP goal Collaborative approach to problem solving For some divisions it has made the process worse Some frustrations with working groups when everyone is front line 	<p>PROCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make mission statement and vision available to community Maintain a target approach – the served population does not change Improvement to TCHC especially as it relates to residents participation in decision making Clear long term vision Setting clear goals

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>down the "silos" and turned conversations into actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility of model has been good structure target population • Helped make divisional operational decisions like hours of operation and capital • Working towards same goal • Capturing demographics – e.g. Identifying number of dropout youth and then use stakeholders to meet needs • NAP great at focusing on low income aspects of neighbourhood: Tower Renewal with private property owners shows focus on TCH rather than other pockets. How do we move to these? • Focus on particular neighbourhood – target local issues • Senior managers involved initially, evolved to front line staff attendance • Good for community to see Directors at the frontline forum. Opportunity for Directors to step out of traditional role of Director work – invigorating and energizing. • Current model has been focused on infrastructure • HR has not been on the neighbourhood table across City. Need for long-term role for HR – re. hiring • Public Health's commitment to meeting quarterly with Health Officer and Community Development Officer • Long term focus brings up priority neighbourhoods to healthy standard that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of follow up after commitment is made • Lack decision making power slows process down • What are the municipal, provincial and federal government's roles in supporting that and creating jobs? <p>ORGANIZATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff turnover at City and other organizations/agencies led to inconsistency and delays. • Take community safety issues into consideration • Newcomer focus is turning residents off of some programs • Need to build on past projects that were successful and make them ongoing • Maintain/step up youth programs – many youth out of the school system and they have to be reached • Are the residents needs being met? Are the agencies addressing the actual issues or just following what they are mandated to do as opposed to working with the community identified issues, and how do we move towards a model that puts community input as the determining factor to action taken? • If residents would have a deeper clearer vision of the goals, we would have worked differently and the commitment would be stronger In the beginning there was a lack of clarity in roles and objectives • Get different messages from different City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating focal points for action • A better management of Crisis Response Program • Developing a work plan coming from community • Better representation of residents in City facilities and service delivery • Re-examine the boundaries of the priority neighbourhoods • Focus more on the high needs areas • Plan and invest based on consideration of demographic changes • Focus on newcomers and settlement services • Agency stretch beyond current neighbourhoods is a serious concern. Going beyond 13 neighbourhoods with the NA approach will require a discussion about which agencies are best suited to work in which neighbourhoods. Some City-wide agencies can focus on some things while smaller ones may focus more locally. Good to have a facilitated process engaging agencies in figuring it out through Community Partnership Strategy. • Workgroups focus on stated needs of the community may stay because they are established by agency partners leads. Short term goal oriented could go on but by nature is not sustainable in its focus. Though would be weakened by lose of connection to emerging opportunities. • Have a long term focused group and other subgroups who can work in different issues

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>other neighbourhoods enjoy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus was not on ranking poverty as priority but clearly neighbourhoods deemed priority for investment in what was needed Stressed importance on action This is truly building a community <p>ORGANIZATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff needs to be at the centre of this work for it to be effective Division of NAP work into subcommittees Various ways of organizing NAPs according to neighbourhood's specific needs Structure of programs implemented Working through the employment workgroup on specific issue like employment allowed for strategic focus and shift of priorities that were much needed. Regular schedule meetings in advance Dividing NAP in subcommittees, where everyone participates and creates programs for specific problems Different NAP have different organization, based on each particular neighbourhood Monthly meetings are very informative, very well organized especially for people who don't have time to come in every single meeting Excellent leadership Committed partners Workgroup/ committee structure. Kingston/Galloway/Orton Park Neighbourhood Action has a lot of momentum – sub-committees and workgroups are 	<p>people. Would appreciate an official response to what issue is being discussed. I can understand moving from silo to inter-divisional work is a change process, not always a clear communication as a youth worker to figure out what is the response. Different City staff and Cllr Office have different messages. Who has final say as the official voice? From community perspective sometimes it feels like banging our heads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value in bring just City staff together once in a while to help ensure the City focused issues are coordinated. NAT as needed What NAP goal is? A champion for the neighbourhood; a hub for communication? Promote the continuity over time and have always people in the meetings and who takes decision Some City members/Councillor commitments are not equal to that of other members, bred resentment Strong Neighbourhoods created together – strategies created separately Tiered approach created divisions, perceptions of "better" neighbourhoods that were addressed first The NAT is powerful and hence it needs to respect all existing planning bodies and find some way to work with/build on them instead of creating NAPs. Need to seek out points of intersection to avoid duplication of efforts Need to increase flexibility of staff in regards to protocols to better meet the needs of the community. 	<p>for short-term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involve residents in the discussion through popular education tool and simple language. Using Arts Community to make youth be part of planning Giving independency to NAP related to focus, based on the neighbourhood needs Move to action. We know the issues. How do we move from that to action? Get better at how to facilitate dreams into action so the spirit of community based – youth based work is fostered At a Youth Speaks mentioned that not comfortable moving beyond our neighbourhood boundaries, then subgroup focused on youth that were not engaged in areas of community that had not been engaged before to get their input, ideas and priorities. Then through NAP table find connections to bring action to those inputs. Focus on engaging youth beyond what may have been the first enticement/incentive. Build in check in on where the shared vision is now. More foundational work at the beginning on shared principles, commitment, resources Addressing action towards specific needs of the community Focus based on community needs (E.G. a high school for the area, English school for adults, community access spaces) Vision needs to be bottom-up and community based to better serve individual communities

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>productive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular meetings, email exchange, help bond • Documentation of issues with focusing and addressing them • When there is funding to do certain work, it can have parameters. The working group approach allows flexibility to do work that truly helps shift issue beyond funding limitations <p>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICER (CDO):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCRP CDO was there for us whenever there was a crisis • The role of CDO is a necessity. Representation from government is an employee who care about the community • The influence of CDO creates positive change. • CDO goes out of way to advocate for community and that is highly important there are not many people who are positive about the community • Great support from CDOs • Facilitated by City has helped to bring most of the agencies together • Great support from CDO's • Community Development Officers have taken a lot of leadership in bridging gaps • Brought expertise from outside and from CDOs • CDO is key to a lot of work -- Bring vision forward, momentum going. • The role of the CDO are crucial in: Facilitating the discussion; a bone to partnerships; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imposing at times. Asking the neighbourhood at times to conform to City Policies instead of asking the city to understand/work with their communities. • "Independent of the Community". It would have been better for the NAT to be better resourced or it would have been neat to all work on one topic/project, from an organic perspective. This could help raise the profile of NAT. • Our city is very complex, the language used (lingo), our deadlines, the way we are framed is a barrier. • NAP is it a place for discussion, for action, for directing different issues; what's the real purpose of the NAP? • Sometimes we come in the table for different reasons. It should be an understanding of why we are there? We can't keep changing agendas or issues. • Not a clear vision and goal • Long term vision • Trying to focus on residents' needs • Focusing on action and accomplish with an action • Work plan needs to come from community. • responding to City's priority rather from a community priority (i.e. safety committees) • Meeting the needs of residents • Where does our neighbourhood go to? To which organization/service do people go? • Difficult for city staff to be at NAP and sub-committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on "racialized" youth – disconnect between vision and process, it needs to be owned by the community, not just discussed - address systemic oppression, embed the process in the community • Address the biases and oppressions of everyone , look into the systemic causes and reflect on ourselves – youth and community members encouraged to do the same • Impact on Aboriginal youth, get strategies that better impact them • Popular education model approach needs to be used • Need to have same goal and focus; think of the outcome • Recommendations for possible changing in by-laws related to the development of these neighbourhoods • Long term policies • New framework to be developed by UWT, City, residents and city-this needs a plan to plan—this should be the focus of the report that is 'A Plan to Plan' • Remove the charity model. JOBS! –'Poverty is Policy' • Empowerment neighbourhood focus on the assets • The report to committee should focus on a plan to do proper consultation for 3 years to get at the real issues- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - redistributing wealth - divide on basis of needs • Deal more with advocacy

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>engaging key partners; proactive- flexible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very engaged hard working CDO • CDO to help make connections with community, resources peripheral but some associated with care mandate of division/ agency. CDO has broader focus – help make connections • Skilled CDOs able to facilitate in the community is key! Building community capability very valuable. CDOs secret sauce - how much more difficult to connect without city institutional resources – hard to imagine community development work without CDOs. • CDOs are the skeletons on which NA rests in terms of galvanizing...need that glue <p>RESOURCES AND FUNDS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brought expertise from outside and from CDOs • Attracted funders to some communities • Expertise was brought in that would otherwise not be part of community in both REXDALE and MD • The availability of food and refreshments • NAP has done lots with a little but more funding and support for NA is required • Using other resources to bring people to the table (usage of a van) • ANC offices • Funding • Very strong political and corporate support (including mayor, deputy city manager). • Director table, corporate support at high level, decision making level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workload issues • Overextended work load • Consistency of meeting times • Organizational guidelines and City's guidelines not letting people know of their true limits e.g. organizational structure could not affect the needed changes at the time the right people representation that cannot make the necessary change • Challenge change of staff that we have, big and change of staff start from the beginning if you are not committed you will not come back, over time certain people felt that residents shouldn't be at the table, if you are not strong they wouldn't come back. <p>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICER (CDO):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of funds to support CDO like in Lawrence Heights and Bathurst-Finch to assist with coordination. Jane-Finch didn't have that • Successor (when NAT/NAP CDO person leaves) need to be well briefed. Do homework and be respectful of work that has been done <p>RESOURCES AND FUNDS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may be helpful for champion directors to take lead and help • Competition for funding – when applying for grants and other agencies are applying as well • Lack of funds in general and lack of funds for seniors and women programs • Unequal distribution of funds based on a geographical setting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity on scope (i.e. not perfectly understood that ARC was an outcome of NAP; connection with NAT; youth focus) • Reviewing mandate more frequently. • Focus on sustainability, i.e. ANC, LIP are parallel processes. How are they being supported/connected/built upon? • Develop opportunity to understand the needs of the community • Co-ordination across networks too. It's not realistic to expect partner agencies to carry the responsibility for admin/note taking/communications, etc. • Appreciative Inquiry approach to address structural oppressions • Collaborations and NAPs needs to intersect and not recreate • Review lessons learned with neighbourhoods that are more resources so that they get a better understanding of the realities of under-resources communities • built on asset not on deficit") • Who is setting the agenda (this is not about the money but about where we are spending it • Clearer roles and expectations of City staff. Perhaps captured in an "Expression of Interest" posting. • Empower one person that cares from each City Division in the region with money and time and advocate for their division whatever's needed for their community • NAP itself with uncertainty around funding and new crops of projects emerging; it's

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of funds helped. Prioritized allocation of resources has benefitted people • City staff involved in NA see world differently and how approach neighbourhood based work • City has invested in Parkdale and Regent Park. Neither are "priority neighbourhoods" due to their proximity to services • Brought more resources to the neighbourhood • The facilitation, involvement and support of the City • Excellent leadership and commitment • Support from other City staff, including Directors • Brought expertise from City Divisions • Crisis Response is fast and reliable; there is comfort in knowing that support is there. • TAVIS supported sports/culture programs (i.e. Click-it photography club) • Pathways to Education great tool for the entire family. • Resident Grants through the City and United Way enables community members, residents etc. To work for themselves • Bus tokens for residents • Availability of refreshments • Helped in organizing community speaks and conferences • Helped in bringing funding to communities • Allocation of funds after prioritizing • Effective way to concentrate resources in a focused way for the City • Financial support for conference community and services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for residents engagement awareness program • Funding tend to be short term • Lack of commitment from some City divisions, e.g. Transportation • Trade-offs can withdraw presence in some communities and transfer resources elsewhere • Insurance is a big barrier – funds and the bureaucracy of it • Long term funding for having sustainable programs • Set up youth programs • Funding for the summer festival is different every year – hard to make it similar & plan ahead • Long term sustainable funding needed to make systemic change (i.e. TAVIS only one year term, not long enough time) • To meet social criteria i.e. applying for grants • Financial Part was the biggest challenge and if we had had more support things would be better • Meetings attendance is a challenge, grant receiving agencies, staff change, buy-in and sustainability • As a resident, I don't see challenges other than money • Grassroots organization did not benefit from the new funding coming into the neighbourhood. Only larger agencies benefitted. How's this practice broaden resources to neighbourhoods. 	<p>difficult to "co-ordinate the co-ordination".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More money for Full Time Coordinator vs Part Time. More admin support. • Regional outcomes are possible as opposed to just neighbourhoods • Opportunity to value and recognize the hard work of city staff • No longer designated for the priority neighbourhood • Strategy was already being implemented. Community was already functioning at the capacity of NAP. • Must be a way to recognize what was established before and after NAP • What was the logistic behind the statistics? – Same contact and numerous engagement opportunities • The term "Crisis" – Residents live daily, were there for the moment • Resident engagement is a long process – sometimes decisions must be made quickly • Small tasks groups would be helpful to get work accomplished • Mixed level of staff in the meetings • Blending – same goals • Purposes and outcomes , visible outcome <p>ORGANIZATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to understand what has happened but there seems to be an impasse what has caused this, did people get tire did we ran out of money steam or What cause the current impasse,

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connecting City resources to neighbourhood initiatives • City's involvement was instrumental in the success of community speak outs and conferences • Resources sharing (space, translation,) was amazing • Don Montgomery CS: PFR shares and communicates with other centres, crossover with Dorset Park • Funding made possible through the NAP • Creative fundraising • Good resource sharing - synergy of agencies • Structure of programs let communities mobilize funds in the way best suited for the community (i.e. POL and TESS) • Leveraging of other outside resources for neighbourhoods, grant writing for new programs etc • Availability of different sources of funding and social capital <p>FACILITIES AND ACCESS TO SPACE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitated access to community centres, community gardens, community rooms, library rooms, schools • Reduction of fees for use of public parks for community events • Wave of fees for PF&R permits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources and investment to support real transformation • Still a young neighbourhood and we may not be as ready to go after funding, and this might affect how transient things are. Hopefully with age there will begin some sense of stability • Might have lack of resources • New administration in the City is talking about cutting programs, this is frustrating to residents when programs aren't reliable/sustained • The challenges replacement CDO no tokens but we continued to come. No tokens, we continued to come through the weather, some of agencies access is youth, newcomers and OW, nothing for anyone else. Nothing for me, I am not on OW but still know there is a need to connect • Funding and resources needed. Pressure given community based sector is facing cuts, still many serve a fully as possible through NAP work group process. Depends on all partners to find time, energy and make it priority <p>FACILITIES AND ACCESS TO SPACE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need Council's recommitment of large capital investment, like POL Fund, beyond state of good repair • Funding for operational costs for city spaces or new programs • Long and tiring procedure for booking space • No consistency in responding to community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome different point of view, not being resistant to change • Balance resources, time and commitment of different members • Schedule meetings on a regular basis • Connect strategically with library, schools and other ABC capital investment with PN • Funds to support CDO's with coordination • Small tasks groups would be helpful • Balance number of members in the table • Experiencing a lack of momentum from the city partners/ politicians because of the lack of clarity of the future of Neighbourhood Action involves into a lack of mandate means they don't come • Should be someone designated to attend from each division in each priority neighbourhood <p>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICER (CDO):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To keep things moving must be someone to pull it together (CDO) • CDOs are members of the table representing the City and are supposed to facilitate the table. Hats off to the CDOs for doing the job they have done. Moving forward by having external facilitator to focus on the process so CDOs could participate. • Hire a community development officer to work with agencies and residents • Continued involvement of Community Development Officers • Providing CDO's with more support and tools to work with tables, outreach workers to

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
	<p>needs related to space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to TCHC facilities • Youth feel ignored in the political process of space development • What happens to the newly created space, who can access it? Insurance issues? • Youth lounge "The Commons" at McGregor Community Centre – no funding for program staff – other resources a challenge • Community Garden – Fiskars funding – still facing difficulties around the facilitation of garden – no funds for that • How can we connect Director Champions to space development processes, and is their ability to influence enough? • The money being received is to build, not to facilitate programs, no operating funds – change this • Finding a space even with money is a problem • Instead of funding leasing expenses of organizations- funders should look long term solution—only property owners are benefiting from this approach ("public purse is supporting the private purse"). Instead City should purchase properties and have community agencies pay for the mortgage and all operating expenses • Match \$1 -invest \$1 in positive space, spaces for all-including grass-roots groups • ProTech WMD-development of space long process; fund raising needed beyond city's investment; grapple with what the participants need (access to space, and more) • Art hub (Jane/Finch): Challenge; situates in a 	<p>enable CDO's to do more, more tools as source</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn from the CDO's who are currently doing the work • More engaged CDO's • Role of CDO in current model has been key to its effectiveness • CDO should bring the NAP perspective to the director table and advocate for issues <p>RESOURCES AND FUNDS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validities and recognize the work of city staff • New resources in kind not just at "cost" • Communities should have access to existing resources • Knowledge we have with other neighbourhoods so far • Look at community needs e.g.: Interagency networks (e.g., Parkdale) • Can be divisive, explore new versus existing neighbourhoods • TR Renewal – apt comm. Not in PNs. Look at other clusters for T renewal, create more pilot projects • Dedicated resources • Invest on core services for the community • City investment ought to go to areas in most need. Focus on making neighbourhoods strong • Dedicated funds for expansion of facilities • City operation costs to be planned for service delivery • Funding for agencies that provide needed services

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
	<p>institution (survival of the fittest)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City workers and space users see the work from a different lens <p>OTHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff that are capable of actively engaging residents are needed, residents are leaving programs because of lack of engagement from agency staff, diversity needs to be reflected in workforce • The City's rejection of residents suggestions • TTC bus 54 still a problem • Staff was a representation of comfort and not need and could not be trusted • The city's involvement has not resulted in real jobs • Organizational guidelines and city's guidelines not letting people know of their true limits e.g. organizational structure could not affect the needed changes at the time the right people representation that cannot make the necessary change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the revision of funds distribution within the 13 PN • Consider funding from other sources but in alignment with City's strategy • Non PN areas cannot access funds to have similar benefits for residents in need as City and other funders allocate investment based on those already defined as priority neighbourhoods • "If stretching existing City resources beyond 13 would cause this work to crumble. Without focused staff resources with responsibility to coordinate the partnerships and provide admin and backbone from City, overburdened community sector unable to take it on. Would lose the connection to the bigger City perspective and information into the local planning and action table. Would lose depth and richness at the table" • "Tax corporations and large business to fund neighbourhood work." • One of the key things about City staff is that staff have power to leverage to bring focus to action, impact needed, etc. Also help navigate system • Full time staff dedicated to coordinate partnership – partnership benefits. If whittled away the partnership weakens. IE less than 3 days a week for a full partnership, partnership begins to fall apart. Keeping people connected, stimulated, connected and keeping people on track to the vision of the partnership. Will be tough for one person to manage three neighbourhoods.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to create and encourage small-medium sized businesses in Scarborough Village • Get big business to invest in the community, sponsor community events, give scholarships etc • Government should give incentives for companies to hire local, such as subsidies, make long term solutions to employment more attractive • Funding commitment from the beginning • We need allocated funds so we can budget and plan ahead • Investing in vulnerable communities (not necessarily the current structure) Investing in community be seen as an ongoing process and not a one-time investment • Adequate funds made available. Support communities that are doing the work • Creating a more collaborative funding system, not a competition • All investment everywhere all the time • Donors should be more flexible • Being creative in finding funds • Dedicated funds for expansion of facilities • Provide funding for agencies that provide services • Providing funds to community based initiatives led by residents • Consider revision of funds distribution within 13 priority neighbourhoods • Consider funding from other sources but in alignment with city strategy

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontline staff or part time staff • Coordinated backbone, administrative support to local networks and planning tables. <p>FACILITIES AND ACCESS TO SPACE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a database of community spaces available • Planning to have meetings in the neighbourhood boundaries • Maintenance of public spaces already rehabilitated. • Make use of TCHC building recreation rooms to have meetings there or at least coffee and a consultation. Start building relationships that way. • Set up a regulation to avoid personal preferences in using a city space Across aboard commitment for using city space by residents <p>OTHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing services to community (gas station, bank, post office, school etc) • Increase subsidized housing • Support for both marginalized residents (youth in conflict with the law, dropping out of school), and those who are succeeding but have limited opportunities • Stretch is a concern if expand to other neighbourhoods. Divisional efficiencies, less people doing more work will be a challenge • Define City Role: Objective for city role is helping communities achieve.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of ABC to help supplement where staff stretch – i.e. TCHC safety coordination in cluster of buildings. • Need to answer questions like: how can existing networks ask for help from the City? • TESS would support the NA approach to other parts of the City. TESS initiatives such as Investing in Neighbourhoods, Investing in Youth, Investing in Families, PAYE and Jobs incentive project are already City wide. The shape and size of other community NA will be determined by local conditions. Either way having City services talk to each other will benefit local citizens • There will be some tradeoffs and potential reduced presence in some areas to transfer to new needs • Not sure how to support within existing model • Identify other community needs to help determine if serves Divisional mandates. Need to be clear about where we would go and how to decide • Potential to lose target and galvanizing around core target. Important to integrate equity lens into efficiencies, improvements and access to services • We have learned from place-based that it works best when it is focused and sustained overtime. Now is the time to search for other models. Can't use same model of NA on another neighbourhood to mobilize integrated response • Planning to take present the accessibility by

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
		<p>the residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and investing taking in consideration the demographic changes • Focusing on newcomers and settlement services • Neighbourhoods that identify priorities • Scarborough Village still has no bank, post office, high school or gas station, we need to involve politicians (councillors, MP, MPP) to get these in to the neighbourhood, they will create long term productive jobs • Need a way not to take away from neighbourhoods currently getting support.
7. EVALUATION & ACCOUNTABILITY		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident engagement is a tool to keep their elected officials accountable to residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sometimes initiatives are taken over by city divisions and grassroots are ignored • Information on success of programs isn't shown enough, and when it is many parties are claiming ownership • Not enough involvement in the activities (they should have roles defined and measured) getting agencies involved, not just being there • Evaluations may be challenging but the work needs to be measurable, quantifiable • Policing in community continues to be a challenge – brutality and racial profiling, little accountability • When you give the youth the opportunity to make their own regulation the youth will follow, adults giving the rules, doesn't work but having the youth be given the process - after the fact, the space when getting nearer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure solutions and outcomes with the support of technical support – evaluation tools • Baseline data of how things were compared to how they are now. Clear measures, outcome framework. • Provide evaluation process • Create an evaluation process for Neighbourhood Action and fund it • Be goal oriented and track our progress. Deal with one issue or multi-face issues with solutions that match concrete solutions or multi-faceted and complex solutions. Get better at communicating the change underway. Show the movement in the work. Share success points with residents, youth • Storytelling/evaluating/research – designate a person to focus solely on this to assure it isn't missed

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
	<p>to the finished project, we feel we are out on a raft starting to sink-everyone wants the space we created now that it is there everyone wants it</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardized tools that need to be completed, a tool to follow as a process piece, Research and evaluation of the partnerships needed. Useful and specific resources that are effective are key • Inventory of neighbourhoods: Analyze where communities are at in terms of needs and readiness. Be opportunistic towards neighbourhoods ready to maximize. Is scale back possible in any of the existing 13? • Be clear on resources, identify neighbourhoods with high needs • Need an in between mechanism – framework to assess and bring together City • Create selection criteria for new neighbourhoods. • Transparent and regular check in about how the criteria are being impacted/affected and then move to another area. Look at the PNs, what is needed to define a strong neighbourhood. • Need to assess the capacity of the neighbourhood including existing capacity including community service sector strength and networks and the purpose of choosing a neighbourhood against criteria. Types: -intensive investment and building -ad hoc/swat for moving issues to action -one-shot where opportunity is apparent and use it to strategically support foundation of existing networks. • Prepare measurable, quantifiable outcomes • NAP needs to influence on City policies

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organize consultations before going to CDRC committee Define criteria for neighbourhoods to be deemed investment areas or healthy. Criteria must include sufficiency of existing infrastructure and services.
8. OUTCOMES		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Real Estate prices have increased in Rexdale. Decrease in condo value by \$50k after the plans for the light rail construction was cancelled The middle class benefit as crime rates decreased Crime rate has decreased. Toronto is one of the top 4 cities to live in. Neighbourhood supports like NAP contributed to this-why would you decrease/cut the investment Job opportunities were opened up, more places hiring local Employment training - CPR, cashier, parenting helps not only with work but with personal life Being able to speak to the police Building comm. Spaces in Chester Lee The development of the Hub Community activities and free programs Workshops, such as Diversity, Access and Equity, conflict resolution, CPR & First AID, food handling Neighbourhood is noticeably cleaner, there are sidewalk cleaning machines here now, noticeable changes. Engagement of young people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less clear about outcomes City barrier on the crosswalk (need to get issue on the NAP safety committee agenda Need more employment of residents There needs to be jobs and jobs are not always readily available at a moment's notice, employers are not employing that many youth limited only a few youth can be employed at time We perceive were doing and what youth see the response and the outcome if youth don't think we're doing anything then what is the point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare measurable, quantifiable outcomes Regional outcomes are possible as opposed to just neighbourhoods It's critical to ensure sustainability of priority neighbourhood investments; capital and operating budgets are important in this As demographics change in a neighbourhood, there is a need to ensure that parks are safe for the residents that live there

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tower Renewal project had positive impact • Creating job positions as animators / volunteering opportunities to gain experience. • Job creation and infrastructure • Community BBQ's, Recreation activities, Tree Planting through resident associations • CCRP program was very helpful • Resident employment training was excellent and it connected with Ontario Works. • Different community programs, such as: Safety Audits, Subtext festival, Food Bank, other community events. • Promoting the arts via bridge/choir healthy living arts programs • Community volunteering projects • Grassroots organizations received capacity development supports • Empower the residents and help with numerous things, securing jobs, training, giving a voice and bringing communities together to make change • Projects that were initiated by residents and supported by the City (i.e. 106 and York, West-Side Arts Hub) • Despite transition and change there is still a healthy participation. • Priority neighbourhood designation was a call to action by resident organizations and facilitated their involvement • Residents' grant through United Way • Facilitation to access City services • Emergency protocol in Flemingdon Park - core group established 		

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributed to community development • Grant writings • Leveraging of other outside resources for neighbourhoods • 1st summer employment opportunity: going to the TCHC sites and meeting residents and giving them services-outreach-bring resources to the community. • Action part-what would work well, when there is action oriented movement that would work, more of a conversation, keep the tangible to, festivals something to get the young people involved. Focus it as an action • Developed youth services in community • Second journey at the Arts Hub The youth engagement and youth circles • People looking out for their community • Rexdale community hub rewarding • Moving an idea into reality • Participation of 70 women in the "Body Image" Conference • The target investment in the hubs....happening on the corner (Bathurst & Finch), "The Hub" was fantastic • The funding to approve...the developments at Antibes (Weight room, dance room, DJ station) and support from the community agencies • SDIP Grant – \$25,000 first year, \$40,000 this year helps cover the salaries of the Network Coordinators • The Action for Neighbourhood Change (project was through United Way) from this we got: 		

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>Stop sign in front of Antibes and the Community Garden</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for our YOW in the past to support First Aid courses, food at events, etc. • Jane and Finch had enhancement made to Centres and Communities. • JF worked well • Opportunities for employment trainings, arts, mentoring enhanced • Many more opportunities of engagement (youth) • Safety was a (main) focus – SNS helped safety concerns. • Kennedy Eglinton Library expansion and the building of the media centre • Child care expansion. SV Community Garden, • LKE branch enlarged, expanded, partner with Tropicana, achieved ProTech centre. • Enhanced library profile in comm., driver of resources • Helped address safety concerns • PH initiative gave particular place based focus to that service delivery. If removed, it is business as usual • There have been many success stories and initiatives through Neighbourhood Action, especially if additional, unique funding is available. Working with Neighbourhood Action is very much consistent with TESS's service management approach of working in the community enabling residents to access available programs in a proactive manner. • Helping youth complete their education and prepare them for productive employment 		

**APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY**

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In many Neighbourhood Action partnerships, TESS has supported and at times led the planning and delivery of employment programming. A number of financial initiatives were introduced under the Enhanced Employment Funding program to assist youth with their education, prepare for employment including education scholarships. We have also worked with younger youth to assist them in obtaining part time employment by way of resume preparation, accreditation and counselling. Some NA's have developed as the community action group, while others support the many existing community resource groups. Improved services and programs in the area Reduced dropout rate where programs focus on supporting youth to stay in school and support continuing education 		
9. NEIGHBOURHOOD DESIGNATION & BOUNDARIES		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the end, the greater City benefits from what has been done in 13 priority neighbourhoods. This investment in the 13 priority neighbourhoods has made our entire City better Included neighbourhoods that were excluded as being designated priority Collaborative approach/place based- both work, but without priority neighbourhoods, you lose the focus, the structure for discussions The stigma is not a reality-very few business 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative stigma attached to being a priority neighbourhood Non designated communities were left out, not able to access funding even though they were just as needy Current boundaries include affluent residential homes Took power away from residents by imposing a name. Talk to the residents about how they identify with their neighbourhood Priority neighbourhood changes the dynamic of the neighbourhood - give a specific group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current boundaries include affluent residential homes. Re-examine the boundaries of the priority neighbourhood Focusing more on the high needs areas Need a positive spin about where people live especially if they are in areas of need or poverty Once 13 priority neighbourhoods are up to standard, then move to other areas in need. Need positive framework instead of a label Branding and marketing of NAP as a "mobile

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
<p>complained--why would they complain-Kids are in programs and local suspension rates in schools decrease significantly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted work focused on particular neighbourhoods and those in need based on statistics and demographic data • Focus on particular neighbourhood – target local issues • Long term focus brings up priority neighbourhoods to healthy standard that other neighbourhoods enjoy • Focus was not on ranking poverty as priority but clearly neighbourhoods deemed priority for investment in what was needed • Strengthening neighbourhoods are important. There is this big puzzle called Canada, made up of neighbourhoods. But if we keep cutting from our neighbourhoods, then all we make are big holes • A great country begins with strong neighbourhoods • Negative opinion of Malvern had to be overcome; Malvern was not a color thing. It's not a bad place. When the news reported they would be specific to a neighbourhood now they do not specify a particular community or neighbourhood now it may be reported as north or south Scarborough 	<p>civic engagement strategy shift the power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's a challenge to get the right level of geography for planning and implementation • Political efforts to rename the community as 'University Heights' • Prioritization for investment became synonymous with "at risk" neighbourhoods • Concerns from businesses they don't want to move into areas labelled "priority". 	<p>resource" for the community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advertise it as an information sharing tool, make known what is available i.e. training opportunities • The name itself, Neighbourhood Action Partnership – how does that resonate with residents? • Reach out via newsletters, social media, schools to give updates and to contact members • Create a website/ social media to keep everyone updated easily • A mobile unit moving from neighbourhood to neighbourhood talking about NAP • We could do something like the SLYE road shows or hanging out in a mall or in lobbies • We need more resident NAP members as part of the engagement piece in lobbies and malls. They could tell their stories to other residents • If City has vision to expand, must do research what alternative forms can be used to address needs, connectivity to services. May not require large investment for new areas. Don't take away from existing 13 neighbourhoods • Involve residents in naming their priority neighbourhood • Documenting the success stories and what NAP has achieved • City needs to find out what if any conditions/limitations are placed on specific neighbourhoods and tied to name of neighbourhoods • Concerns from businesses they don't want to

APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION REPORT
TORONTO STRONG NEIGHBOURHOOD STRATEGY

THINGS THAT WORKED WELL	CHALLENGES/DIFFICULTIES	Q. If we did it all over again...?
		<p>move into areas labelled "priority"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on a more regional area versus neighbourhood area • Prioritization for investment became synonymous with "at risk" neighbourhoods • Address service program gap for communities that are not identified in the priority • Some downtown pockets are in need of investment and development attention. • One social planning neighbourhood • Careful planning of investment based on measurements. • More flexibility in reducing boundaries or explosion of differences of Priority neighbourhoods • Service providers need to know their limits and boundaries • Inclusive approach - services shouldn't be offered only within the boundaries • Some opportunities only offered in boundaries within the priority neighbourhood and just outside it are the same issues • So much poverty focused on private high-rises – looking at clusters of vertical poverty that may not be in the priority neighbourhoods