

**Taking Stock:  
Developing a Comprehensive Approach  
to Crime Prevention in PEI**

**Research One:  
  
Building Successful  
Community-Government Collaborations**

March 2007

By  
**The IRIS Group**

Wendy MacDonald and Katherine Clough  
Project Leaders



**Taking Stock:  
Developing a Comprehensive Approach  
to Crime Prevention in PEI**

**Research One:  
Building Successful  
Community-Government Collaborations**

Wendy MacDonald and Katherine Clough  
Project Leaders

Thanks are expressed to the members of the Research Management Committee of the Taking Stock Management Group, Key Informants and others who gave of their time to provide information and guidance to the project team.

The opinions and interpretations contained in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of those individuals.

This project was funded by the National Crime Prevention Centre, Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

***Research Management Committee:***

Julie Devon Dodd  
Jill Lightwood  
Laurie Ann McCardle

*The IRIS Group is a private company with a public purpose.  
It specializes in projects related to public policy.*

The IRIS Group, 52 East River Drive, Stratford, PE C1B 2E4  
[www.theIRISgroup.ca](http://www.theIRISgroup.ca)



# Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	i
1.0 Introduction.....	1
2.0 The Emergence of Community-Government Collaborations .....	2
2.1 The Traditional Model .....	2
2.2 The New Paradigm .....	3
3.0 The Prince Edward Island Experience .....	4
4.0 Context: Taking Stock .....	5
5.0 Definitions and Analytical Framework.....	6
6.0 What Makes Working Together Among Communities and Governments Successful	7
6.1 Inclusion.....	7
6.2 Integrity.....	10
6.3 Commitment .....	11
6.4 Trust .....	12
6.5 Relationships.....	13
6.6 Leadership.....	14
6.7 Clarity .....	14
6.8 Effective Structures.....	16
6.9 Skills .....	17
6.10 Resources .....	17
6.11 Knowledge .....	19
6.12 Sound Processes.....	20
7.0 Conclusion .....	21
Appendix One: References .....	22
Appendix Two: List of Key Informant Interviews .....	24
Appendix Three: Profiles of Collaborations .....	25
Appendix Four: Analytical Framework for Collaborations.....	28
Appendix Five: Glossary .....	30

## **Executive Summary**

The goal of the Taking Stock project is to move towards making Prince Edward Island a safer place by addressing the root causes of crime through social change. The Taking Stock project has three research pieces and this report looks at successful efforts of government and the community to work together.

‘Collaboration’ is defined as a long-term, well defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to reach common goals. There are some factors that are common to working together in any successful collaboration, but there are also barriers to working together. We looked at the studies that have been published, as well as ten PEI projects where government and the community have worked together. What conditions helped these projects to be successful and what barriers had to be overcome?

Governments have usually dealt with social problems through the old method of using experts. This is often described as the ‘decide-announce-defend’ model. In this model, programs are developed with only a small amount of advice from the community. This model has been shown to be not very useful in dealing with complex problems.

It is now clear that everyone needs to work together so that communities take an active role to help develop policy and programs to solve problems. It is an opportunity to link community experience to public policy. The responsibility for change is shared amongst government, citizens, private sector businesses and non-profit organizations. It is assumed that:

- Complex issues require a broader response than one department can give, and
- Solutions must involve everyone who will live with the results.

The following cooperative actions between the Province and citizens were studied:

- Active Living Alliance
- Children’s Secretariat
- Healthy Eating Alliance
- Justice Options for Women Who are Victims of Violence
- Premier’s Action Committee on Family Violence Prevention
- Prince Edward Island French Language Health Services Network
- Prince Edward Island Literacy Alliance
- Prince Edward Island Tobacco Reduction Alliance
- Round Table on Resource Land Use and Stewardship, and
- Rural Development Council

### **What makes working together successful?**

While we tend to focus on the inputs and results that are tangible (that is, the things can hold in our hands like money and reports), the main elements of success are largely intangible in nature like trust and integrity:

**Inclusion** means bringing in everyone who should play an active role or give advice. It is important to bring in a wide range of interests, knowledge, skill, ideas and ways of looking at an issue rather than working with just one 'layer' of an organization.

**Integrity** is being open, fair and honest and showing respect for differences. It means sticking to commitments and allowing people to see how the system works. The research shows that groups cannot work together without integrity.

**Commitment** is generally strongest in those projects which came from the community or grassroots. This is where the problems as well as the solutions are most strongly felt, and where there is some passion and perhaps even pain about an issue.

When **trust** is present, people are more likely to open their minds to new ideas and to risk new ways of doing things. It also helps them to change what they first saw as most important and to support the overall good instead.

Many people spoke of the importance of **relationships** which are built over time and which are the glue that hold projects together in spite of challenges.

**Leadership** is a key factor for success. Leaders need to know a lot about the issues and have good connections with other people. They are committed and trusted and are able to bring people together.

There must be **clarity** in order to work together successfully. The goals and the work have to be clear as well as why this direction is being taken. It is important to have a clear vision of what is to be done, what the roles are and who is to do what.

**Structures** are needed for working smoothly and good organization helps to make the best use of everyone's time and work. However, the structure can vary over time due to changes in such things as new members and the amount of money and other resources.

**Skills** are a key factor to achieve success and include:

- Helping people to work together
- Running meetings
- Getting information to everyone
- Managing people with respect
- Resolving conflict, and
- Running an organization

**Resources** alone do not make working together successful. However, money, people and other resources are necessary, especially a skillful coordinator and space in which to work. A major barrier to success is a lack of funding on a long term basis.

Every project needs to develop a base of **knowledge** to which everyone has agreed. This helps to define issues so people can agree on goals and priorities. It also helps to know the strengths and assets that everyone brings to the table.

**Processes**, or ways of doing things, should be set up so that they work well. For success, systems are needed for managing money, information, staff and volunteers.

- **Planning** must take an overall approach. It needs feedback loops, and a variety of tools such as building of assets, running workshops, carrying out surveys and focus groups and action planning.
- **Communications**, getting information back and forth, is important. The research showed this is an area of weakness for many groups trying to work together, but successful projects communicate often and well.
- **Evaluation** is almost always seen as something that must occur. If there is a lack of attention to watching what happens and to reporting the results, problems can arise and could lead to the breakdown of working together.

The two most important things for success are *inclusion*, and *integrity*. Inclusion leads to *commitment* and passion, while integrity fosters *trust*. Commitment and trust form the basis of good *relationships* which are important to everyone who is involved for working together successfully. Commitment and trust also encourage the rise of effective *leadership* and a shared purpose. This is shown as *clarity* of what the group wants to do; the ways of doing things, in what order; and roles and responsibilities of each player. These all make the organization stronger for setting up good *structures* to manage programs. They also help to get *resources* with which to gather *knowledge*, to develop *skills* and to put in place *processes* to work toward the objectives.

**Conclusion:** It has been proven that working together gets the best results when everyone is included and the community plays a strong role. This kind of cooperation is needed to get at the root causes of complex social issues. However, the success is shown only over the long term and is difficult to prove. Processes that are based in the community are the most likely to respond to local needs, and also tend to get the commitment that is needed to work across sectors, cultures, professions and socio-economic differences. Success happens when people put a lot of effort into making sure the key factors are there to allow everyone to work together for our future well-being.

## 1.0 Introduction

In 2005, the Taking Stock project was launched to “*take stock, and with community and government partners put in place a plan to work together for community safety and well-being by addressing the root causes of crime.*” The goal is to move towards a comprehensive community approach to crime prevention through social development in Prince Edward Island.

The project has three research components as described in the terms of reference:

- What makes working together among communities and governments successful?
- What key indicators should be tracked and how will data be managed?
- What are community strengths toward safety and well being?

The first research component is addressed by this report.

The project methodology used several standard techniques for this kind of study. The scope of the project was determined at the outset from a literature search and discussions with the project proponents. These allowed the consultants to develop a register of collaborative models. Further research from the literature and through interviews with key informants served to identify factors common to successful collaborations and conversely barriers to collaboration. The report brings together these insights, integrating the research evidence from the national and international research literature on enabling conditions, success factors, and barriers to successful collaboration, with the practical experience of practitioners in a variety of community-government collaborations both within and outside Prince Edward Island. Selected references are contained in Appendix One, while the key informants interviewed for the case studies are listed in Appendix Two.

The report opens with an overview of the context of the research, to establish the increasingly vital role that successful community-government collaborations play in crime prevention. Next, the concept of community-government collaboration is defined and the characteristics of such collaborations are discussed. Given the tremendous diversity of collaborations with regard to origins, purpose, membership, structure, roles, and governance, such a typology is essential to enable analysis of success factors and barriers. The report then turns to the heart of the work – an analysis first of success factors and then of the factors that may impede or undermine the prospects for success. In each of those sections, the research evidence from the literature is presented first, followed by insights garnered from the case studies. The report concludes with a synthesis of the key insights to guide the development and maintenance of successful community-government collaborations in Prince Edward Island.

## 2.0 The Emergence of Community-Government Collaborations

### 2.1 The Traditional Model

Historically, government has approached social challenges through an old paradigm of government expertise and government making the rules, developing programs from its perspective with relatively small amount of community input. The paradigm is manifested through a ‘decide-announce-defend’ model, where governments develop policy based only on expert advice, then ask bureaucrats to design programs to deliver the policy. Evaluative frameworks are rarely found in these types of policies. Government only reacts when the public feedback is negative and potentially damaging to its popularity. The underlying assumptions of this traditional model are as follows:<sup>1</sup>

- Every public issue can be classified and assigned to a single sector and dealt with by a single government department
- Experts and planners are best suited to address public issues
- Government officials should select solutions after considering expert advice

This model has proven to have limited effectiveness in addressing complex problems in areas such as social development and environmental stewardship. Since the model is reactive in nature, it deals with symptoms rather than root causes. As such, its costs spiral upwards while solutions continue to elude us. Moreover, this traditional model often tends to mobilize single interest organizations and build their capacity to compete with other interests in the community. When misapplied, this approach can polarize interests, escalate conflict, and generate advocacy deadlock.<sup>2</sup> This model tends to breed cynicism about and mistrust of government by citizens.

Despite its disadvantages, the traditional model is still widely employed. As noted by Jones-Walters, it represents an approach deeply embedded in our society, and dating back over two millennia to Roman approaches – linear and hierarchical, “*almost without exception based on advocacy, the power of argument and the triumph of one dogma over another, an absolute view of right and wrong, and the idea that someone ... has been placed in a position to make decisions for others.*” As such, a move away from this paradigm reflects profound shifts in power and control from those who have traditionally wielded it, to those affected by it, or even to those who have traditionally been viewed as ‘the problem’.<sup>3</sup> Nonetheless, the need for a different, more collaborative approach, has become profoundly apparent in recent decades.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ellsworth, Jim. *Justice Stewardship – The Modern Sustainability Challenge*. International Association for Public Participation, Discussion Paper 2001

<sup>2</sup> Ellsworth, Jim and Jones-Walters, L, *Defining the Social Dimensions of Sustainable Development: Advances in Crime Prevention, Social Inclusion and Sustainability*. 2003 p. 1, p. 10

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, L. Walters-Jones, Foreword.

## 2.2 The New Paradigm

The new paradigm is one where communities take ownership of policy issues, and responsibility for change is shared amongst public, private, and non-profit sectors.

Within this paradigm, there is a wide spectrum of processes and practice. Close to the command and control model is the limited public participation model where government still maintains control, but consults in a limited way with citizens through formal consultations. The government's point of view is presented and people are asked to react. Government then retreats and fine-tunes the policy based on what it heard.

At the other end of the spectrum is the fully collaborative model where communities use their resources and some expert advice, to propose policies which meet their needs, and enlist a variety of community resources as well as government to deliver them. This shift from government to governance brings an increasing level of complexity to public discourse. The shift can be risky since it requires new relationships and new skills in facilitation and listening. Much is emerging in the literature about the characteristics and required skills for these collaborative governance models.

Two underlying assumptions guide this new form of governance:

- Complex issues require a holistic response which no single government department or policy can provide
- Solutions must be found through the collaborative efforts of all who must live the outcomes

In a fully collaborative model, partners work together to accommodate social, economic and environmental interests. They also consider local, regional, national and international perspectives as part of the decision making process. As stated by Tamarack: An Institute for Community Engagement, "*Collaboration is more than coordination or partnership. It is a way of working that builds the will of a community to work together to bring about a desired future.*"<sup>4</sup>

The benefits of this approach are concisely expressed by Julie Devon Dodd: processes which 'link community experience to public policy,' help shift "*from disintegrating communities, alienation from government, and unresolved social problems, to engaged and empowered communities, responsive and accessible governance, and enhanced capacity for problem solving across sectors.*"<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See [www.tamarackcommunity.ca/](http://www.tamarackcommunity.ca/)

<sup>5</sup> Devon-Dodd, Julie and Boyd, Michelle Hebert. *Capacity Building: Linking Community Experience to Public Policy*. Health Canada Population and Public Health Branch, October 2000 p. v

### 3.0 The Prince Edward Island Experience

In Prince Edward Island, until the late 1980s, the decide-announce-defend model, with minimal public involvement, predominated in policy development and issue resolution in all sectors. One early exception to this trend was the Rural Development Council, which emerged in the mid-1960s as a grassroots response to the wrenching social and economic forces changing the Island. The Council was asked by government to take on the role of community outreach and engagement with regard to the new PEI Development Plan. This pioneering collaboration eventually met with significant difficulties, explored later in this report, and the Council's funding was terminated in 1975.

During the 1980s, the era of federal-provincial agreements featuring substantial federal funding and largely provincial delivery wore to an end across different policy sectors, and the federal government shifted its emphasis to third-party delivery approaches and partnerships in fields as diverse as social housing, literacy, and agriculture. This decade also saw a shift in government perceptions of members of the public as 'consumers' and 'citizens' rather than as passive 'clients,' and a philosophical recognition within many professions that 'doing with' was a more effective approach to most social and health interventions than 'doing for.' This shift was lent impetus by a growing body of court rulings on rights, as well as international declarations and obligations with regard to stakeholders, local communities, population groups, and individuals.

These shifts manifested themselves in different sectors over time. An early example was the adult education field, which gave rise to the PEI Literacy Alliance in 1990, a partnership of sixteen community and government partners, growing to 27 by the mid-1990s. This early collaboration has continued to enjoy strong partner support.

During the early 1990s, further events occurred to lend impetus to the shift to collaborative approaches. The focus at both the federal and provincial level shifted to fiscal restraint, leading in turn to a shift from core funding of community organizations to project-based funding, and a greater emphasis on accountability for outcomes. Constrained resources, both within government and among community organizations, impelled a greater openness to partnering to achieve shared goals. At the same time, awareness was increasing both within government and in the community of the complex and interconnected factors underlying most social and environmental issues, and the need for a holistic, integrated, and participative approach.

In 1994 these factors found expression in Prince Edward Island's *Strategy for Safer Communities*. This pioneering initiative was based on a consultative process intended to "involve people in local communities directly in defining the problem, developing solutions, and implementing and evaluating programs that increase safety and reduce fear." The strategy set out a ten-year framework for social development, community development, and evaluation, overseen by a provincial Safer Communities Advisory Committee. This work eventually led to the Taking Stock initiative which this report seeks to support, discussed more fully below.

In 1996, a collaborative approach emerged in the environmental sector, through the province's initiative to establish a Round Table on Resource Use and Land Stewardship, with a mandate to propose solutions to the worsening environmental problems in PEI, particularly soil quality and water quality. The Round Table was made up of citizens and stakeholders, and consulted widely with communities and experts before producing a report with 86 outcome-oriented recommendations. This was widely seen as a fully collaborative policy process and in a sense, ahead of its time. Government's response, however, was traditional: it assigned recommendations to individual departments for solutions, rather than mobilizing a holistic response.

During the late 1990s, several additional collaborative models emerged in the social and health domains, including the Premier's Action Committee on Family Violence Prevention, established in 1995, the PEI Tobacco Reduction Alliance, founded in 1999, and the Healthy Child Development Strategy, developed in 1999 and launched late in 2000. Also in 1999, the Justice Options for Women who are Victims of Violence collaboration was founded to explore and enhance justice options for victims of family violence. During the early years of the current decade, a number of collaborations emerged in the health promotion field, including the PEI Active Living Alliance, the PEI Healthy Eating Alliance, and the PEI Healthy Living Strategy. As well, in 2003, the PEI French Language Health Services Network was founded to promote increased access to French language health and social services. Recent policy collaborations in the health field include the Cancer Strategy and the Stroke Strategy. These represent the key collaborations investigated for this report, and all provided valuable insights for this project. Selected collaborations investigated are briefly profiled in Appendix Three.

#### **4.0 Context: Taking Stock**

In 2004, the Department of the Attorney General released *An Approach to Safer Communities in Prince Edward Island*. The document affirmed the need for a broader collaborative approach, noting, "*While there has been earlier activity, a coordinated provincial approach that involves the key partners from federal, provincial, and municipal governments, and from police and community organizations is now needed.*" Accordingly, *Safer Communities* sets out the process through which the community and government leaders can consult, coordinate, recognize, and evaluate crime prevention and social development activities in the province, including the establishment of a planning group responsible for the process.

This approach is consistent with that recommended in the literature. For example, the *Crime Prevention Digest II*, produced by the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime in Montreal, identifies a 'responsibility centre' as vitally important to the success of collaborative initiatives. This responsibility centre should provide leadership, mobilize partners, and reflect diversity. It should initiate and support a systematic process of identifying issues and needs, and designing, implementing, and evaluating action plans.

The Taking Stock process represents this approach in action. Its purpose is "*to take stock and with community and government partners put in place a plan to work together for*

*community safety and well-being by addressing the root causes of crime.” This work supports the vision first expressed in 1994 in *Strategies for Safer Communities in Prince Edward Island*:*

***VISION: A safe community is one where people know their neighbours, respect themselves and each other, where everyone is valued and included in decisions and activities of the community. There is an absence of alcohol and drug abuse, violence and fear.***

The process is managed by a small group made up of representatives of the broad range of partners involved. This group’s role is defined as management of staff hiring and supervision, finances, funder liaison, and evaluation. The plan is to be developed by a larger Planning Group with broad representation from community organizations and government. Both groups are supported by professional staff resources including a facilitator and a coordinator.

This research paper and the other two research components noted in the Introduction are intended to provide a knowledge base for the work. This paper addresses the question, “What makes working together among communities and government successful?” The other two projects respectively address the questions, “What crime / victimization and socio-economic conditions should we track and how? What can selected communities tell us about their strengths and needs, and how can we support communities to have what they need to plan?”

To complement these research components, the process also includes focus groups to learn about the strengths and needs of diverse communities. The information and knowledge generated by these processes is being used to support dialogue within the planning group, and development of the framework and action plan for safer communities. The process is scheduled to be completed in the spring of 2007.

## **5.0 Definitions and Analytical Framework**

In reviewing both the literature and the interview data, it was clear that the concept of community-government collaboration spans a wide range of entities. As discussed later in this report, many of the most critical factors in the success of collaborations are intangible. However, the evidence also suggested that some structural or operating characteristics also influence the likelihood of success for collaborations. These are referenced as applicable in the analysis that follows, and are categorized in Appendix Four using a why – who – what – how – when framework.

The research also indicated the importance of a shared understanding of language and terminology. Accordingly, Appendix Five contains a glossary of relevant terms.

## 6.0 What Makes Working Together Among Communities and Governments Successful?

In examining the success of collaborations, there is often a tendency to focus on the presence or absence of tangible inputs (funding, membership, staff and resources) and outputs (interventions carried out, processes and projects completed). Input issues such as lack of funding, lack of skills or resources, and loss or rapid turnover of members, leaders, or staff, and operating issues such as lack of communications and lack of planning are often identified as factors impeding the success or sustainability of collaborations. In the CPSD Toolkit for example,<sup>6</sup> a list of factors that undermine sustainability include lack of funding, lack of interest, turf wars, a change in the problem being addressed, not having the right partners at the table, staff turnover, leaders too busy, and ongoing crises.

The literature review and consultations for this project suggest that factors such as these certainly play a role; however, they are but symptoms of underlying root issues. This project's research suggests that the foundational elements of success are largely intangible in nature. If they are present, the collaboration is likely to be able to overcome or prevent the symptoms noted above; if they are absent, funding or resources alone will not ensure the success of the collaboration.

These intangible factors are complex and inter-related. Some are complementary, while others are conflicting and must be carefully balanced to maximize the potential for success.

The two foundational elements for success are *inclusion*, and *integrity*. Inclusion in turn ensures *commitment* and passion, while integrity fosters *trust*. Shared commitment and trust, in turn, are the foundation of *relationships*, which were identified by most key informants as critically important to the success of collaborations. These factors of commitment and trust also foster the emergence of effective *leadership*, and the development of *shared purpose* as expressed in clarity of vision, mission, priorities, approaches, and roles, and responsibilities. These achievements in turn strengthen the collaboration's capacity to establish effective operating and governance *structures*, and to obtain *resources* with which to gather needed *knowledge*, acquire or develop *skills*, and design and implement sound *processes*, particularly including planning, communications, and evaluation. These factors and their interrelationships are further explored below.

### 6.1 Inclusion

Broad inclusion, both horizontal and vertical, is widely identified in the literature as fundamental to – indeed, the essence of – a collaborative approach. Inclusion ensures

---

<sup>6</sup> Centre for Initiatives on Children Youth and Community. *Sustainable Approaches to Crime Prevention through Social Development* March 2006. Toolkit, Fostering Policy Dialogue Tool, p. 5

diversity, which brings a broader range of knowledge, perspectives, skills, and ideas to the collaboration.

Horizontal collaboration is defined here to include participation from various sectors and populations dealing with various root causes of crime, while vertical collaboration is defined to include participation not only from agencies and community organizations dealing with crime, but also both from those affected by crime, and those involved in perpetrating crimes. Within agencies, according to Mattessich,<sup>7</sup> the strongest collaborations do not involve just one ‘layer’ of each organization, such as top leadership or front-line staff, but rather involves people at all levels of the organization. These need not necessarily be part of the core group that meets regularly, but should have a meaningful role. With regard to community members, according to Ellsworth, experience suggests that the greater the involvement of the socially excluded in the development of policies affecting their lives, the more the resulting policies tend to be preventative in nature. Ellsworth goes on to position prevention as the first platform for change in a broader process leading to social inclusion through collaborations among those advocating for crime prevention, health promotion, poverty reduction, and substance abuse prevention. In turn, social inclusion forms a platform for ultimate achievement of sustainability in all domains – social, environmental, and economic.<sup>8</sup>

In its *Primer on Public Involvement*, the Canadian Policy Research Network identified as the first of its seven key conditions for success, “*Participants must be as representative of the population as possible, reflecting geography, demography, political affiliation, and ideology. It is essential to avoid co-option and exclusion.*”

Pearce, in his study of volunteer sector sustainability in Atlantic Canada, identifies the following elements as key:

- Community involvement and ownership: Actively involving the community in asset/gap identification, project design, delivery, and decision-making processes
- Partnerships: Working collaboratively across sectors to develop strategic partnerships to carry out the work, including the private sector.<sup>9</sup>

Within this context of broad inclusion, the literature widely supports a localized approach to collaboration. “*A local population is better able to orient decisions and set up solutions which best meet its particular needs; a more solid basis for inter-sectoral cooperation may also be found at the local level,*” noted Quebec’s *Policy on Health and Well-being* in 1992.<sup>10</sup> The toolkit *Sustainable Approaches to Crime Prevention through*

---

<sup>7</sup> Paul Mattessich, “Can This Collaboration Be Saved? Twenty Factors that Can Make or Break any Group Effort,” from *Collaboration: What Makes it Work?* Mattessich et al. Excerpt at <http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/129/savecollab.html>

<sup>8</sup> Ellsworth and Jones-Walters, op. cit, p. ii and p. 3

<sup>9</sup> Pearce, Bruce. *Filling the Gap: Keeping Good Work Going*. Research Findings and Recommendations Regarding Voluntary Sector Project Sustainability in Atlantic Canada. The Murphy Centre, St. John’s NL, 2004, pp. 25-27

<sup>10</sup> Quebec Ministry of Health and Social Services. *Policy on Health and Well Being*. 1992, p. 151

*Social Development* identifies, from its case studies of six successful CPSD initiatives, the need for “*a commitment to issues of local concern – a grassroots process,*” and notes, among its lessons learned, the need for:

- Local meaning: problems, needs and solutions are locally defined
- Local connections: bringing together people at the local level who care about an issue
- Local ownership: community, not individual
- Community vision: move from the issue at hand to a bigger picture<sup>11</sup>

At the same time, the literature warns against focusing exclusively on the local community level. Husain notes that promoting ‘local solutions to local problems’ can result in effective practice being ignored.

The input from the key informant interviews identified that certain geographic regions of PEI such as West Prince, and communities of interest within PEI such as the francophone community, were perceived as having a particularly strong track record of effective collaboration. On a related note, the literature identifies that ‘success breeds success’ -- that a track record of successful collaboration was in itself a predictor of further success. This suggests that those successful collaborations have over time achieved many of the fundamental characteristics and capacities for success described below, which then carry forward into new efforts.

Although inclusion is critically important to the collaboration’s effectiveness and prospects for success, it also poses challenges. These challenges mount as the collaboration becomes more inclusive and the participants more diverse. Shaw has noted the following challenges, with regard to her study population of youth at risk, which are relevant to all collaborations working with socially excluded population groups:

- The challenge of motivating young people to participate
- A lack of existing youth networks on which to build
- The difficulty of accessing those most at risk for consultations and keeping them involved
- The need to counter negative views/fears about young people<sup>12</sup>

Even where members of the target population are not involved in the collaboration, the differing circumstances of the government and community members pose challenges to an inclusive approach. Government members tend to have greater access to information and resources, and to have more power to make or influence decisions than do the community members. As well, on a more practical level, government representatives in a collaboration often participate as part of their paid work and are compensated for both their time and their out-of-pocket expenses, while community members often incur direct

---

<sup>11</sup> Centre for Initiatives on Children, Youth and Community. *Sustainable Approaches to Crime Prevention through Social Development*. March 2006

<sup>12</sup> Shaw, Margaret. *Investing in Youth: International Approaches to Preventing Crime and Victimization*. IAPC, 2001.

and indirect costs as a result of their participation. These may include travel costs, child care costs, income loss due to unpaid leave, utilization of vacation time, and increased workload. Ideally, direct costs are reimbursed, processes are designed to be sensitive to and minimize hidden costs of volunteer participation, and volunteer time is valued equally with that of paid staff; however, this is not consistently the case.

An inclusive approach raises a number of further challenges. Participants may lack a common language, both among various professional terminologies and between jargon and commonly used language. As well, as collaborations become more inclusive, participants hold increasingly different world views, philosophies, and perceptions of issues, needs, and root causes. As a broader range of organizations and agencies is represented, participants must reconcile ever more diverse goals and priorities, preferred approaches, and professional practices. Cultural, social, and gender differences among participants pose a further challenge. As collaborations broaden their scope, they are more likely to have to deal with a history of adversarial approaches, or a past or continuing power imbalance. All these factors represent centrifugal forces on the collaboration, pulling its members apart and creating continuing pressures of fragmentation and gridlock.

Despite these challenges, inclusion remains a fundamentally important requirement of a successful collaboration leading to sustainable outcomes. It is only through a horizontally inclusive approach that the multiplicity of root causes of crime can be addressed in a holistic way; and it is only through a vertically inclusive approach of those most affected that the commitment and passion necessary to success will ensue. As such, many of the success factors for collaboration described below are those needed to deal with those challenges and reap the benefits of inclusion. The foremost of those, as described next, is integrity.

## **6.2 Integrity**

While integrity is seldom explicitly mentioned in the research literature, it was cited often in the interviews as an essential component. The concept encompasses transparency, openness, fairness, truthfulness, adherence to commitments, and respect for and valuing of differences. For government partners, the concept includes consistency of goals and approaches, and an absence of favoritism. A lack or loss of integrity is extremely damaging to a collaboration.

Collaborative processes pose pressures for their participants, as they must balance their loyalty to their fellow collaborators with their obligations and responsibilities to the organization, group, or profession they represent. These pressures were reported to be particularly strong for government participants in collaborations, who are often placed in a position of withholding important information from their partners, or of defending unpopular government policies and actions. Such individuals may also be in a position of power over their collaborators in such areas as access to funding and resources, participation in the collaboration itself, or decision-making. Most key informants in government roles indicated that they had to ‘walk a fine line’ in their collaborations.

While a range of special skills are needed to do this successfully (discussed further below), personal integrity is crucial to achieving this balance.

Integrity is particularly essential, given that many collaborations begin in a negative climate of neglect or conflict. In the literature, the following factors have been identified as playing important role in the emergence of collaborative efforts:<sup>13</sup>

- It is easier for communities to take the lead and/or play a major role when there is a void that the government is not filling
- Fiscal restraint and limited resources have impelled many organizations both within government and in the community to shift to collaborative approaches, enabling them to pool their resources in pursuit of shared goals
- The legal recognition of local/community/stakeholder rights, e.g. aboriginal rights, has forced the government to work collaboratively with those sectors. International / external factors, such as environmental accords, are a further stimulus to collaboration

Circumstances such as these, which drive collaboration by necessity rather than choice, do not create a positive initial climate for the establishment of community-government partnerships. Integrity by all participants goes a long way to overcome these negative beginnings.

### **6.3 Commitment**

Both the research literature and the interview input indicated that commitment is essential to the success of collaborations. This commitment is generally strongest in those collaborations which emerged from the community or the grassroots, where both the problems and their solutions are felt most strongly. Conversely, collaborations which originate in government and are rolled out to the community by paid staff may experience difficulty in engaging or retaining community participants, as they may not reflect or respond to community needs or priorities.

According to the key informant interviews, commitment usually comes from a degree of passion and even pain about a particular issue -- that is, from strong and rising levels of concern about issues affecting the community. The Rural Development Council is an early example of this, and most of the other collaborations explored arose from issues or concerns significant enough to build commitment and passion among the collaborators. It was suggested that collaborations could also arise from opportunities and from positive events; however, most of the examples studied involved challenges and problems. The commitment generated in the community in turn fosters the political will in government to partner and intervene for social change, the patience needed for major change, and the major, long-term investments required to develop skills, acquire knowledge, establish systems, and build trust.

---

<sup>13</sup> Walsh, Deatra. "Doctoral Student Explores Community-Government Collaboration in Coastal Areas," Oceanet E-zine, Memorial University <http://www.mun.ca/oceanet/content/Ezine/KellyVodden.pdf>

The Premier's Action Committee on Family Violence Prevention collaboration was portrayed as an example of such commitment. This initiative arose from over a decade of widening partnerships in this area, notably the Partners for Prevention Initiative to hold consultations on family violence across PEI.<sup>14</sup> As awareness and partnerships increased, then Premier Callbeck responded by establishing the Premier's Action Committee on Family Violence Prevention, and provided funding and in-kind resources to the strategy. Anderson House had been founded in 1981 and since then there were a number of 'projects' related to family violence, but none were sustained and statistics were not improving, until the Premier's Action Committee on Family Violence Prevention was established and began its work.

Government employees are generally expected to be impartial and even hide their passion or at least not let it guide them. As such, it would be easy to assume that commitment to collaboration tends to be greater in collaborations with a grassroots origin rather than in those that originated as an idea from government; however, the picture emerging is more complex. 'Bridge persons' play a critically important role in leadership collaborations. Those individuals often have experience in both government and community organizations. Upon moving from government to a role in the community, their commitment may find expression through collaborations. An example of this is the Active Living Alliance, which is grass roots but came from an idea the current Director had when he was in government and 'carried over' upon his retirement.

## **6.4 Trust**

Trust is fundamental to the success of collaborations. Sometimes, especially in small jurisdictions like Prince Edward Island, a history of past collaboration already exists and has generated relationships in which there is trust to venture into further collaborations. Where such a history is not present, however, trust cannot be taken for granted; it must be fostered over time. Pearce identifies several challenges that can erode trust between government and community partners or slow its emergence. He notes frequently shifting funder priorities and policies, with possibly limited community input into the decision processes giving rise to these shifts. More generally, he observes that there is a disconnect between funders and doers, for a variety of reasons:

- Bureaucratic approaches of government versus the community-based approaches of volunteer organizations
- Lack of funder experience in community and social development
- Erosion of the community development role within government
- Power imbalance constraining doers and deterring them from speaking out
- Those who set the rules not being at the table

To address factors such as these, the qualities of inclusion, integrity, and shared commitment, described above, are essential to develop and nurture trust. Participants

---

<sup>14</sup> *Family Violence in Prince Edward Island: Background Information 2001.*  
[http://www.gov.pe.ca/photos/original/hss\\_famviolback.pdf](http://www.gov.pe.ca/photos/original/hss_famviolback.pdf)

must demonstrate mutual respect, and must genuinely value the diverse skills, knowledge, and perspectives that different participants bring to the table. To begin, as expressed by Mattesich, “*Right from the start, the group needs to devote energy and time to developing mutual respect, understanding and trust. This starts with common courtesy and taking time to learn about the others around the table – both the individuals and the organizations they represent.*” He further notes that collaborations must pace themselves, and that in the early phases, modest goals and immediate successes help to build trust and build the collaboration’s collective strength and reputation, preparing it for larger, more complex and long-term joint action.

When trust is present, people are more prepared to open their minds to new ideas and approaches, to risk new ways of doing things, and to modify their individual priorities in support of the overall good. The need for such trade-offs and for give-and-take was mentioned in a number of the key informant interviews. Conversely, where trust does not develop, or where it is lost, the collaboration’s potential for success will be severely limited.

## **6.5 Relationships**

Many key informants spoke of the importance of relationships, and how lack of relationships can be a serious barrier in collaboration. Relationships are built over time, founded on commitment and trust, and are the glue that holds collaborations together in the face of the internal and external pressures and challenges described in this paper. Examples were cited in the interviews of successes founded on effective relationships between co-chairs from community and government. Indeed, the mantra of Rayona Sharpnak, founder of the Institute for Women’s Leadership, is “*Relationships are the Foundation of Accomplishment.*”

The interviews suggested that the importance of relationships and particularly the pivotal role of government liaison personnel do not appear to be fully recognized by government decision-makers. The recent process of health reform since 2004, and the ensuing staff cuts and changes was widely seen in consultations as having fractured or even ended a number of very productive relationships. In some cases where there is an extraordinary level of commitment, these relationships have endured despite individuals’ move into new roles. In other cases, new relationships have had to be built, creating a setback for the collaboration’s effectiveness and momentum. In still other cases, a void remains.

Although relationships are vital, the interviews also suggested a need to guard against over-dependence on a single relationship, or to substitute reliance on relationships for the other success factors discussed in this paper.

Linked to the issue of relationships, several key informants identified gender as a success factor. Particularly among male key informants, it was felt that collaborations with a preponderance of women, especially as leaders, are more effective and likely to succeed, while more male-dominated collaborations face more difficulties managing competing loyalties and working in cooperative rather than competitive ways. It is notable that

women predominated in the collaborations reviewed for this paper, as reflected in the gender balance of key informants.

## 6.6 Leadership

Leadership, in various forms, is identified as a key success factor both in the literature and in the interviews. Much of the literature simply refers to ‘good leadership,’ or ‘internal and external leadership.’ The CPSD Toolkit is more specific, noting from its six CPSD case studies of success stories, “*Leaders who are knowledgeable and connected, committed, trusted, able to build partnerships,*” reflecting some of the key factors outlined above. Shaw, meanwhile, notes the importance of having leaders who have a track record in developing community partnerships, and a demonstrated ability to ‘embed’ interventions within strong existing organizations. Pearce notes the importance of “*Leadership: both internal and external, of different kinds: innovators and maintainers.*” Mattessich says, “*Leaders of successful collaborative efforts have strong organizing and interpersonal skills. They are knowledgeable about the topic the group is working on. They carry out their role with serious attention and with fairness.*”

Leadership style is also important. In the early stages of a collaboration, visionary leadership is important to articulate the ‘big picture,’ mobilize the various partners into a collaborative group, and foster consensus on goals and priorities. As the collaboration moves into an action phase, the leadership focus needs to shift to effective ongoing implementation. As the collaboration continues, its members must exercise shared leadership to sustain the collaboration and to advocate for related changes and action within their own organizations.

## 6.7 Clarity

Both the literature and the interviews identified a cluster of features related to clarity of purpose and direction as essential to the success of collaborations. The term ‘planning’ is often used to refer to these; however, planning is simply the process through which groups agree on a common vision, realistic goals, evidence-based action, and well-defined roles and responsibilities, and then refine those over time to reflect progress and changing circumstances. Conversely, a lack of consensus on the vision, goals, and approaches is both a symptom of and a factor in the failure of collaborations. Commitment, trust, relationships, and leadership are key to developing and adhering to a plan. Skills, discussed below, also play a vital role.

Pearce cites as key factors for sustainability:

- Vision: Having a clear vision of what is to be sustained, which flows from the collaboration’s core values and mission
- Planning: Doing the research and planning to clearly define the issues to be addressed and the strategies and activities to be used

With regard to the collaboration's vision, Mattessich notes that the group may not begin with a shared vision, but needs to develop one very early in the process – and that this vision must be unique to the collaboration rather than mirroring that of a partner organization. He observes, as well, that if the partners in a collaboration are actually competing to achieve the same goal, that collaboration will be very difficult, and that some less demanding form of joint action should be considered, such as coordination or cooperation on certain activities.

Several sources in the literature cite the need for a mix of short-term and long-term measures/remedial and prevention activities. Husain identifies the need for a clear working framework, which tackles both symptoms and causes, and features both short-term and long-term responses. He also notes the importance of early successes in solidifying a collaboration and building the momentum for longer term action, a factor also noted in the CPSD Toolkit. Mattessich calls for a progression of goals from the immediate and doable to the ambitious and long-term, noting that the group's momentum and strength will come from a progression of successes, some quite modest in the beginning. Shaw warns against the dangers of goals which are either over-ambitious or under-ambitious.

Interview input indicated that community groups who are clear and united in their mission usually have more success in their relationship with government. The Acadian community's various achievements were cited as a notable example of this.

Clear definition of roles and responsibilities is also crucially important. Mattessich suggests, *“In successful collaborations, the partners clearly understand what is expected of them and what they can expect from the group. These things are discussed directly, not assumed. A letter of agreement can be helpful, spelling out the roles, rights, and responsibility of each partner, and perhaps even stating the basic values and philosophy of the group.”*

Both the collaboration itself, and the individual members of the collaboration, may pursue their mandates and goals through a diversity of roles, including:

- Advisory
- Advocacy and public policy development
- Program planning
- Program and service delivery
- Communications, public education, social marketing
- Knowledge sharing, clearinghouse, networking
- Services to members (professional development, helping access funds, standards development)
- Celebration of achievements, recognition, awards

In some cases, these roles may conflict. A notable and frequently seen example of this occurs when a collaboration or community organization takes on both a government-funded delivery role and a member-driven advocacy role. Balancing these roles can be

very difficult, as the Rural Development Council found to its cost. Key informant input suggested that the RDC took on a major delivery role to engage the community in the PEI Development Plan, creating a substantial staff complement to do so and in the process becoming more and more removed from its grassroots membership. At the same time, the RDC continued to advocate for social change and to work to mobilize communities, thus alienating elected officials who felt their role was being usurped. These converging forces resulted in the withdrawal of public funding for the RDC in 1975, and a relative absence of public backlash to this action. While other organizations have not experienced such a spectacular demise, many have struggled with the pressure to moderate their advocacy so as not to jeopardize their funding.

In addition to the need to clearly define and balance the roles of the collaboration itself, there is also a need to define and balance the roles and responsibilities of individual members of the collaboration. Without this, serious risks exist of role gaps or overlaps, duplication of effort, and even working at cross-purposes. Roles and responsibilities should be designed to respect the mandates of the individual members of the collaboration, and to build on their various capacities while accommodating their weaknesses.

## **6.8 Effective Structures**

The ability of a collaboration to achieve its goals and to hold together is promoted by effective structures which reflect and support the group's purpose and which maximize its investments of time and effort. Governance structures must be representative of the partners, 'bring the right people to the table,' and promote trust and build relationships.

As noted above with regard to the Safer Communities initiative, at the operational level, the *Crime Prevention Digest II* identifies a responsibility centre as essential to provide leadership, mobilize sectors, reflect diversity, and stimulate effective processes of needs identification, action planning, implementation, and evaluation. Within this context, the detailed structure will vary according to the collaboration's mission, membership, time-frame, resources, and roles, and will evolve over time. Indeed, Mattessich notes that there is no magic formula for structure, and that any structure chosen would need to be flexible and open, to evolve to meet the needs of the project or partnership. He did note, however, that it was essential that all partners understand and 'buy into' the structures and processes that the group will use. Within this context, however, key questions to be addressed include:

- What is the governance structure?
- To whom is the collaboration accountable?
- What requirements and processes are there for evaluation and reporting?
- How is membership determined and by whom?
- What processes are there in place to determine and renew leadership?
- What demands does the structure place on volunteer participants?
- What is the extent of resources and paid staff?

The key informant interviews yielded few examples of well-designed structures, but provided a number of insights into poorly designed structures. Collaborations fail or are undermined by structures which:

- Are top-heavy, with too many people at the table for effective processes
- Feature a proliferation of committees or layers which drain time and energy
- Create or reinforce inequities or power imbalances among partners
- Are closed or exclusionary
- Are costly to operate or participate in
- Become inward-looking

These risks suggest that a regular, though not frequent process of organizational review should take place to maximize the effectiveness of structures. This process should be integrated with the evaluation processes discussed below.

## 6.9 Skills

Skills are a key enabling factor in the success of collaborations. These skills must exist both among the collaborators, and among staff and support people if any. The CPSD toolkit case studies identified investment in capacity – acquiring knowledge and human resources – as essential to sustainability of collaborations.<sup>15</sup> Particularly important skills include facilitation, running meetings, communications, people skills, conflict resolution, and operational and administrative skills. Interview input indicated that some of these skills, notably facilitation, running meetings, and community engagement, were felt to be lacking in the PEI context, and these deficits were seen as weakening the success of many collaborations. ‘Feeling our way’ approaches and committee meetings with no agendas or outputs were seen as turn-offs for collaborators. In the historical example of the Rural Development Council, a lack of planning skills was seen as having impeded its capacity to go from vision to implementation. Conversely, PETRA’s successes were attributed by key informants partly to good planning, facilitation and management.

## 6.10 Resources

Resources in themselves are not sufficient to ensure the success of a collaboration, but they are necessary. “*Genuine collaboration does not come cheap,*” notes Mattessich, “*it takes substantial, consistent funding and staffing... Putting off the resource question for later can be a fatal mistake.*” He emphasizes, as well, the need for each partner to make a contribution, according to its means, of “*substantial staff hours and skills, fundraising efforts, in-kind support and funds.*”

The literature widely identifies the need for people, especially a coordinator, with appropriate skills as described above; space; and access to ideas and knowledge. Shaw cites the need for committed and experienced staff who work well with the target

---

<sup>15</sup> CPSD Toolkit, op. cit. p. 3

populations; and strong agency support for their workers. She notes as barriers to success, a lack of initial funding or a lack of on-going or sustaining funding.

The need for stable funding, at least three years in duration, is frequently cited in the literature. Conversely, the very short-term timeframe of much project funding is seen as damaging to collaborations. Staff and members of the collaboration must devote significant time and energy to securing resources. Promising measures come to an end when funding runs out, resulting in a loss of credibility and erosion of trust among members of the collaboration. Organizational goals and priorities are compromised or adapted to the priorities of project funders.

Pearce, in his study of the volunteer sector sustainability in Atlantic Canada, focuses strongly on issues such as these. He defines sustainability broadly, as encompassing both the sustainability of the organization and its activities, and the integration of the organization's aims into existing community processes. He identifies resources as one of nine critical factors in sustainability, "*Resources: projecting the needed human, physical, and financial resources and developing a variety of strategies to provide stable resources over time, investing in organizational capacity development, and working to optimize relationships with funders.*"

Pearce highlights the damaging consequences that funding inadequacy or instability can have for collaborations:

- The pressure to re-profile the vision and mission with each project can lead groups to chase money, experience 'mission drift'
- Organizations feel stretched and overburdened, doing more with less
- Leadership is diverted from the group mission to keeping the collaboration going
- Core operations may suffer from lack of investment

Pearce notes that further resource pressures are placed on collaborations by such factors as:

- Lack of integration among funders, different administrative and reporting formats
- The amount of detailed work required to tap and report to every funding source, no matter how small
- The difficulty of providing the measurable outcomes demanded by funders in social development activities that show benefit only in the medium to long term
- The relatively scarcity of funding sources in Atlantic Canada

In short, Pearce observes that the shift from the core funding approaches of the 1980s to the project funding approaches of more recent times have placed severe stresses on the sustainability and functioning of many organizations. Despite this, he warns against organizations tailoring their activities and priorities to the funding available, and calls on them to define their focus and then find the resources. Affirming the critical importance of a clear vision and plan as noted above, he notes, "*Articulating a vision and results and critically looking at whether project activities are effective must take place before*

*developing a financing plan.*” More broadly, the collaboration’s success and the sustainability of its achievements depends in part on its ability to carry out its goals through its members, drawing on their collective resources and embedding its initiatives in the processes and activities of existing organizations.<sup>16</sup>

## **6.11 Knowledge**

The development of a shared knowledge base is an important step in building a successful collaboration. Shaw notes the need for “*a careful analysis or diagnosis of the problems in the area – including safety audits to locate specific problems and areas, and developing and implementing an integrated plan of action which matches intervention projects to the problems and needs identified.*” Husain outlines an ‘audit to action’ approach to mobilizing communities for crime prevention. He warns, however, against letting data warehousing become a substitute for problem analysis, and cautions, as well, against too much emphasis on the purely local, observing that it can lead to best practices being ignored.

This step of developing a shared knowledge base is by no means an easy one, especially in broad collaborations with diverse participants. Case studies by the Kings Fund identify significant barriers to linking local knowledge and research evidence:

- Lack of recognition of the experience of practitioners and citizens, and lack of opportunity for them to contribute to the evidence base, can result in confusion, exasperation, and cynicism
- Issues of a lack of appropriate evidence, or conflicting evidence, or evidence which may not be transferable, frequently arise with complex, multifactorial, multi-stakeholder collaborations
- Complex community based initiatives are hard to evaluate because of their size, speed of rollout, and involvement of multiple stakeholders addressing multiple complex problems in a shifting political environment

Despite these challenges, the researchers confirm that local practitioners and citizens must be able to contribute to the knowledge base. To achieve this, they call for sensitivity to individuals’ learning needs, a rigorous and structured program, a focus on action and results, and the development of strong networks. The creation of an agreed knowledge base is essential to develop a shared definition of issues and needs, to more fully appreciate the strengths and assets of all collaborators, to identify and disseminate best practices, and to design effective interventions.

---

<sup>16</sup> Pearce, Bruce. *Filling the Gap: Keeping Good Work Going*. Research Findings and Recommendations Regarding Voluntary Sector Project Sustainability in Atlantic Canada. The Murphy Centre, St. John’s NL, 2004, pp 19-20, pp. 25-27

## 6.12 Sound Processes

The literature widely cites the need for sound, standardized processes and the application of effective practices. Pearce identifies as essential to sustainability, strong internal systems, including fiscal management, information, personnel, and governance.

The CPSD Toolkit notes the following aspects of effective processes:

- Inclusive, non-hierarchical approaches
- Building on existing community capacity
- Consistent coordination
- Appropriate communications strategies
- Early successes

In the area of *planning*, the CPSD Toolkit case studies indicate the need for:

- An iterative process with feedback loops, rather than a linear process
- A mix of informal and structured processes, using tools including asset building, workshops, surveys, focus groups, action planning
- Broadening out from the immediate problem to a more holistic view.

Key informant input affirmed the value of planning, but also warned against over-planning. One collaboration reported that it had moved from one-year action plans to three-year action plans, thus reducing the burden on collaborators. An appropriate balance is needed to ensure that collaborating partners are fully involved in establishing goals and priorities, but are not bogged down in detailed implementation design and operational issues. Too micro-level a process risks collaborator fatigue and burnout. Another collaboration, Justice Options for Women who are Victims of Violence, used an approach known as Interest Based Problem Solving, which allowed the collaboration to identify factors which may not have shown up using standard problem solving.

*Communications* is a process of particular importance, and interview input suggested this is an area of weakness for many collaborations. It is assumed, or sometimes formally stated, that communications will happen spontaneously as members of the collaboration bring information to and from their home organizations. In fact this seldom occurs in a consistent or fully effective fashion. Poor communications then has ramifications both for the morale of collaborators and for the relationship with funders.

Mattesich notes that successful collaborative groups communicate often and well. They keep each other up to date, discuss issues openly, and consistently convey an appropriate level of information to people outside the group. Communication styles and methods should reflect the diversity of the group, but must include a strong personal, face-to-face element and not just rely on memos, emails, and newsletters. He notes that a large or complex collaborative group may even need staff dedicated to keeping communication flowing. This view was affirmed by key informants, who felt that the best practice is to formally assign this responsibility, or ideally to have a dedicated communications person.

Measures such as these were reported for both the Premier's Action Committee on Family Violence Prevention, and the Healthy Child Development Strategy.

*Evaluation* is almost universally recognized in the literature as another essential process. A lack of attention to monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and feedback of results into the planning loop is widely cited as a factor in the eventual failure or breakdown of collaborations.

Interview input indicated that the value of evaluation was recognized in principle, especially in a time of limited resources, but that it is often neglected or poorly done in practice. Funding may be fully devoted to meeting the identified needs, leaving no resources to evaluate those activities. In other cases, project funding may not include an allocation for evaluation. Especially in a multi-stakeholder, multi-factorial initiative, evaluation is fraught with difficulty. Cause and effect relationships are very difficult to demonstrate in such a context. Evaluations may be poorly designed, measuring the wrong things or focusing on the wrong timeframe. Many evaluations are summative, when a formative process would be considerably more useful. Both collaborators and funders may resist evaluations which risk finding failure or which are unable to demonstrate benefits of investments and efforts.

Despite these risks and pitfalls, the evaluation is vitally important to allow collaborators to identify and recognize early successes, to gain a realistic understanding of the time required for some outcomes, to refocus resources and effort for maximum impact, to sustain commitment or conversely to 'know when to quit,' and to be accountable both to funding bodies and to the populations being served.

## **7.0 Conclusion**

Many inter-related factors affect the success of a community-government collaboration. The challenge is that the collaborations most likely to have an impact are also those which are the most difficult to build and sustain. The evidence outlined in this paper indicates that broad, multi-partner, community-based collaborations are necessary in order to address the root causes of complex, multifactorial social issues, yet the results of such initiatives are realized only over the long term and are difficult to prove. Community-based processes are most likely to reflect and respond to community needs and to mobilize the commitment needed to work across sectors, cultures, professions, and socio-economic differences, yet such processes face many internal and external pressures. This paper has sought to capture some of these complex forces and to suggest some factors which address the challenges and promote the success of the collaborative approaches so vital to our future well-being.

## Appendix One: References

Attorney General of Prince Edward Island. *An Approach to Safer Communities in Prince Edward Island*. April 2004

Australian Government Information Office (AGIMO), *Elements of Good Community Collaboration*. Australian Taxation Office case study  
[http://www.agimo.gov.au/resources/ppt/2004/040526rv?result\\_page=2](http://www.agimo.gov.au/resources/ppt/2004/040526rv?result_page=2)

Canadian Policy Research Network, *Public Involvement Network*  
<http://www.cprn.org/en/network.cfm?network=3>

François-Pierre Gauvin et al, *Primer on Public Involvement*, Health Council of Canada, July 2006 Downloadable at <http://www.cprn.org/en/doc.cfm?doc=1519>

Centre for Initiatives on Children Youth and Community. *Sustainable Approaches to Crime Prevention through Social Development*. Toolkit, March 2006

Coote, Anna; Alle, Jessica; and Woodhead, David. *Finding Out What Works: Building knowledge about complex community based initiatives*. Kings Fund, November 2004 (Summary only, 6 pp.)

Devon Dodd, Julie and Boyd, Michelle Hebert. *Capacity Building: Linking Community Experience to Public Policy*. Health Canada Population and Public Health Branch, October 2000 [http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/canada/regions/atlantic/Publications/Capacity\\_building/capacity\\_2000\\_e.pdf](http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/canada/regions/atlantic/Publications/Capacity_building/capacity_2000_e.pdf)

Devon Dodd, Julie. *It's All About People: A Story of Crime and Hope; Community Leadership Toolbox; Facilitators Guide*. PEI Crime Prevention Association, 2004

Ellsworth, Jim and Walters, L. Jones, *Defining the Social Dimensions of Sustainable Development: Advances in Crime Prevention, Social Inclusion and Sustainability*. 2003

Ellsworth, Jim. *Justice Stewardship – The Modern Sustainability Challenge*. International Association for Public Participation, Discussion Paper 2001

Gallant, Sarah Henry. *Understanding the Early Years: Community Research in Child Development*. ECDA, November 2001

Husain, Sohail. *A Comprehensive Approach to Creating Safer Communities*. (UK Crime Audits) Safer Neighbourhoods Programme, Birmingham. (powerpoint, n.d.)

IAPC, *The Crime Prevention Digest II*, brochure, 13 pp., 1999

Paul Mattessich "Can this Collaboration be Saved?" Shelterforce Online, Issue #129, May/June 2003 <http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/129/savecollab.html>

Newfoundland and Labrador Community Services Council, *A Glossary of Terms for the Voluntary Sector* [www.enVision.ca](http://www.enVision.ca)

O'Grady, Michael A. *From Grassroots to Grim Reapings: A History of the Prince Edward Island Rural Development Council*, Institute of Island Studies, 1995?

Oginsky, Kathie. *Investing in Youth: International Approaches to Preventing Crime and Victimization*. (annex, 36 pp.) IAPC, 2001.

Pearce, Bruce. *Filling the Gap: Keeping Good Work Going*. Research Findings and Recommendations Regarding Voluntary Sector Project Sustainability in Atlantic Canada. The Murphy Centre, St. John's NL, 2004

Quebec Ministry of Health and Social Services. *Policy on Health and Well Being*. 1992

Sansfacon, Daniel, *Of Prevention and Security. Reflections on Sustainable Governance of Community Security*. International Centre for the Prevention of Crime 2004

Shaw, Margaret. *Police, Schools, and Crime Prevention: A preliminary review of current practices*. IAPC, 2001

Shaw, Margaret. *Investing in Youth: International Approaches to Preventing Crime and Victimization*. (summary, 9 pp.) IAPC, 2001.

Smith, Bruce L. *Public Policy and Public Participation: Engaging Citizens and Community in the Development of Public Policy*. 2003. Population and Public Health Branch, Atlantic Regional Office, Health Canada.

Tamarack Institute for Community Engagement, *Communities Collaborating for Impact: Ingredients for Successful Multi-sectoral Collaboration*. [http://tamarackcommunity.ca/g3s61\\_CC411.html](http://tamarackcommunity.ca/g3s61_CC411.html) Accessed February 9, 2007

Walsh, Deatra. "Doctoral Student Explores Community-Government collaboration in Coastal Areas," Oceanet E-zine, Memorial University

---

## **Appendix Two: List of Key Informant Interviews**

Jean Paul Arsenault, Parks Canada and former executive secretary to the PEI Round Table on Resource Land Use and Stewardship.

Dawn Binns, Canadian Cancer Society and co-chair Healthy Living Strategy Steering Committee.

Deborah Bradley, Department of Health and former co-chair and former government assigned co-coordinator of the Healthy Living Strategy

Rona Brown, Department of Social Services and Seniors, PEI Family Violence Prevention Co-coordinator

Vicki Bryanton, PEI Lung Association and Prince Edward Island Tobacco Reduction Alliance

Mark Cabaj, Tamarack Institute for Community Engagement, Edmonton, Alberta.

Sterling Carruthers, Department of Education, Active Healthy School Communities Coordinator

Norman Finlayson, Project Officer, PEI Literacy Alliance.

Sarah Henry Gallant, Department of Health, coordinator, Healthy Child Development Strategy.

Don LeClair, Executive Director, PEI Active Living Alliance

Catherine O'Bryan, Executive Director, PEI Literacy Alliance

Michael O'Grady, author of a history of the Rural Development Council, *From Grassroots to Grim Reapings*

Kirstin Lund, Chairperson, PEI Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Formerly consultant to Justice Options for Women who are Victims of Family Violence

Laraine Poole, Department of Health and former full time support person for the Healthy Living Strategy

Margaret Prouse, Island Gusto and co-chair Healthy Eating Alliance

Lisa Shaffer, Provincial Treasury, former full time support person to PETRA

## **Appendix Three: Profiles of Collaborations**

### **Active Living Alliance**

The Active Living Alliance of Prince Edward Island is a collective of fifty groups and organizations. Its purpose is to encourage and enable all residents of the province to be physically active. It operates under the umbrella of the PEI Healthy Living Strategy. The partners in the alliance come from chronic disease, education, sport, recreation, medical, and government sectors. <http://www.peiactiveliving.com/>

### **Children's Secretariat**

The Children's Secretariat is a broad, inter-sectoral group which includes community representatives and also government representatives from seven provincial government departments focused on key areas of action for healthy child development. As well, representatives of key groups who are involved with children sit as members on the Children's Secretariat. The Children's Secretariat is a 'network of networks' and links with other existing networks and coalitions who are working on behalf of young children and their families. The Secretariat's activities are derived from the Healthy Child Development Strategy. <http://www.gov.pe.ca/hss/hcd/index.php3?number=1005282>

### **Healthy Eating Alliance**

The Healthy Eating Alliance is a group of individuals and approximately twenty organizations dedicated to improving the eating habits and nutrition of children and youth. The Alliance is linked to the PEI Healthy Living Strategy and works collaboratively to develop and implement a comprehensive, coordinated plan which encourages Island children and youth to enjoy, understand, and benefit from healthy eating. <http://www.gov.pe.ca/peihea/>

### **Justice Options for Women who are Victims of Violence**

This community-government partnership began in November 1999 as an outcome of a workshop on Gender Issues in Restorative Justice. The partners in the collaboration included the PEI Advisory Council on the Status of Women, Individual Survivors of Abuse, Transition House Association, Victim Services, PEI Rape/Sexual Assault Crisis Centre, Community Legal Information Association, Interministerial Women's Secretariat, Restorative Justice Network, Office of the Attorney General, Child and Family Services and Family Law Branch, and the Canadian Bar Association. Additional partners were represented on a Reference Group.

The collaboration worked to give victims, victim advocates, and the community a voice to ensure that justice options do not re-victimize victims, and to promote a safe and effective response to family violence in PEI. During the first phase, focus groups and a workshop were held to identify needs and issues, resulting in the development of an information brochure and a framework for improving justice for women who are victims

of violence. The second phase examined restorative justice as it pertains to family violence issues, with a focus on ensuring that it does not decriminalize family violence or result in re-victimization. The third phase examined the interplay of criminal and family law systems and made recommendations to improve their functioning as it related to family violence. In the fourth and final phase, completed in December 2004, the group developed recommendations on a Family Violence Response for PEI, including collaborative roles for service providers in a coordinated multi-agency team approach, with a specialized family violence court, enhanced support and services for victims and children and enhanced treatment, support and supervision for offenders.

<http://www.isn.net/~tha/justiceoptions/index.htm>

### **Premier's Action Committee on Family Violence Prevention**

The Premier's Action Committee on Family Violence Prevention is a 23-member committee consisting of 18 community representatives and five government representatives. The mandate of the committee is to implement a five-year strategy on family violence prevention for Prince Edward Island. It reports directly to the Premier on all issues related to family violence prevention and intervention on Prince Edward Island. <http://www.gov.pe.ca/hss/familyviolence.php3> ; <http://www.stopfamilyviolence.pe.ca/>

### **Prince Edward Island French Language Health Services Network**

In June 2002, community and provincial government representatives met to explore the feasibility of a joint approach to improving the state of French language health services. It was agreed that the most appropriate means to prepare for the full proclamation of the *French Language Services Act* was to create a joint community-government network dedicated to the task of proposing practical solutions for the delivery of French language health and social services. In November 2002, the PEI French Language Health Services Network was established by the community, the Minister responsible for Acadian and Francophone Affairs, and the Minister of Health and Social Services. The FLHSN brings together key provincial government players as well as leaders from the Acadian and Francophone community. The FLHSN is directed by two co-chairs, one chosen among the government representatives and the other among the community representation, and reports to the Acadian Communities Advisory Committee which advises the Minister responsible for Acadian and Francophone Affairs.

### **Prince Edward Island Literacy Alliance**

The Literacy Alliance is a collaboration of over 20 organizations dedicated to raising awareness on issues related to literacy. The Alliance creates partnerships for literacy projects, provides information and advice for people seeking training and upgrading and works with educational organizations and government on literacy issues.

<http://www.pei.literacy.ca/>

### **Prince Edward Island Tobacco Reduction Alliance (PETRA)**

PETRA is an alliance of fifteen agencies including health organizations, educational institutions and government dedicated to reducing smoking rates and public exposure to tobacco smoke. Its comprehensive efforts include information sessions, printed materials and a smoker's helpline. <http://pei.lung.ca/programs.html>

### **Round Table on Resource Land Use and Stewardship**

The Round Table on Resource Land Use and Stewardship was formed to consult with Islanders and advise government on what was needed in a resource land use strategy. It was in existence for 18 months in 1996 and 1997 and brought together a group of individuals representing a wide range of interests in land use issues.

<http://www.gov.pe.ca/roundtable/index.php3>

### **Rural Development Council**

The Rural Development Council originated in the mid 1960s as a small loosely structured group of community leaders with a concern for rural development. It collaborated with government in the late sixties and early seventies to deliver programmes of the Comprehensive Development Plan. The collaboration experienced serious role conflict problems, lost its funding and ended in the mid seventies. See Institute of Island Studies publication *From Grassroots to Grim Reapings*, by Michael A. O'Grady

## **Appendix Four: Analytical Framework for Collaborations**

### ***Origins: Why?***

- Who initiated the collaboration – government, grassroots, or joint?
- What factor(s) led to the founding of the collaboration? (problem / opportunity)
- To what extent is the collaboration based on a statement of shared values and principles?

### ***Membership: Who?***

- Nature of membership: who is involved?
- Breadth of membership: focused and specialized or broad and general?
- Inclusiveness: to what extent is the consumer target group included?
- How determined: Who decides who gets to join? How permeable is the organization?
- How does the entity recruit new members? Formality of processes? Openness of processes?

### ***Mission, Mandate, Role(s): What?***

- Who defines the mandate?
- How narrow / broad is the target group to which the collaboration pertains?
- What elements does the mandate include?
  - Advisory
  - Advocacy and public policy development
  - Program planning
  - Program and service delivery
  - Communications, public education, social marketing
  - Knowledge sharing, clearinghouse, networking
  - Services to members (professional development, helping access funds, standards development)
  - Celebration of achievements, recognition, awards

### ***Approaches: How?***

#### External:

- Direct delivery? (outwards – target group)
- Support for members' organizations? (downward – internal)
- Communications, public education, promotion? (outwards – at large)
- Advocacy and advisory? (upward – decision-makers)

#### Internal - Operations:

- Processes to establish and renew mission and mandate?
- Planning processes?
- Monitoring processes?

- Staffing processes?
- Communications processes?

Internal – Resources:

- Sources of funding?
- Stability and sustainability of funding?
- Balance of core funding to project funding?

Internal – Structure and Governance:

- Governance structure?
- To whom is the organization accountable?
- What requirements and processes are there for evaluation and reporting?
- Leadership and succession processes?
- Degree of reliance on volunteer effort; extent of resources and paid staff?

***History, Timeframe, Status, Prospects: When?***

- When founded, how long in operation?
- Time-limited specific task, or ongoing mandate?
- Achievements?
- Difficulties and challenges?
- Current status?
- Changes being considered or planned?

## Appendix Five: Glossary

**Bridge person:** someone with experience and skills in working across different sectors and with different parts of the public policy process.

**Capacity:** the power or ability to use one's own resources to achieve goals.

**Capacity building:** the strengthening of the ability of people, communities, and systems to plan, develop, implement, and maintain effective health and social approaches.

**Citizen engagement:** situations where governments take the initiative to involve citizens in policy development, including the clarification of values, principles, and desired outcomes.

**Collaboration:** goes beyond informal cooperation or occasional coordination of efforts. It is a long-term, well-defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to achieve common goals. It involves genuine sharing of authority, accountability, resources and rewards. Partners come together to accomplish something that they cannot do alone.

**Community:** a group of individuals and/or organizations with common geography (i.e. north end community) or a common identity (i.e. women).

**Community development:** A process to improve quality of life and well being in communities through empowering individuals to plan, develop and implement solutions which maintain vibrant communities

**Community capacity:** A community's ability to identify, mobilize, and address health and social issues.

**Governance:** Actions and processes that govern the direction of an organization or a society

**Policy:** a guiding principle or plan of action agreed to by a group of people with the power to carry it out.

**Public consultation:** Two-way communications between the public and government or a sponsor which allow the parties to become better informed.

**Public participation:** Processes which allow individuals, groups or organizations to have input into decisions which affect or interest them.

**Social development:** Commitment to individual well being by allowing citizens to determine their own needs and influence public policy decisions

**Social capital:** Willingness and ability of people to engage in collective activities to build social infrastructure and improve community well being.