

## Request for Decision

### Annual Grants Value for Money Review

Presented To: Finance and  
Administration  
Committee

Presented: Tuesday, Jan 17, 2017

Report Date Thursday, Dec 22, 2016

Type: Managers' Reports

### Resolution

WHEREAS staff were directed by City Council on March 8th, 2016 to develop clear criteria and an application process for annual grants, and each grant recipient was advised they would have to reapply every five years commencing in 2017, and;

WHEREAS the Finance and Administration Committee of November 15th, 2016, directed staff to conduct a value for money audit on the Annual Grants, and;

WHEREAS a tool with clear criteria and scoring was utilized and staff contacted the recipients to gather the required information;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Finance and Administration Committee adopt the six (6) recommendations from the report dated January 17th, 2017;

AND THAT any savings for 2017, generated as a result of the six recommendations, be considered to support Population Health Initiatives, a written report with recommendations for the use of these savings will be brought to Community Services Committee in April 2017,

AND THAT a Memorandum of Understanding is sent out with the 2017 grants for sign off by each recipient outlining the intended purpose of the grant along and for the provision of an annual year end report.

### Finance Implications

The value for money review recommends a reduction of \$73,500 in community grants for 2017. Further review and negotiations with groups may result in additional savings. This report recommends an additional report be brought back to Community Services Committee in April, 2017 to finalize savings and recommendations. Consideration may be given by Council for reinvestment of savings into population health priorities, other granting opportunities or savings to the municipal budget.

#### Signed By

**Report Prepared By**

Tyler Campbell  
Director of Social Services  
*Digitally Signed Dec 22, 16*

**Division Review**

Tyler Campbell  
Director of Social Services  
*Digitally Signed Dec 22, 16*

**Recommended by the Department**

Catherine Matheson  
General Manager of Community  
Development  
*Digitally Signed Dec 22, 16*

**Recommended by the C.A.O.**

Ed Archer  
Chief Administrative Officer  
*Digitally Signed Dec 22, 16*

## Background

This is a follow up to the report from the Finance and Administration Committee dated November 15th, 2016 in which staff were directed to create a framework for auditing annual grants in the context of value for money as per the following resolution FA2016-38:

*WHEREAS the City of Greater Sudbury provides annual grants to various community organizations to help provide programs and services for our community;*

*AND WHEREAS staff has been directed by City Council on March 8, 2016 to develop clear criteria and an application process for annual grants; and each grant recipient be required to reapply every five years;*

*AND WHEREAS all recipients of Leisure Services grants have been informed they will need to reapply for 2017 allocation;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the annual grant recipients complete a grant application form every five years and complete a year end report each year;*

*AND THAT prior to formalizing the applications for 2017, staff conduct a value for money audit on the grants and make recommendations to the Finance and Administration Committee in January of 2017;*

*AND THAT staff report to Council prior to the approval of new annual grant allocations and prior to renewal of grant applications every 5 years; and that staff prepare a year end report each year for Finance and Administration Committee.*

## Value for Money Definition

A value for money audit is a systematic, purposeful, organized and objective examination of government activities (VFM Audit Manual, Office of the Auditor General, 2000). In consultation with the City of Greater Sudbury's Auditor General's office, a value for money audit was conducted relative to the level of community grant that was being administered. The primary purpose of the review was to determine whether the funds were being utilized for the purpose that it was intended and whether or not there was community value.

## Review Process

Staff created a value for money framework in consultation with the City of Greater Sudbury's Auditor General's office with additional input from the Halifax Grant Review Model. All of the grant recipients were contacted and the information that they provided were run through the tool with a total score out of 100 points (Appendix A – Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria - attached).

The grant recipients that are identified in the Annual Grants Allocation By-law 2016-44 were broken down into six different groupings for comparison purposes. Each grouping indicates a range of scores and provides information on the background of the grants, the purpose and findings for Council consideration and direction.

## Community Grants

The following community grants scored in a range of 72 to 88 points. The review indicates that the value for City expenditure produces a community benefit as defined by the criteria.

Capreol Northern Railway Museum	\$3,570
Rainbow Routes	\$45,000
Volunteer Sudbury/Bénévolat Sudbury (Volunteer Centre)	\$10,000
Sudbury Community Foundation	\$50,000

Social Planning Council	\$100,000
Junction Creek Stewardship Committee (2015 - 2018)	\$30,000
Sudbury Rainbow Crime Stoppers	\$50,000
Child Care Resources	\$20,000
Samaritan Centre	\$27,000

### **Findings and Other Considerations**

These organizations also receive funding from other sources, and are provided with a grant from the City of Greater Sudbury for a specific purpose or program.

The Samaritan Centre's operational grant funding also enables them to qualify for property tax exempt status by MPAC.

The Junction Creek Stewardship Committee's grant was approved by Council as a four year request for funding that expires after the 2018 grant.

The annual grant to the Sudbury Community Foundation (SCF) is a direct contribution to the endowment fund that the Foundation holds. Through past contributions and other support, the total endowment fund has grown to approximately \$4,000,000. The City of Greater Sudbury is one of forty donors to the fund. The interest generated from this fund is used to make annual grants to registered charities to deliver programs.

The City contributions to the SCF are a result of a 2003 budget request and have enabled the endowment fund to grow. With respect to the value for money review, it is recommended that the City cease future contributions as the fund has reached a sustainable level.

The annual grant to Child Care Resources (CCR) was developed to help run a highly specialized service in one location in the community as a summer program for developmental services. This program was historically operated by the City, without the trained staff and specialized programming that is offered by CCR. The program provides services for a target age group of 12 to 18 years old with multiple complex needs including g-tube feeding. The operating grant provides direct staffing support in order to provide individualized programming for this target group.

The Social Planning Council (SPC) was reviewed in light of the original grant of \$50,000 that they have received for well over a decade. For this original grant amount, the SPC was funded as a backbone organization for social development in the community and this need still exists today. The direction by Council through the 2017 budget process eliminated the additional \$50,000 that was added to their grant in 2007. This additional \$50,000 was not part of this review.

### **Seniors Groups Grants/Senior Citizens Centres**

Overall the Seniors Groups scored in a range of 81 to 89 points. These grants specifically target seniors programs throughout the community and allow the identified seniors groups to access the Elderly Persons Centre (EPC) grant from the province. The most recent group that was added to the grants by-law in 2014 was Club Amical du Nouveau Sudbury and the intent at the time was to allow this group to apply for the provincial EPC grant. The size of the grants vary due the timing by which they were initiated and fulfilled the EPC requirements which specify a twenty percent Municipal contribution towards operating expenses. The Provincial grant has a maximum of \$42,700.

Club Accueil Age d'Or - Azilda	\$14,100
--------------------------------	----------

Club Accueil Age d'Or - Hanmer	\$17,080
Rayside-Balfour Senior Craft Shop	\$5,700
One Eleven Senior Citizens Centre Inc. - Sudbury	\$12,000
Parkside Older Adult Centre Sudbury (formerly Sudbury Seniors)	\$12,000
Onaping Falls Golden Age Club	\$9,527
Club 50 - Chelmsford	\$12,000
Nickel Centre Seniors Club	\$6,700
Club Amical du Nouveau Sudbury	\$14,000

### Findings and Other Considerations

All of the seniors groups with the exception of Club Amical du Nouveau Sudbury were able to provide staff with audited financial statements as it is a requirement of the provincial EPC funding. The audited financial statement allowed for a full review of spending areas and any other sources of revenue beyond what is received from the province. In terms of recommendations, while Club Amical du Nouveau Sudbury provides community value for the grant they received, the original intention of the grant was to leverage Municipal dollars to receive the EPC grant. At this time, the Province has not opened a call for applications for new applicants and therefore the Club cannot apply for the EPC grant. The status of the EPC grant for this Club will be brought forward for Council review during the year end report that was called for through the Finance and Administration Committee resolution FA2016-38 as noted above.

The lowest scoring grant in this group was the Parkside Older Adult Centre due to the stability of revenue and cash flow along with the number of paid staff employed versus the other seniors groups that rely primarily on volunteers. It should also be noted that the Parkside Older Adult Centre receives additional support which is identified as a grant on their financial statements. The City provides approximately \$140,000 towards the operating costs for the Parkside space which is owned by the City. Furthermore, as identified in the September 27, 2016 report to Council on parking matters, Parkside OAC volunteers receive free parking, valued at approximately \$24,000 per year. The percentage of maintenance and utility costs is directed through the Condominium Agreement with the YMCA. Additional costs as a result of special revenue generating events, such as weddings, are invoiced by the YMCA directly to the Parkside Centre. The combination of using City space and having paid staff contributes to them being the highest revenue generating seniors group in the category, which surplused approximately \$70,000 in 2016. It is recommended that the City re-negotiate the operational costs with the Parkside Older Adult Centre within the first half of 2017, and leave the grant in place to continue to leverage Provincial funds.

### Community Recreation Centre Grants

Overall the Community Recreation Centre grants scored in a range of 54 to 86 points. These grants were put into place to support non-owned municipal buildings that provide recreational opportunities to the community. The exception to this is the Kukagami Campers Association which uses a private lodge site.

Some of the buildings also have additional uses such as the Wahnapiatae Community Centre which is an emergency evacuation site. The City also runs outdoor rink programs at some of these locations. Both the Skead and Wahnapiatae Community Centre grants existed at amalgamation and Carole Richard, Penage Road and Beaver Lake Community Centres were added in 2004. For the Community Recreation Centres, audited financial statements were not available so staff used sources and uses statements, which were generally prepared by outside sources.

Wahnapiatae Community Centre	\$16,000
------------------------------	----------

Skead Community Centre	\$16,000
Penage Road Playground Association	\$16,000
Beaver Lake Community Centre	\$16,000
Carole Richard Park Community Centre	\$16,000
Kukagami Campers Association	\$16,000

### Findings and Other Considerations

The lowest scoring grant of the group was the Kukagami Campers Association which was added to the Annual Grants Allocation By-Law in 2010. The group had been supported prior to this date from the Emergency Services Budget and primarily allows for the association to purchase and maintain fire suppression equipment, water quality testing for their five area lakes and the purchase of 6 Automated External Defibrillators. In review of the statement of financial position, the Association has accumulated over \$50,000 which increased by approximately \$11,000 from 2015 to 2016. Given that Fire Services has responsibility for fire suppression services within the Municipality, the positive cash position and the minimal expenditures on recreation, it is recommended that this grant be ceased.

Carole Richard Park Community Centre is another grant that stood out due to the return of their 2016 grant cheque which was stale dated. Based on this information, a review of the banking information for the Centre showed a positive cash balance at this time. The governance model is currently undergoing a renewal to ensure that the group becomes more active in recreational programming as per the intent of the grant. It is recommended that only half of the 2016 grant be re-issued given that the City's summer program was operated at the site in 2016. Furthermore, it is recommended that Centre continue to be eligible for the 2017 grant as long as a work plan is provided to Leisure Services with projected fund utilization. They have also committed to running the outdoor rink program for the winter of 2017.

### Youth Centre Grants

Overall both Youth Centre grants scored above 70. Both of these grants provide operating funding for programming and staffing for two youth centres. Beyond these two youth centre grants, the City also directly operates six other youth centres which are spread throughout the City and include; Ryan Heights, Capreol, Dowling, Onaping, Valley East and Walden. These six centres are funded by the City, with a Provincial grant specifically available for the Ryan Heights program.

Both Centres that receive a Municipal grant run through the summer whereas the six that are operated by the City only offer programming from September to June. The operating hours and number of days vary by location.

Rayside-Balfour Youth Centre	\$60,000
Sudbury Action Centre for Youth (SACY)	\$89,120

### Findings and Other Considerations

Both Youth Centres scored well in the majority of the tool, however lacked points in the volunteer category as full time paid staff are in place. The Rayside-Balfour Youth Centre operates out of Cote Park, which is a Municipally owned facility at no cost. Rayside-Balfour Youth Centre did not have audited statement however they did have sources and uses statements provided by a third party. The statements show that the Youth Centre received additional grants for staffing subsidies to help with operational costs.

SACY provided audited statements which show that the Centre received additional grants through other sources such as the United Way.

It is recommended that a review of all Youth Centres be undertaken for comparison and consistency of service across the geographic area.

### **Community Event Grants**

The following three grants are intended for specific annual community events and as such audited financial statements were not received. Given the specific focus of this type of grant, a simple pass or fail rating was used as the grant is either being used for the intended purpose or it is not. The evaluation committee did however review the narrative from each group to consider community impact.

Onaping Falls Lions Club - Cavalcade of Colours	\$1,500
Science North – Canada Day Fireworks	\$10,000
Anderson Farm Site Committee – Walden Fall Fair grant	\$2,500

### **Findings and Other Considerations**

The Science North grant for Canada Day Fireworks was fully utilized towards the fireworks display and Science North inquired about an increase to the grant in future years given that the grant does not cover the full cost of the fireworks display. It should be noted that the City pays for a portion of paid duty officers during the Canada Day event along with some in kind support for items such as barricades and pylons for the event from the Parks Section.

Cavalcade of Colors receives a minimal annual grant from Leisure Services and they indicated that the grant was primarily used for advertising for the event.

The Anderson Farms Historical Society grant helps to support the society in a broader context so that they can provide community events such as the Walden Fall Fair. The submission in this case, indicates that the grant helps to support operating costs in a broader context such as annual fees for insurance. Overall, the full grant was utilized to support the Anderson Farms Historical Society.

### **Community Action Networks (CAN's)**

All the CAN's identified below are currently receiving a yearly grant of \$2,500 for costs associated "with promotion of activities, photocopying and mailings" (Appendix B - CAN Terms of Engagement - attached).

Given the small value of the grant, a modified process was used to evaluate the grant that focused more on what the grant was being spent on and if the entire grant was being spent. Sources and uses of funds were received from the CAN's for this review.

Capreol	\$2,500
Coniston	\$2,500
Copper Cliff	\$2,500
Donovan/Elm West	\$2,500
Garson/Falconbridge	\$2,500
Minnow Lake	\$2,500
New Sudbury Ward 12	\$2,500
Onaping Falls	\$2,500
Azilda	\$2,500
South End	\$2,500

Walden	\$2,500
Ward 1	\$2,500
Valley East	\$2,500
Chelmsford	\$2,500
Ward 8	\$2,500

### **Findings and Other Considerations**

The Flour Mill CAN has become active again during the 2016 year, but was not named in By-law 2016-44 meaning that staff could not release the grant without creating another by-law. It is recommended that this CAN receive half of the 2016 allocation given their activity during the past half year.

For the majority of the CAN's, the review found that during 2015, only two followed the current Terms of Engagement regarding the grant that was paid by the City. In many cases, CAN's had donated some of the grant funds to other community initiatives such as Keeping Seniors Warm, Community Garden projects and the Lions Club Telethon. While some of these initiatives may be deemed as worthwhile community causes, it is not what the CAN funding was intended for. As CAN's have evolved since their inception, a new Terms of Engagement document has been developed by staff and will be brought forward to Council for consideration. Staff have already brought forward the new draft Terms of Engagement for review and input from the CAN's at the CAN Summit which was held on November 28th, 2016. It is recommended the grant funding for 2017 be held until Council has approved the new Terms of Engagement during the first quarter of 2017 and further that the CAN funding be reduced to \$2,000 each.

### **Grant Allocations Budget**

With Council approval of the recommendations in this report, it will lead to an under expenditure in the grants budget for 2017. It is recommended that these budgeted dollars continue to contribute to the community, through the Quality of Life initiative as defined by Council's strategic plan. The Community Development Department is currently meeting with community partners to develop a framework for a population health initiative which will be brought forward to Community Services Committee in 2017. It is recommended that the unspent grant funds be dedicated to this initiative which is based on improving the social determinants of health.

### **Summary of Recommendations**

- 1) It is recommended that the grant to the Sudbury Community Foundation be ceased due to the current size of the endowment fund.
- 2) It is recommended that the City negotiate a new agreement with the Parkside Older Adult Centre Sudbury in terms of cost sharing for the operating costs of the Centre given the healthy revenue and cash balance that is in place.
- 3) It is recommended that the grant to Kukagami Campers Association be ceased due to the grant utilization findings and their growing cash balance.
- 4) It is recommended that half of the 2016 recreation centre grant be issued to Carol Richard Park Community Centre and that they have eligibility for 2017 with an appropriate work plan in place.
- 5) It is recommended that a report be brought forward to the Community Services Committee by the second quarter of 2017 with a review of Youth Centres for comparison and consistency of service across the community.
- 6) It is recommended that an updated Terms of Engagement for CAN's be brought forward for Council

approval in the first quarter of 2017 before the release of the 2017 funds. Furthermore, it is recommended that the CAN funding be reduced to \$2,000 per year based on the review of the grant utilization.



### Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria

Community Grants are grants to assist with the annual operating costs of programs, events or facilities.

In order to be eligible for an annual operating grant, the applicant organization must:

- be a registered charity or non profit organization/community group that is located within the boundaries of the City of Greater Sudbury
- respect the Canadian Charter of Human Rights and promote equal access and opportunity for all persons
- have a governance structure that includes a board of directors or committee of volunteer members
- demonstrate a financial need and community benefit for their operating funding,
- be able to demonstrate any active fundraising efforts to support the continuation of program, project or service
- agree to be provide annual reports regarding the expenditure of the funding received
- not be indebted to the municipality, organizations with debt ( eg outstanding receivables including taxes owed, fines or outstanding final reports for previous grants etc.) will be deemed ineligible

### Eligible Expenses for Operating Grants

The costs incurred to deliver the organizations programs, services or events such as:

- employee compensation and development
- The space in which the organization operates and related expenses (eg. rent, insurance, utilities, maintenance)
- Fees related to operations (eg. marketing, legal, accounting etc.)
- Non-capital program and office equipment and supplies necessary for the ongoing operation and development of the organization

### Ineligible Expenses for Operating Grants

- Capital Costs ( expenses for purchase of buildings, land etc)
- Deficit funding (ie. Funds intended to cover and or decrease the organizations deficit position)
- Equipment or expenses for personal use

### **Evaluation Criteria**

The grant funding application will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

#### **1. Organizations Viability and Impact ( 10 Pts)**

- Description of organization and its goals
- Goal achievement and community contribution
- Financial information provided ( financial statements, project budget, information supporting request)
- Other sources of funding, fundraising or other government assistance

#### **Key Questions**

- Please provide an overview of your organizations mission and goals?
- Please provide examples of how your organization has worked towards its mission and is achieving its intended goals over the past 12 months and more broadly over the past five years?
- Does the organization have annual audited financial statements prepared? If yes, please provide us with a copy of the most recent year end. If No, what financial reporting does the organization prepare and please provide a copy of the most recent report and bank statement. What are your primary sources and uses of cash over the last 12 months?
- Does your organization receive any other grants or in kind contributions from the City of Greater Sudbury or other levels of government?
- Does your organization engage in fundraising within the community and if so what level of funds are raised on an annual basis
- Please explain the organizations governance structure? How does the organization govern itself if there is no formal Board of Directors in place? Who is the Treasurer and authorized signing officers?

#### **2. Funding Impact ( 10 pts)**

- Limited capacity of program users to pay full cost of service or program. Program cannot proceed without municipal assistance and significant loss to community if program delayed or cancelled
- Funding removes barriers to equitable participation
- Can organization maintain program or service without municipal funding

- Opportunity to leverage municipal funding in order to receive funding from other levels of government

#### **Key Questions**

- What is the community impact of your initiative?
- Does your organization employ paid staff? If so, how many and at what annual cost?
- What programs or services do the City's grant funds support? Please provide examples of expenditures that the Municipal grants support?
- Will your municipal grant funding be used to leverage any other types of one time grant funding?

### **3. Public Benefit ( 25 pts)**

- Promotes public benefit ( benefit to all residents, community or neighborhood residents, or specific interest groups)
- Scope, scale or type of inclusion. Is there a demonstrated need or opportunity

#### **Key Questions**

- How many program participants does the organization's programs serve?
- How many members does the organization have and has the membership grown or declined in the past 5 years?
- Please provide an overview of how far your organization reaches within in the Ward and greater community?
- Does any other organization provide similar or alternate programs in the Ward or community?

### **4. Project Merit in relation to Municipal goals and funding priorities (25 pts)**

- Application and project has clear stated goals and objectives which align with Council approved strategic plans (attach)
- Stated outcomes for program are realistic and achievable
- Demonstrated community need for program or service

#### **Key Questions**

- How is your organization aligned with Council's strategic priority of Quality of Life and Place? (See Below)

## Quality of Life and Place

*Strengthen the high quality of life we already know and love*

- A. Create programs and services designed to improve the health and well-being of our youth, families and seniors.
- B. Maintain great public spaces and facilities to provide opportunities for everyone to enjoy.
- C. Promote a quality of life that attracts and retains youth and professionals, and encourages seniors to relocate to our community, taking into consideration all of Greater Sudbury.
- D. Focus on clean, green living and the environment, by investing in our future and celebrating how far we've come.

- If your organization had more funding what would you do differently?

### 5. Contribution to Healthy Communities Challenges ( 15 points)

- Organizational congruence with the Healthy Community Challenges approved by Council (attach)

#### Key Questions

The Social Determinants of Health have 11 challenges: income and income distribution, education, unemployment & job security, employment and working conditions, early childhood development, food insecurity, housing, social inclusion, social safety network, health services , aboriginal status, gender, race and disability

- How does your organization meet the challenges of improving the Social Determinants of Health?

### 6. Volunteer Impact and Economic Benefit ( 15 points)

- Opportunity for volunteer development, community engagement, diversification, cost saving efficiencies, enhanced profile of organization as a result of proposed project or service
- Volunteer economic impact based on "Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating" from Statistics Canada.

#### Key Questions

- How many volunteers or members are involved in the program delivery for your organization?
- How many volunteer hours do you employ on an annual basis?

## Background

On June 10, 2001, City Council unanimously adopted recommendations from the Mayor's Task Force on Community Involvement and Volunteerism, including a recommendation to initiate Community Action Networks (CANs). Working in partnership with the Sudbury Roundtable on Health, Economy and the Environment, the City of Greater Sudbury (CGS) introduced the concept of CANs to help in the planning, budgeting and implementation of community initiatives. CANs were also identified as a valuable resource in the encouragement of civic engagement within the Healthy Community Strategy (HSC) and the Regional Centre of Expertise on Education for Sustainable Development.

CANs bring people together to build a healthy community giving each resident of the City of Greater Sudbury an opportunity to have their voice heard at city hall. The Constellation City Report noted that residents in the former outlying areas felt disconnected from the city. CANs were established to help provide a better line of communication between the community, Council and City staff. Such groups embody the values that are reflected in the HCS, which identifies four pillars: Active Living/Health Lifestyle, Natural Environment, Economic Growth, and Civic Engagement/Social Capital.

## Benefits of Community Action Networks

CANs work collaboratively to advocate for positive change and the betterment of the community.

- **Enhancement** in the overall quality of life in the CGS by addressing issues within the four HC Pillars: social, environmental, active living and economic.
- **Awareness** of the services offered by the CGS and other community organizations to local residents.
- **Participation and involvement** in project planning at the community level through **identification and prioritization of** community needs at a local level; taking action to address each priority individually.
- **Promotion of community inclusiveness** to ensure all residents have the opportunity to participate and be heard.

## What Community Action Networks Are Not

- Ratepayer associations
- Groups focusing on a single issue or mandate
- Political entities
- Policy creators
- Are not responsible for City personnel

## Development of the Terms of Engagement

Since 2004, 16 CANs have been established within the CGS in partnership with the community, Council and CGS staff. CANs can bring a unique perspective of a particular area, reflecting the values and needs of residents living within the community. Each CAN operates in their own unique manner, allowing for flexibility in the operational methods of the executive.

In January 2007, the Constellation City Report called for the development of 'Terms of Reference' to better define the role of CANs helping to outline their responsibilities to the communities they represent. The report noted that in developing a Terms of Reference for CANs, *"the city risks losing the grassroots nature*

*that has made the CANs a success to this point.*" As a result, the Terms of Engagement establish guidelines which provide direction for CANs, staff and Council.

The revised **Terms of Engagement** are intended to accomplish the following:

- Reflect and embrace the grassroots nature of CANs and the unique community that each represents.
- Provide a fluid framework that is more representative of how CANs develop and change over time.
- Set minimum eligibility criteria for a group to be considered a CAN.
- Detail the expectations for CANs and their responsibilities to the community which they represent and to the city as a whole.
- Ensure that relationships between CANs, Council and City Staff are mutually respectful.
- Provide an inclusive and respectful environment that supports positive interaction between CAN members.
- Identify administrative and financial support provided to the CANs from the CGS.
- Ensure that ultimate responsibility and decision making rests with the elected City Council.
- Create increased awareness of HCS and its connections to the CAN priorities.
- CANs are unique and reflect the diverse needs of each community. They are open to new members and encourage acceptance and inclusivity.
- Encourage active involvement and participation in CAN activities.

### *CAN Minimum Eligibility Requirements*

- Community driven and lead
- Non-profit in nature
- Open and transparent to the public
- Strive to represent the broad interests of the community
- Encourage active participation from all residents across a variety of ages and interests
- Reflect the cultural diversity of the community
- Actively participate in CAN Summits and other learning opportunities
- Meet a minimum of five times per year
- Knowledgeable in the HCS

### *How will Eligibility Be Measured?*

- Each CAN will conduct a visioning session to identify the community's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT Analysis).
- The priorities identified in the visioning session should be reviewed annually.
- Meetings will be advertised and open to the public.
- The Community Development Coordinator will be informed of CAN activities in a timely manner (i.e. meeting dates, agendas, minutes and newsletters).
- Individuals appointed or elected to executive positions within the CAN should be community members in that respective area.
- The CAN will seek community input and participation when initiating projects
- Each CAN will strive to engage the various service clubs and associations, and businesses within their area.
- Attendance at CAN Summits and other learning opportunities

### *Community Action Network (CAN) Terms of Engagement*

*Following the CGS's Public Participation Policy, the CAN's Terms of Engagement helps to define the interaction between Council, City Staff and CANs through the process of informing, consulting, involving and collaborating.*

### Inform

- Provide a Community Development Coordinator (CDC) as the primary liaison between the CGS and the CAN
- Identify a directory of key contacts from all departments within the CGS
- Provide information about CGS programs, policy change and opportunities (i.e. CANmail)
- CDCs are not required to attend all CAN meetings, however they are available to respond to CAN inquiries
- CANs assist in disseminating information to the local area.
- Provide a forum for CANs to exchange information and best practices with one another (i.e. CANmail and CAN Summits).
- CANs serve as a primary point of contact for the community for CGS projects and initiatives (HCS).

#### Considerations:

It is important that all information provided is timely, clearly defined and easily understood as well appropriately targeted to members of the CANs and that the basic concepts are in line with the H.C. priorities.

### Consult

- Encourage feedback when considering policy change or developing new ways of doing business that require community input
- Community consultation can be facilitated through CANs
- Attendance at CAN meetings to discuss issues or projects relevant to the CAN (i.e. promoting HCS)
- CANs provide feedback representative of the broader community
- Help to connect with other community champions.

#### Considerations:

This type of engagement involves seeking community views regarding specific issues.

### Involve

- Work directly with CANs to understand concerns at the community level
- Cooperatively develop solutions which will address the identified community needs
- Ensure CAN input is reflected in any directions chosen
- Communicate with CANs on how public input impacts final decisions
- CANs work with the CGS to increase awareness of participation in existing CGS programs.

#### Considerations:

This type of engagement is more of a process than consultation and is most effective when all relevant groups and individuals within a community are involved. The CAN requires a high level of organization for involvement to be effective, which details how decisions are made and the roles of all involved.

### Collaborate

- Work cooperatively with CANs to develop community partnerships to deliver outcome-based projects and programs

- Encourage partnerships with other community groups to nurture civic pride and engagement at the local level (i.e. service clubs, schools, etc.)
- CAN is working in each of the four pillars of the HCS (Active Living/Healthy Lifestyle, Civic Engagement/Social Capital, Natural Environment, Economic Growth)
- CAN reflects the cultural diversity of the community or neighbourhood it represents

#### Considerations:

To have successful collaboration, CANs must be truly representative of their communities. They should have representation from youth, seniors and the private sector. There should be representatives from service clubs and associations from the area. CANs need to be open and inclusive to all residents, and need to encourage participation from the community at large.

### *Administrative Support*

Those CANs meeting the minimum eligibility requirements will receive the following administrative support from the CGS:

- Meeting space
- CAN Reference manual
- Office space (if available)
- Printing of 3 newsletters annually
- Mysudbury.ca website space and training
- Promotional space in Leisure Guide (general CAN info)
- Liability coverage for approved CAN activities
- CANmail

### *Funding Recommendations*

In addition to the administrative support previously outlined, each CAN is eligible to receive the amount of \$2,500 per year. The funds are intended to cover costs associated with promotion of activities, photocopying, mailings, developing websites (other than mysudbury.ca sites), and other day-to-day expenses. CANs looking for financial support for outcome based projects have the option of requesting funds from their City Council representative, community sponsors or by submitting grant applications where eligible.

CANs are required to prepare an annual financial report in order to remain eligible for funding.

The report should include an outline of recent accomplishments, and should include a list of groups and associations affiliated with the CAN. Money is provided to CANs for annual operating expenditures and should not accrue over the years.

### *Ensuring CANs are Sustainable*

In addition to the administrative support provided by the CGS, learning opportunities and CAN Summits to assist with CAN sustainability will also be offered. CANs are expected to have members attend these learning opportunities as part of their eligibility. CAN Summits provide excellent networking opportunities and allow CANs to share ideas and best practices. To date some of the learning opportunities provided at the CAN Summits include presentations by Rainbow Routes, Greater Sudbury Police Services, and Volunteer Sudbury/Ontario Summer Games. Other topics covered have included HCS updates, social networking, youth engagement, and risk management.

Topics to be addressed at future CAN Summits may include:



- Volunteer recruitment
- Facilitating group discussions and effective meetings
- Conflict resolution/Consensus building
- Engaging seniors/private sector
- Strategic planning
- Special event organization
- Developing project proposals
- Succession planning

### *Reporting back to Council*

As with all other community groups, CANs may request the opportunity to present before Council. Presentations to Council provide CANs with an opportunity to update Council on their current projects and priorities.

## HOW THE CITY OF GREATER SUDBURY ENGAGES CANs (A VISUAL REPRESENTATION)

	Inform	Consult	Involve	Collaborate
Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•To provide information to increase the community's understanding of issues and decisions made for the CGS, for example: updates on progress of HCS and the Sustainable Mobility Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•To seek community level input regarding plans, policy and procedures</li> <li>•Seek input regarding HCS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered</li> <li>•Community to identify projects within the 4 pillars of HCS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision-making process including the suggestion of alternative ideas and the identification of preferred solutions.</li> <li>•Develop how to carry out HCS to entire community.</li> </ul>
CAN Stages of Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Few active members</li> <li>•Informal operating structure</li> <li>•Undeveloped ties with local associations</li> <li>•Introduction of HCS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Loose structure (Co-Chairs)</li> <li>•One or two active projects</li> <li>•Some key community organizations involved</li> <li>•Obtain input regarding HCS</li> <li>•Relate priorities and projects to the HCS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Some working committees</li> <li>•Well organized with regular meetings and broad community involvement</li> <li>•Work in multiple Healthy Community pillars but not all</li> <li>•Develop priorities and align with HCS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Youth, senior and business representation</li> <li>•Community associations well represented</li> <li>•Functioning sub-committees and executive/Recognition of HCS within planning and priorities</li> </ul>
Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Staff guiding process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key community champions identified to work with staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer of leadership to community</li> <li>• Established executive in place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•100% community driven</li> <li>•CAN Executive developing new leaders (succession planning)</li> </ul>
CAN Responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Disseminate information received to local community</li> <li>•Identify additional community partners</li> <li>•Work with CGS to increase participation in City programs (Community Clean Up, Trails, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide feedback which represents the broad community</li> <li>• Identify community partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead, engage and mobilize community groups and members</li> <li>• Use visioning sessions &amp; SWOT Analysis to identify community priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Involve and engage existing local community associations</li> <li>•Explore external funding opportunities to assist project funding</li> <li>•Pursue projects linked to HC Strategy</li> </ul>
CDC Role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Help navigate/guide CAN</li> <li>•Respond to inquiries</li> <li>•Educate CGS departments and Council regarding CANs</li> <li>•Introduce HCS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Animator</li> <li>•Keep other departments &amp; Council informed</li> <li>•Identify link(s) of project to HC pillars</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Enable</li> <li>•Facilitate</li> <li>•Keep other departments &amp; Council informed</li> <li>•Create link(s) of project to HC pillars</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Project support</li> <li>•Access to resources</li> <li>•Keep other departments &amp; Council informed</li> <li>•Encourage CANs to pursue projects that link to the HC pillars</li> </ul>
Other City Staff				

**Responsibilities**

- Respond to CAN inquiries
- Provide information through brochures, media releases, public meetings, etc.

- Survey CANs regarding potential policy changes
- Attend meetings, as requested with CANs to discuss plans and alternatives

- Engage CANs at the onset when considering changes to policies, procedures, etc.

- Work with CANs at all stages to realize outcome based projects (i.e. trails, parks, etc.)

**Council Role**

- To listen
- To provide information

- To solicit feedback
- To provide information

- To be involved in the decision-making process

- To use CANs as a community sounding board