



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien



Reaching the next Development Level: Changing a Client-Based Relationship to one of Collaboration

Summary Report on Consultations held by the
Department of Canadian Heritage – Fall 2004

Official Languages Support Programs Branch
Cooperation with the Community Sector

Canada

The opinion expressed in this publication are those of the participants and do not necessarily reflect federal government policy or opinion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF THE SUMMARY REPORT.....	5
CAVEAT.....	5
1. CONTEXT FOR CONSULTATIONS.....	6
2. THE KEY QUESTION	6
3. CONSULTATION SESSIONS MECHANICS.....	6
4. PARTICIPANT EVALUATION.....	7
5. SCENARIO DIALOGUES.....	8
6. CROSS-SECTIONAL THEMES IDENTIFIED DURING THE CONSULTATION SESSIONS.....	9
6.1. Communities should take responsibility for their own development.....	10
6.2. Canadian Heritage's essential role.....	11
6.3. A true partnership between Canadian Heritage and the communities.....	12
6.4. The interdepartmental issue.....	12
6.5. Streamlining the administrative process.....	13
6.6. Developing a sense of citizenship	13
7. THE PROPOSED COOPERATION FRAMEWORK	14
SECTION 2: FINDINGS AND POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS	38
8. THE MAIN FINDINGS AND POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS ENSUING FROM THESE FINDINGS	38
8.1. Ensure more stable and predictable funding for organizations that participate in community development.....	39
8.2. Strengthen the ability of the community development architects to focus their energies on results—centred on a shared global vision and strategic sequencing of actions to be undertaken.....	41
8.3. Clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Department and of the community network	42
CONCLUSION	44
APPENDIX 1: NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE SESSIONS	45
APPENDIX 2: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SCENARIOS	46
APPENDIX 3: DATA ON THE SESSION EVALUATIONS.....	48

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – Post-session evaluation questionnaire: average response scores	7
Table 2 – Evaluation of the scenarios before and after the sessions: average rating for each scenario.....	9
Table 3 – The cooperation's main features and the mechanism's implementation principles.....	15

PRESENTATION OF THE SUMMARY REPORT

This summary report is divided into two sections. The first section deals with the broad themes identified during the consultation sessions that were held to define the future directions of the collaboration between the Department of Canadian Heritage and the official-language minority communities. It uses various tools (session reports, pre-session and post-session questionnaires, evaluations by participants, etc.) to recall and organize the content generated by the participants during the sessions.

The second section deals with the sessions' findings and the possible directions that emerge from these findings. Our firm has been retained to communicate these findings and offer suggestions for possible directions. These suggestions do not reflect the positions of the Department of Canadian Heritage or the communities.

CAVEAT

This report naturally reflects the views of the consulting firm that facilitated the consultation sessions. The presentation of the themes in the summary report attempts to present as faithfully as possible the range of opinions in each province and territory.

There is a risk of oversimplification when drawing conclusions from consultation results that vary in each province and territory. The session reports provide us with a better understanding of the richness and unique character of each session. These reports are representative of what was said by the participants; they constitute the official report on the consultations.

Although the report demonstrates that, on a national scale, consensus and a common ground were reached on a number of broader themes, it also points out the specificity of each province and territory, and even of regions within larger provinces. The cooperation frameworks that the Department and the communities agree upon must take this distinctiveness into account.

The Department has decided to adopt an asymmetrical approach in defining the mechanisms for cooperation with the official-language minority community in each province and territory over the next few years. The merits of this approach are confirmed in the summary of results on the consultation sessions.

Budget allocations

Participants in all session emphasized the need to increase available funding. Everyone agreed to hold a separate forum on this issue and that, regardless of the budget size, it is necessary to determine what basic non-financial elements are important to the relationship between the Department and the community. Therefore, budgetary allocations were not discussed again during the sessions.

SECTION 1: CONSULTATIONS

1. CONTEXT FOR CONSULTATIONS

In her speech before the general assembly of the federation of francophone and Acadian communities (Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne du Canada) held in Halifax, on August 14, 2004, the Minister of Canadian Heritage told the audience:

[translation] “My objective is clear: to maximize the impact of our programs in your communities and to ensure that your issues become the government’s priorities. The time has come to rethink our ways of doing things and our mechanisms for cooperating with each other. They have brought us much success in the past, but we have a duty to improve them. [...]

It is essential that all the key players in the official-language minority communities of today and tomorrow—young people; women; community, social and economic agencies; educators and businesspeople; and all orders of government—have a voice in this process and work in closer cooperation than ever before.”

The Department of Canadian Heritage (referred to in this summary report as “Canadian Heritage” or as “the Department”) is currently considering what steps to take to strengthen cooperation between itself and the community development architects involved in building the official-language minority communities (referred to in this summary report as “the communities”). In particular, these consultation sessions focused on the goals of the *Cooperation with the Community Sector* sub-component of the Department’s Official Languages Support Programs.

2. THE KEY QUESTION

The key question for these consultation sessions was:

“Considering the strategic objectives of the Department and those of the communities, how can the impact of the Department’s Cooperation with the Community Sector be maximized?”

3. CONSULTATION SESSIONS MECHANICS

To fully examine the question, 17 consultation sessions were held in the provinces and territories between October 13 and December 7, 2004. These sessions enabled some 455 individuals with more than 8,000 years of cumulative experience in community development to deliberate for a full day on the values and principles that should frame the relationship between the communities and the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Representatives from the Department and the communities drew up the list of participants in the sessions. In general, half of the participants from the communities came from various associations, a quarter represented various institutions, and another quarter were opinion leaders not belonging to these other groups.

To facilitate group discussions during the consultation sessions, the Department used a method called "deliberative dialogue." With this method, scenarios are developed specifically for the purpose of providing a framework for a dialogue session and to encourage discussion. In this case, participants were given three different scenarios to examine; the scenarios were designed to encourage participants to reflect on the fundamental values that should be part of the relationship between the Department and the community sector.

Using this process, it was possible for most participants of each consultation session to find common ground. In addition, the session led to the development of a fourth realistic scenario, based on this common ground, which offered an even better opportunity to answer the key question. Lastly, participants were able to define the desired mechanisms for cooperation between the Department and the communities, based on this fourth scenario.

Each session was presided by a senior Department official.

4. PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

Participants were asked to fill out an evaluation questionnaire on site. Eighty-one percent (391 of the 455 participants) completed and returned the questionnaires.

The questionnaire used a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 indicated "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." The median value was 3.

The results of these questionnaires showed that the participants were generally satisfied with the sessions, as summarized in Table 1:

Table 1 – Post-session evaluation questionnaire: average response scores

STATEMENT	AVERAGE RESPONSE SCORE*
A. I received the materials in time to review them before the session.	3.82
B. The Guide for Deliberation was easy to understand.	4.31
C. The background document provided me with useful information that I needed to participate.	3.37
D. The process allowed for an interesting exchange between participants that added to my own thinking about the issues.	4.66
E. The facilitators kept the dialogue on track, but did not stifle participants.	4.60
F. The process enabled me to express my views and ideas.	4.68
G. Participants represented a good cross-section of the stakeholders interested in this issue.	4.42
H. The facilities and refreshments helped to make for a productive day.	4.29
I. Overall, I am pleased with the consultation and its output.	4.46

* On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "strongly disagree" and 5 = "strongly agree."

It should be mentioned that the provincial/territorial profile (question C) was handed out on site for information purposes only and was not used during the sessions. People were

particularly satisfied with the method used because it allowed them to express their opinions, while hearing the other participants' points of view. Participants gave statement (I), "Overall, I am pleased with the consultation and its output." - a rating of 4.46.

Results for the nine multiple-choice questions (A to I) handed out at all 17 sessions can be found in Appendix 3.

5. RESULTS OF DIALOGUES ON THE SCENARIOS

About one week before each session, a deliberation guide was sent to the participants.

This guide presented three scenarios to help start the dialogue process. Participants were asked to fill out scenario evaluation questionnaires before and after the sessions, in order to generate quantitative data regarding their views on these scenarios.

During the plenary sessions, the participants in each of the 17 sessions readily agreed that a fourth hybrid scenario had to be developed, which would comprise the positive and important aspects of the three scenarios along with any other issues that emerged during the dialogues.

The scenarios did not represent options from which to choose. Rather, each scenario was based on a choice of values and proposes specific actions with specific consequences. The scenarios were meant to give participants a concrete basis for examining the fundamental values that should inform the relationship between the Department and the community sector.

The three scenarios were:

Scenario 1: Canadian Heritage determines funding priorities in accordance with its strategic objectives.

Under this scenario, the Department determines what action priorities it will support according to its mission and its strategic objectives. It seeks to develop partnerships and projects that are consistent with these objectives.

Scenario 2: Canadian Heritage supports the development priorities identified by the communities.

Under this scenario, the communities determine their priorities through community forums and organizations and by preparing development plans. Canadian Heritage provides funding to support the community priorities that will enable it to achieve its program results.

Scenario 3: Canadian Heritage invests to help build the communities' capacity for social action.

Under this scenario, the communities want to obtain stable services from governmental and quasi-governmental institutions. Canadian Heritage allocates funding to help the communities build their capacities for advocacy. These capacities are based on knowledge and on communication that influences public opinion.

The following instructions were given for pre- and post-session questionnaires: "For each scenario, indicate how favourable or unfavourable you feel towards it, on a scale of 1 to 6, where 1 means totally unfavourable and 6, you means totally favourable. Circle the number that best reflects your opinion." On a scale of 1 to 6, the median value was 3.50.

Of the 455 participants, 425 filled out and returned the scenario evaluation questionnaires.

Table 2 shows the average ratings for each of the scenarios — before and after the sessions.

Table 2 – Evaluation of the scenarios before and after the sessions: average rating for each scenario.

AVERAGE RATING FOR EACH SCENARIO			
	SCENARIO 1	SCENARIO 2	SCENARIO 3
Pre-session rating	2.51	4.45	3.70
Post-session rating	2.37	4.59	3.26
Difference	-0.14	+0.14	-0.45

These results confirm that the values and principles presented in Scenario 2 were considered by the participants to be the fundamental values that should govern the relationship between the Department and the community sector. This scenario was given the highest post-session rating (4.59).

The day-long session gave participants the opportunity for in-depth reflection, since they had to identify the strengths and weaknesses, and the advantages and disadvantages of each scenario, and for each case, find the common ground on which an agreement could be built, that is, the values and principles that would be fundamental to the relationship between the Department and the communities. These points will be brought up again in subsequent sections of this report.

6. CROSS-SECTIONAL THEMES IDENTIFIED DURING THE CONSULTATION SESSIONS

Six cross-sectional themes were identified during the consultation sessions. These themes should be taken into account when choosing mechanisms for cooperation.

6.1. Communities-driven development

When participants discussed mechanisms of cooperation between the Department and the communities, all agreed that the fundamental principle that development is community-driven.

This is an issue that was brought up unequivocally, many times, and in many ways, at every session. The following sub-themes emerged:

Communities must have the capacity to ensure their development. This includes ways to cooperate, to develop a knowledge base, and to prepare and implement action plans. The consultations revealed varying points of view between all the provinces and territories on this subject. In some cases, people affirmed that the last 10 to 15 years had enabled the community to develop many ways of cooperating and that they were proud of their successes. These communities have developed effective mechanisms for democratic representation, although these could be improved upon. Their research capabilities have broadened their advocacy for representation at the municipal and provincial levels.

In other instances, people said that their community had achieved some progress in its capacity to define community-driven development, but that there remained a lot of work to be done. In some cases, when a province is quite large, long distances make community-driven development to achieve. In other cases, the population is very small and there may be a lot of demographic shifts because of the ebb and flow of a migrant population, so cohesion has to be rebuilt with new people. The smallest communities wanted to emphasize how the developmental dynamics had evolved over the years. Advocacy and political actions can have an impact on the social fabric of these communities as well as on their relationships with members of the majority and can even affect family and social bonds. People want to coexist with their neighbours. As such, community-driven development is not synonymous with advocacy.

It was recognized that successful initiatives have come from the communities, but that the federal, provincial and/or municipal governments have supported them. Be it in the health, education, economic, cultural or other sectors, the communities have identified the issues and defined their priorities. In all sessions, it was generally agreed that the community must continue to identify its issues and determine its needs and priorities.

The word “community” has to be synonymous with inclusiveness. According to the participants, this inclusiveness must extend to different geographic areas, different development sectors, diversity within communities, emerging groups, and without forgetting disadvantaged individuals.

The community has to continue to play a role in analysing funding allocations. This sub-theme received unanimous support. **There were significantly divergent viewpoints on the full extent of this role.**

In some regions, it was felt that this role should be limited to developing a general framework for funding allocations that relates to the needs identified by the community and to the priorities defined to meet those needs. In other regions, it was felt that this role could go as far as recommending fund allocations to various groups, thereby enabling the community to act as an arbitrator. It was noted during the sessions that, although internal arbitration can be challenging and foster tensions between groups, it does help a community to create a strong network.

Since the Department and the communities are preparing to negotiate asymmetrical mechanisms of a nature and scale that could vary from one province or territory to another, the issue of community input in the analysis of funding allocations becomes very important. We will come back to it in the section that deals with possible follow-ups.

6.2. Canadian Heritage's essential role

Canadian Heritage is the guardian of the national strategy and plays several fundamental roles that support community development.

This was a recurring theme during many of the consultations. The Department's role is not diminished by community-driven development. The cooperation mechanism is a tool that should enable the entire federal system to acknowledge and support the community in playing a central role in its own development.

The subthemes that were identified are as follows:

Some sessions recommended that the component on official-language community development be added as an explicit strategic objective for the Department.

Participants repeatedly mentioned the necessity to maximize the financial impact of Canadian Heritage's actions. The Department's influence can extend to many areas, including, for example, support for community advocacy efforts, nominations to boards, committees and work groups, and the inclusion of linguistic clauses in federal-provincial agreements.

There were also gradations in how the communities view the fulfilment of Canadian Heritage's essential role. In the richer provinces, communities are relatively well structured and developing well. In these cases, the Department's role is mainly one of interdepartmental and intergovernmental influence.

Other communities are still at a relatively early point in their development. Their main characteristic is that, outside of the school system, community services are only available through volunteer organizations supported by Canadian Heritage. The Department's cooperation mechanisms increase the legitimacy of the official-language minority community and its organizations in the eyes of provincial and municipal authorities and, in some cases, in the eyes of the official-language majority community.

6.3. A true partnership between Canadian Heritage and the communities

The consultations led to the unequivocal conclusion that a true partnership between Canadian Heritage and the communities is needed. This partnership must result from a political choice on both sides and it has to be based on mutual trust and respect.

All the sessions substantiated and reinforced this theme.

The sub-themes that were identified are as follows:

The cooperation framework must be based on this declaration of partnership. Many sessions' participants reported that the community has expressed concern about the Department's possible withdrawal from the communities. The involvement of other departments should not result in the withdrawal of Canadian Heritage from its sphere of action; its action must continue.

The nature and impact of this partnership will vary from one province and territory to another, according to the community's development level. In some cases, the communities want the Department to participate in their planning. People want to know, among other things, where the Department stands regarding their priorities and what is its margin of manoeuvrability. In other cases, communities wish to see Canadian Heritage exercise leadership at the interdepartmental and intergovernmental levels and create a synergy between stakeholders.

In a few sessions, participants mentioned that Canadian Heritage's role is to support a community and not to lead it. In that context, participants asked the Department to respect decision-making structures and processes established by the communities. When some question the structures, the community prefers to handle the issue on its own.

6.4. The interdepartmental issue

Somewhere in the federal system, there must be an authority, supported by a clear federal government policy, concerned with the development of official-language minority communities. This is how the participation of other federal departments in community development was defined. This theme was brought up in many different ways throughout the consultations, and a good deal of time was spent on the subject.

The sub-themes that were identified are as follows:

Canadian Heritage must continue to speak on the behalf of official-language minority communities and be its forceful defender.

To achieve true cooperation, departments and agencies must take make true undertakings, not act as 'tourists'.

The gradation of the views expressed also reflected the developmental level of the communities.

At very least, all sessions saw the importance of a cooperative effort between the federal parties involved to set strategic objectives with regards to the recognition and vitality of

the communities. There was a strong consensus among some of the communities that some of the federal departments should participate in the cooperation mechanism at the local level.

Some participants also indicated that Canadian Heritage should be able to play a funding ‘flow-through’ role for other federal departments and that it should act as the focal point for community accountability to various departments.

Finally, some communities, which identified themselves as being in the beginning stages of development, stated that Canadian Heritage is their lobbyist within the federal government.

6.5. Streamlining the administrative process

Streamlining and speeding up the administrative process is a foremost priority.

This was unanimously agreed upon in all the sessions. Participants stated emphatically that the excessive paperwork involved in submitting requests and follow-up reports had become more than mildly irritating. Some organizations had to resort to instituting ‘management volunteers’ to deal with the overload—a task that is not very rewarding with little added value for community development. And unfortunately, the overload exhausts volunteers’ goodwill and contribution.

Participants in the sessions confirmed the need to implement simple and effective administrative processes while keeping in mind that “simple” does mean “more streamlined,” but not necessarily “easier.” Participants also confirmed that the community is willing to report on its actions, to be held accountable for its decisions, and to ensure that the accountability includes consequences.

6.6. Developing a sense of citizenship

Minority communities should not be seen as being comprised of client groups, but rather, are formed of citizens. Participants expressed a desire for a model based on citizenship as a form of partnership. They do not want a market-based model where the community is considered a client, and even less do they want a model based on charitable assistance where the community is seen as receiving public hand-outs.

Emotions ran high on this topic, and participants brought up this theme repeatedly. The terms “clients” and “beneficiaries” found in the dialogue workbook produced strong and negative reactions.

This theme’s inherent value comes from the following: when government works with its citizens towards the development of all communities, and this includes linguistic communities, then the whole country benefits.

7. THE PROPOSED COOPERATION FRAMEWORK

The cooperation mechanism is at the heart of the consultations. Participants from all the various sessions unanimously confirmed that a cooperation framework is needed to define the relationship between Canadian Heritage and the communities. The reason is obvious, according to the participants: Canadian Heritage is the key source of support to the communities. In most cases, the Department is the only stable source of funding for the associative network, through its sub-component, the *Cooperation with the Community Sector*.

Participants in all the sessions agreed that, as an operating principle, decision-making bodies should be established to act as a bridge between the community and the Department.

The consultations also revealed major differences between communities and their experiences with existing mechanisms.

A summary report can only garner very general guidelines such as the need for inclusiveness, cooperation, reporting, and so on. These are themes and values that were known before holding the consultations. We have designed the following summary report table, Table 3, which outlines the main features of the cooperation framework and the principles for implementing cooperation mechanisms, which were developed in the 17 consultation sessions.

Table 3 – The cooperation's main features and the mechanism's implementation principles

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
BRITISH COLUMBIA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The francophone community's uniqueness in British Columbia must be recognized. 2. The community is responsible for its development and pursue an engagement strategy (strategic commitment, community participation). 3. Socio-demographic, socio-geographic, and cultural equity has to be ensured. 4. There is a need for accountability inside and outside the community (to take part in what is going on elsewhere). 5. A distinction should be made between management mechanisms and key principles. 6. The existing community assets must be protected. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This means that continuity must be maintained to ensure evolution—services and organizations should be kept in place. The community needs a certain stability to achieve long-term and sustainable development. A broad vision is encouraged. There should be emphasis on maintaining what the community has gained as a whole, such as services for example, instead of what is gained by the organizations specifically. • It must be done within available funding. • It must not hinder the community's evolution. Its evolution has to be recognized as well as its emerging needs; they are interconnected and complement each other. There is no clear consensus on how this value can be demonstrated. However, it is acknowledged as a community value and its members should discuss it. For some, it's up to Canadian Heritage to interpret it and put it into effect 7. It should be acknowledged that expertise in community development exists as much at the community level as it does within the Department. This relationship has to be nurtured, and there needs to be good interaction and a true partnership to fully develop and put this expertise to good use. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Canadian Heritage must recognize and support the central role that the community must play in its own development. Support must be given in an equitable manner and should recognize the differences that exist between the provinces and within a province. The community wishes the mechanism to take into account the need for a long-term vision. The partnership is reciprocal: Canadian Heritage has important work to do and the community wants to help carry it out. 2. Equity means equal opportunities, equal criteria and a consideration of specificities and of development realities. Attention should be paid to what has been accomplished, to developing partnerships within the network of community groups, to supporting associations in trouble. The community must keep an open mind. Equity must be assured at demographic and geographic levels. 3. Once the agreement is signed, it must be adhered to.

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
ALBERTA	<p>1. The community would like to work as a partner with Canadian Heritage towards achieving the Department's strategic objectives while also meeting the community's needs and priorities, as defined in a bottom-up approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An optimal balance has to be found between the present vertical relationship and a horizontal cooperation of equals. • The community wants to be able to work with the Department's program officers in an atmosphere of mutual exchange instead of trying to win them over to get a positive recommendation. The officers' role should be to provide assistance. • The Canadian Heritage program officers should facilitate access to the federal system and to the best community development practices in the country. They must play a bigger part than merely analyzing requests for support. <p>2. A consistent and flexible cooperation is desired. There should be a joint committee formed that would give the community equal power, but it should not hold perpetual consultations on ordinary issues such as funding allocations. Some participants brought up the fundamental imbalance in the relationship between government and community. The process of funding allocations should be simplified so that efforts can be focused on the mobilization of the community around development objectives.</p> <p>3. The Department should actively demonstrate respect for agreements drawn up with the communities. Its administrative process should respect deadlines, project schedules, claims, payments, and so on.</p>	<p>1. The community would like to work as a partner with Canadian Heritage towards achieving the Department's strategic objectives, while also meeting the community's needs and priorities, as defined starting from the bottom-up.</p> <p>2. A consistent and flexible cooperation approach is desired. There should be a joint committee formed that would give the community equal power with the Department, but it should not hold perpetual consultations on ordinary issues such as the allocation of funds.</p> <p>3. The Department should actively demonstrate respect for agreements drawn up with the communities. Its administrative process should take into account deadlines, project schedules, claims, payments, and so on.</p>

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
SASKATCHEWAN	<p>1. The community drives its own development: It should be acknowledged that the community developed its own capacities, skills, autonomy, and democratic structures, and that it holds the expertise for its own development. It is up to the community to ensure its development and Canadian Heritage should recognize this responsibility.</p> <p>2. Partnership: The community and Canadian Heritage should define their roles and responsibilities together and evaluate their partnership. When speaking of partnership, it does not mean that the community should play the role of client or benefit recipient. The community defines its global priorities and manages its developmental issues. It is an equal partnership; each party needs the other and both have to make it work together. There should be mutual respect. The true value of each party's contribution is comparable; the contribution made by the Department is essentially one of financial support, and that by the community is one of volunteer work but must be appreciated at its fair values. The federal government must acknowledge the valuable contribution of the community's initiatives. The community seeks to establish a partnership with the entire federal government; this would include the Privy Council and the Treasury Board.</p> <p>3. Administrative flexibility: It is necessary to act on the supply and also on the demand. Canadian Heritage is the most important supporter of the community network; the maintenance and stability of this network must be ensured for the long term. Ways to consolidate the community network are being sought, and increased participation would be welcome. Canadian Heritage should play a central role in cultural matters and in dealing with interdepartmental issues. A much greater proactive participation is required. However, Canadian Heritage cannot be expected to shoulder all the responsibility for consolidation of the network. Other departments should be involved.</p>	<p>1. Interdepartmental relations: The community has many federal partners. Ways should be examined to include them in the agreement within the context of the Plan of action on official languages, subject to certain conditions.</p> <p>2. Intraprovincial asymmetry: The community endorses the principle of asymmetry within a province, but within a context of stability, sustainability, and consolidation. Different levels of community development require an asymmetrical approach to support local communities.</p>

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
MANITOBA	<p>1. Interdepartmental participation:</p> <p>When cooperation is discussed, it is clear that this must include the participation of other federal departments in the implementation of the global development plan at the local and regional levels. It has been demonstrated for 10 years now that interdepartmental cooperation can work, but it must be implemented on a regional and local level, and it requires that a department assume an advocacy role. Canadian Heritage must be the interdepartmental advocate and, as such, it must have some power.</p> <p>2. Federal policy and Canadian Heritage's authority:</p> <p>In the federal system, an authority must exist that is supported by a clear federal government policy. Canadian Heritage must remain a strong interlocutor on behalf of minorities, but it does not appear to have the power to open doors. So that a true "cooperation" can be achieved, serious signatories are required. A local mechanism is needed to ensure the participation of other federal departments. Canadian Heritage should act as the vehicle for funding from other federal departments, and it should be the focal point for community accountability to various departments.</p> <p>3. Equity between groups in terms of having access to Departmental support:</p> <p>Equity between groups means that every group has the same opportunity for support with regards to new needs identified by the community. Smaller groups could be marginalized; it must be ensured that the groups' priorities are well reflected, and that there is a frequent return to these priorities, and that this does not happen as infrequently as every five years. It was stressed that "equity" does not necessarily mean "equality." Equity refers to equal access but also cooperative efforts with other groups that do not fit into the agreements.</p> <p>4. Transparency:</p> <p>The process should be more public than it is today. Both Canadian Heritage and the community have a role to play in making this happen. The preparation process for the global development plan should be much more open. People should be more aware of deadlines; the stages of the process and the people involved should be made clear to foster greater participation.</p> <p>5. The community should drive its development:</p> <p>This value must be vibrant. Community assets must not be lost. The community has developed an internal capacity for competences,</p>	<p>1. The community will determine which issues to focus on during the next five years.</p> <p>2. The community defines the issues with the cooperation and support of Canadian Heritage and other departments. These departments must participate in the dialogue on how to best deal with the issues. The departments must contribute to the effort in a transparent and respectful manner to achieve true partnership.</p> <p>3. Being able to define the issues implies a capacity for analysis and research. This ability is based on knowledge rather than impressions. And to acquire the knowledge necessary to the decision-making process, one must have access to resources such as research material and national perspectives.</p> <p>4. A community's empowerment should go as far as acting as an arbitrator for its own development and being held accountable for the results. A measurable element has to be present as well as a way to evaluate performance. The community must also deal with the consequences of the arbitration, including conflicts that may emerge from time to time.</p> <p>5. Canadian Heritage's responsibility is to make sure the community is equipped to assume full responsibility and look after its own arbitration. All groups should be equally prepared by having access to knowledge and research capacity.</p> <p>6. The community would like to base its cooperation with specific groups on the principle of equal opportunity. It is understood that conditions must apply.</p>

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
	<p>expertise, necessary knowledge, and skills in fostering community development. It is up to the community to pursue this development. Taking charge implies taking responsibility. The community must negotiate, internally, its objectives and arbitrate the choice of ways to achieve them. The community must be able to come together to define objectives, to assess results and to arbitrate resources around emerging needs; this can be difficult, and it requires great maturity. Taking charge means having the power to make decisions together. In such a context, federal-government partners should not be regarded as the “welfare state,” but rather as true partners that can assess their contribution based on results and can evaluate their own performance with regards to supporting community development.</p> <p>In other words, the message that the community is giving Canadian Heritage is: “Help us to better help ourselves.” The community can clearly take responsibility for its own development and for handling risks and consequences.</p>	

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
NORTHERN ONTARIO	<p>1. Shared leadership in the community: In order to maximize the program's impact, the community must give itself a decision-making centre. Geographic representation (and sectoral, when applicable) is important. An appropriate mechanism to ensure the representation of diverse interests, in particular those of underdeveloped regions and under-represented groups should be established. The decision-making body would foster cohesion and lead to the emergence of a political voice, like a consortium. The centre must also enhance the credibility of all the stakeholders within the community as a whole, outside the restricted circle of official-language minority communities.</p> <p>2. A shared leadership between the community and Canadian Heritage: In order to achieve the community's development objectives, there has to be a meeting-point between the community and the government; this would be a decision-making centre that provides the communities with resources and that gathers together all the stakeholders including Canadian Heritage. The Department's role in this collaboration would be threefold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a supportive role to the community in its development efforts; • Play a coordinating role at the governmental level—it should act as the link and the coordinator of other departments; • Play the role of facilitator—it should ensure that there is effective mediation within the community without taking on the role of mediator. <p>3. Separating the political process from the management process: The political coordination process that takes place between the community and the Department should be kept separate from the process of managing the financial envelope. Administering the funds by a separate process would help ensure transparency.</p>	<p>1. Openness to new groups.</p> <p>2. Innovation for all new groups.</p> <p>3. Continued development.</p> <p>4. Programs, projects, stability:</p> <p>Consideration must be given to sustainability and stability: It is important for the communities that program stability, sustainability, effectiveness, and quality standards always remain a priority, while ensuring an inclusive process. Projects are important for new groups, and they must be integrated in the cooperation with the Department with the full support of the existing community network.</p> <p>Stability and continued development will come from effective programming (human resources, organization), and innovation will come from projects.</p>

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
SOUTHERN ONTARIO	<p>1. The non-financial impact of Canadian Heritage's contribution must be maximized. For example, this includes lobbying, nominations, and the inclusion of linguistic clauses in federal-provincial agreements.</p> <p>2. Federal departments need to make a concerted effort. It is Canadian Heritage's responsibility to encourage other departments to support the development of official-language minority communities and to be accountable to them.</p> <p>The community therefore wants the Department to act as its lobbyist with other federal departments.</p> <p>3. This type of collaboration should increase the communities' ability to act.</p>	<p>1. Part of the financial envelope has to be invested in organizations that can sustain themselves. Application of this principle means that once a project becomes self-sufficient, it should be able to function on its own. If projects are subsidized with the aim of making them self-sufficient, they can no longer be resubmitted for support.</p> <p>2. Criteria has to be established jointly; to do so, there needs to be an accountable and representative community process.</p> <p>3. Once criteria are in place, Canadian Heritage has to do its work. Its decisions must follow integrated guidelines and be justified by the Department to the community.</p> <p>The group had various opinions on how much the community should participate in deciding on fund allocation. Some believed that the community should not necessarily be directly involved. Others believed that the community should participate to better reflect its specificity; this should not be a problem if there is an accountability mechanism in place to accompany fund allocation.</p> <p>4. A new system is needed that would establish a cooperation mechanism based on a new definition of the role of Canadian Heritage's officers. Under this new system, officers would have to specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Act as facilitators for community development; • Support organizational development; • Analyze community development.

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
EASTERN ONTARIO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Canadian Heritage should manage the program's finances. 2. In order to maximize the cooperation's impact, there has to be shared planning for the entire community. 3. Planning should be separate from managing the financial envelope. 4. Inclusiveness and community diversity must always be considered. 5. An equalization formula should be applied to the financial envelope. 6. The community has to be equipped to deal with challenges. 7. In the shared planning process, inclusiveness must be built into the discussion process. 8. The asymmetry within Ontario should be recognized. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The community develops a shared and common plan; it does not manage the financial envelope and concentrates on program development. 2. Planning is separate from funds management. Planning is left to the community and managing funds is left to Canadian Heritage. 3. The community and Canadian Heritage co-develop a framework for planning and one for fund allocation. 4. Canadian Heritage is responsible for the specific awarding of funds based on priorities. 5. The community determines the main priorities. The Department designs a framework for strategic planning and one for the allocation of funds based on these priorities.

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
RURAL QUEBEC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The vision and the framework should be very large. Community priorities must be addressed, and Canadian Heritage needs to provide an umbrella large enough for different types of activities to happen and for different types of groups to access funding. Guidelines must be all encompassing rather than restrictive. 2. The challenge of accessing funds is not easily manageable for small groups. There are all kinds of funds available, but the challenge is to access it; getting information on those sources is a first step, but user-friendliness is a second, necessary step. Accessing multi-program source funds would be preferable. It is essential for the English-speaking community to access funding from various departments, but the government must streamline this, so as to eliminate unnecessary duplicate systems. The relationship with government must be a simple one, ideally a direct, "one-stop" relationship. 3. There is a need to change the general culture of our relationships, especially within our groups, from a negative one to a more positive one. 4. There is a need for multi-year funding. This is a major issue for small rural communities, where there is very limited capacity to write proposals and reports. 5. Not only the government, but also urban communities, must expand their knowledge base about rural communities; the rural communities are different from prevailing perceptions in many ways. 6. There is a lack of critical mass in rural English-speaking communities. This must be recognized in the way the program is implemented. 7. There needs to be a closer and more frequent monitoring of the vitality of the community. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both the communities and the government must be accountable, and must also be accountable to each other. 2. The vitality of the community needs frequent monitoring. 3. Co-management must focus on strategic thinking rather than on operational issues. 4. Reporting must be streamlined. 5. Canadian Heritage must remain the primary—although not the exclusive—door to the federal government. 6. There needs to be a more equitable level of funding. 7. Canadian Heritage has to actively listen to communities. 8. Rural communities have to be prepared for change, and must have support for this.

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
URBAN QUEBEC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First and foremost, as a principle, there should be a consensual agreement on equitable division of resources between French and English minority communities. 2. Defining the foundations of the cooperation mechanism should take the focus off money and put it onto values, objectives, and priorities. 3. Canadian Heritage plays and should continue to play a strong role in Quebec's English-speaking community. Canadian Heritage must champion the cause of minority languages, and other departments must have their own champions, so that the federal government as a whole is a true Champion of official languages. With an effective coordination function and with all departments contributing within their respective mandates, there will be results. 4. The community must be in the driver's seat as far as its priorities are concerned. There is recognition that the prevailing representation structure is not entirely inclusive and that the participants at the discussion table must reach out to include broader participation. Individual groups that are presently receiving support need to look at the community's development from a wider perspective and in the longer term. 5. The cooperation mechanism must provide a space to discuss and address challenges, through consultations, as well as to discuss day-to-day issues. The key words here are horizontality, equity, and partnership. 6. The community, working collaboratively with Canadian Heritage, should seek: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An agreement on representation—on who represents the community and on when individual groups should come forward in the process; • A collaborative decision-making process, strategic priority-setting; • A clarification of mutual expectations between the Department and the community; • Equitable budget allocation and common criteria for allocation which are respectful of groups, sectors and regions; • No decisions on specific allocation of funds to individual groups, but rather some kind of review opportunity or appeal mechanism. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inclusiveness and diversity: In operational terms, inequities will need to be corrected along the way; this might include, at some point, that Canadian Heritage act as an arbitrator. 2. Collaborative partnership: The community and the government need to have a common discussion table. 3. Participants at this common discussion table would have decision-making capacity as far as setting priorities goes. However, there is no agreement on whether this group should have decision-making power or only act as consultants on funding allocation. 4. The idea of a parity committee taking charge is endorsed as a principle, but the group agrees the community is not ready yet for such a decision-making committee. 5. There must be a separation between the process of setting objectives and priorities (which deals with ideas, principles, values, strategic planning, etc.) and the process of allocating funds. There is no agreement on whether or not the allocation of funds should be part of the community's responsibilities. Some participants suggested that there could be a community review of funding applications.

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
NEW BRUNSWICK	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There should be acknowledgement of New Brunswick's specific legislative and social characteristics. 2. There should be acknowledgement of the cooperation mechanisms developed by the community. 3. The community assumes responsibility for identifying its own development priorities with Canadian Heritage's support. 4. There should be acknowledgement of the community as a "partner" and not a "client." 5. The community's and the government's performance must be more strategic and more inclusive. 6. The community should be properly equipped. 7. Regarding interdepartmental participation and maintaining Canadian Heritage's present field of action, other departments' involvement should not mean that Canadian Heritage is disengaging from community initiatives. 8. Interdepartmental and intergovernmental involvement as secondary levers. 9. Civil and local governance should be developed. 	<p>1. New Brunswick's particular characteristics should be reflected in agreements and mechanisms.</p> <p>New Brunswick's particular characteristics have several dimensions. It is important to see beyond the numbers, the relative proportion of the province's francophone community, and the fact that the province is the only one that is officially bilingual, and to see its vitality, its responsibilities, and its commitments to success and to extending a helping hand to the communities. The means must be equal to the needs, and that could even extend to setting up "positive discrimination policies" that would allow a presence in all the sectors and urban centres as well as in rural areas.</p> <p>2. The present mechanism should be improved and made more inclusive.</p> <p>The Forum and the Agreement are solid mechanisms for coordinating and directing the community. Less structured groups must have more room to operate. There is no need to completely revise the forum, and the mechanism, but they should be improved: funding allocations should be reviewed; the amount of energy spent on managing the agreement should be reduced; and organizations should be encouraged to become more organized. The means to accomplish this have to be made available.</p> <p>There is the question of providing support to 'eligible students' ('ayant droits'), usually children of Acadian ancestry, but even this is becoming more diversified. There are other 'eligible students' (francophone immigrants). The community needs support, infrastructure, and resources to reach these francophone immigrants.</p>

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
		<p>3. The community must be prepared to participate effectively in tripartite agreements.</p> <p>The community's maturity and level of development require a more extensive partnership. Another kind of lever is needed, such as a tripartite partnership that would include the community, the government, and the private sector. It would require an intergovernmental synergy between the federal government, provincial government, and municipalities. Within this partnership, Canadian Heritage must assume a leadership role, and not only one of a facilitator. This partnership should allow the community to move forward—not hinder or slow down what is already being achieved within a bipartite partnership between the community and Canadian Heritage.</p> <p>In the first phase, the tripartite partnership would include the community, and the federal and provincial governments. But it needs time to evolve into a true tripartite working partnership and, as such, it could take up the program's next five-year cycle.</p> <p>4. The mechanism must serve to develop civil and local governance as well as citizenship participation.</p> <p>Volunteer work translates into good citizenship and an active and civic-minded community. Canadian Heritage must recognize the economic value, among other benefits, that volunteer work brings to community development. Volunteer work must be seen as enriching the community, even if it's difficult to attach an economic value to it. The community cannot be expected to contribute in a financial way. However, human resources, and particularly volunteer work, have a financial value.</p> <p>The community would like to receive</p>

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
		financial support and not be subsidized; it wants to be held accountable and to assume its responsibilities. Major changes are needed (at a financial level and at many other levels); Canadian Heritage must recognize that associations and francophone institutions benefit Canadian society, and that they deserve the respect due to long-standing partners.

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To maximize the program's impact, a community-based approach should be adopted to help build the communities' capacities for advocacy, while maintaining and developing services to the francophone community. 2. The system should also ensure inclusiveness beyond community organizations, especially in the crafting of the global development plan. As a first step, people suggested that the community should first "clean up its own backyard" and get organized, before going on to forge a cooperative relationship with Canadian Heritage and other departments. Community organizations must also work with majority groups on advocacy issues that are not limited to linguistic minority issues. 3. Inclusiveness should be assured for individuals and should take into account family income, literacy levels, and other factors that determine people's capacity to participate. If aspects of living in French—for example, participating in cultural activities—are not financially accessible, then programs are benefiting those who least need them. Prince Edward Island's francophone community organizations want to be inclusive, diversified, open, and democratic. 4. An effort should be made not to make the application and reporting process increasingly demanding. Forms should be brief and simple to use. If there is greater interdepartmental involvement, we must realize that it will not be possible to restrict the process to one support request that would be acceptable to all departments. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inclusiveness: The greatest participation possible of groups and individuals has to be accommodated and such a participation level should be sustained. 2. Interdepartmental involvement: There should be more sources of funding available for community development at federal and provincial levels. 3. Streamlined administrative process: Ways must be found to make sure that organizations spend more time on community development than on fulfilling administrative requirements. 4. Partnership ("together"): Collaboration with Canadian Heritage has to happen between equals. The community and the Department should be true partners in community development.

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
NOVA SCOTIA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The community should set its own priorities and be defined in an inclusive way. People do not always agree on what constitutes a need, but actions have to nevertheless converge while still respecting developmental stages. A shared vision has to be promoted; the global development plan should bring people together and help create networks. How priorities are determined is important; it should involve a process that facilitates making difficult choices. 2. Sustainable development should be targeted so that stable and long-term structures are established at the provincial and local levels. Community organizations can usually count on a large number of volunteers, but they also need permanent staffing. They need organizational stability: there has to be some guarantee of permanent staffing that is not wholly contingent on agreements being renewed. Where permanent structures exist, they should be consolidated; the established community network should be maintained for the good of the communities. 3. Transparency and reporting must be ensured. There has to be an available list of criteria to guide Canadian Heritage and the communities in achieving effective reporting and transparency. Efficiency is essential. 4. Actions must be based on a sound knowledge of what is involved in community development and on ways of communicating with the public. The democratic process within organisations should prevail. Organizations should not presume to know what the population's priorities are. That's where information and education are crucial, since consultations on uninformed public opinion would not be very useful. Canadian Heritage is the best source of information on priority issues (immigration, education) that are shared by the official-language minority community as a whole. 5. Cooperation should be based on mutual respect and understanding between Canadian Heritage and the communities. Both must assume responsibility for failures and learn from them, and successes should be celebrated. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreements must be drawn up to structure the cooperation, and these should include time frames. These agreements must be adhered to. 2. The stability of community organizations would be greatly helped by an automatic renewal of existing agreements. 3. Canadian Heritage should be made accountable to the community. 4. The community should be made accountable to the global development plan. 5. Canadian Heritage has to fulfill its interdepartmental role.

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common goals should be shared to meet the needs of the local community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community defines its priorities with the help of Canadian Heritage. This type of support requires active participation; it can't be just a "show me the money" relationship. There may be courses of action that the community did not think of. Canadian Heritage contributes its expertise, examples of best practices, and innovation. 2. The partnership between the community and the Department should be one where they talk to each other and work together, showing respect and equality. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership is a fundamental principle for a new relationship. • Needs are identified by the community, and the responsibility for priorities is assumed by the community. • Ongoing dialogue helps to maintain a balance of power between two unequal groups, so that each group can benefit from the partnership. 3. Transparency and accountability should work both ways; they should exist in many areas and not only on a purely financial level. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These qualities have to characterize the community's process of establishing priorities. However, the 'democratic overload' has to be lightened as much as possible. • These characteristics are applicable at the government level, extending beyond the Department of Canadian Heritage. • They are also applicable at the administrative level. 4. Community organization must be kept simple. Without taking away any responsibility from various departments and government levels, a kind of mega-organization cannot be expected to come from the community, in order to comply with public structures; it would be preferable to consolidate community networks, while recognizing the presence of various interest groups. This could be risky for the credibility of the main, multidisciplinary and non-specialized organization. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simplicity and effectiveness. Simple means more streamlined, but not necessarily "easier;" results must be achieved and then demonstrated. 2. Respect for volunteer work. 3. A partnership at the implementation level has to include the community's closest local jurisdictions. 4. Inclusiveness. Must be extended especially to youth and Francophiles. 5. Accountability. 6. The mechanism must take into account the global development plan as determined at the community level with the involvement of Canadian Heritage. 7. Once the partnership is established, rules have to be defined to make sure its principles are adhered to.

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
YUKON	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To maximize the impact of the cooperative partnership, there has to be stable program funding. A long-term financial commitment by Canadian Heritage is needed (for example, around a societal development blueprint) to support established infrastructures or new ones that need to be implemented. It's important to build on past success and to go even further, but more money is needed. 2. The process for allocating funds has to be more open and negotiable. If the amount of funds allocated to the financial envelope is frozen, that can't be described as a negotiating process. A partnership has to be a true partnership. In the Yukon, the community wants to sit at the negotiating table; it wants more recognition and respect for its needs. 3. Emerging needs must be included in the special projects that are negotiated from year to year. All the special projects are financed by other sources of funding. 4. The community expects to continue to play a role in analyzing fund allocation. 5. The question of asymmetry is important. Outcomes should be acknowledged and current needs taken into account. The Franco-Yukoner community would like to be considered as a model by the Department. 6. The community and Canadian Heritage must share responsibility for the relationship with francophiles. 7. Canadian Heritage should play an advocacy role. The government has to understand that there is more involved in the relationship than drawing up agreements. A great deal of advocacy work is necessary to bring other departments to act on behalf of francophone rights. Canadian Heritage should help by educating other departments on the realities of the community. 8. Canadian Heritage should stick to the objectives of its Official Languages Support Program; they offer respectful and realistic guidelines. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Multi-year funding. 2. Well-defined decision-making (power) centres. 3. A mechanism that supports the francophone legitimacy. 4. Ongoing advocacy that takes into account an ever-changing political context. 5. Canadian Heritage should play a supportive and unifying role; it should serve as a link to other departments. 6. The influence of Canadian Heritage on other departments should be examined. 7. Convergent community and departmental objectives (concerted action). 8. Ongoing dialogue on the balance between community development and the maintenance of infrastructures. 9. Recognition of the very strong coherence in the community. 10. A variable scale that is adaptable to the Yukon's realities. 11. A streamlined regional and national network. 12. Using a simplified version of the Global Development Plan, continuing to work with and include Francophiles, and gaining access to adequate resources.

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
NORTHWEST TERRITOIRES	<p>1. Keeping the community vitalized should be the main goal of the cooperative partnership. It is important to sustain what the community has already built and to help it grow from year to year. When a given need is being met, adequate funding has to be available to maintain that in the long term. Canadian Heritage cannot withdraw unilaterally.</p> <p>2. The community has to be in charge of its own development, starting with identifying its needs and priorities. It is fundamental to the relationship. As the community succeeds in reaching its objectives, it will inherit additional responsibilities.</p> <p>3. The administrative process has to be streamlined, to free up the volunteers and employees who should be working on community development and not administrative tasks. The agreement should comply with this requirement by making sure that the communities have the necessary resources to be able to administer their own development. Canadian Heritage imposes administrative requirements but does not provide the community with the resources it needs to meet those requirements. One way to streamline the administrative process would be to implement multi-year financing. Applications for project funding could be submitted every 3 to 5 years instead of annually. Adherence to a payment schedule of contributions should also be ensured. In the North, the change of seasons defines the community's ability to act, and any delays in sending funds can compromise how the work is carried out.</p> <p>Outside of the administrative process, there is the interdepartmental aspect. Canadian Heritage's role has to be made clear here. The Action Plan for Official Languages has increased the number of people and programs that the community must deal with, even though it is not equipped to begin dealing with ten departments from one day to the next.</p> <p>4. The relationship has to be based on the partners' mutual respect. The community must be made to feel secure; it must be confident that agreements will be respected. Canadian Heritage cannot change rules on a unilateral basis. Everyone works for the same cause. It would therefore make sense to develop an effective information and communication strategy. At present, there are two separate 'bubbles' : the government and the community. The link between the two groups must be defined.</p> <p>Compliance with the contract renewal cycle has to be assured. Community services are an essential benefit and their renewal has to be guaranteed well before a cycle ends, instead of six months later. The rising cost of living has to be factored in. The government needs to be in</p>	<p>1. Long-term financing. When a project begins, the community needs to know that it will have the means to sustain it for the long term.</p> <p>2. Streamlined processes. The interdepartmental involvement complicates the community's work, because it means that it has to knock on five more doors, and write up five more applications. Funding applications for projects could be managed by Canadian Heritage who would look after securing contributions from other departments.</p> <p>3. Canadian Heritage's human resources at the service of the community. Government employees should be integrated into community life, and their level of authority could be increased.</p> <p>4. Measurement of outcomes. Realistic objectives must be determined and carried out. There should not be a need to always start anew: what has been gained should be preserved and built upon.</p> <p>5. Interterritorial and interprovincial issues. Canadian Heritage would have a key role to play here. This is an aspect of the cooperative partnership that needs to be better defined.</p>

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
	<p>control, and that is understandable, but the community needs should be seen as equally important. The same applies to setting strategic objectives: the community has to be involved from the beginning and not only consulted at the end when reports have already been written.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Acquired rights must be recognized. Bilingualism is a reality, not a myth. About 60% of the francophone community has assimilated into the English-language community, even with the present funding. We have to ask ourselves if the purpose of Canadian Heritage is only to support the francophone community until it fades away, or if the support is supposed to help it grow. The issue of having equal entitlement for francophone services is embarrassing, but it has to be brought up. The community insists on equal opportunities for its development. 6. Asymmetry must be recognized. Realities for various communities across the country differ greatly. In the North, large distances and the small number of francophone people have a big impact. Community network infrastructures are not as solid here as they are elsewhere. Asymmetry means that needs should be considered before sheer numbers are considered. The community in the Northwest Territories does not want to create opposition with the other communities. However, it does want to stress that its particular characteristics do require a different way of doing things as well as different levels of support. 7. The relationship has to be bidirectional so that Canadian Heritage and the community can fulfill their roles effectively. Training, information, and communication should flow both ways. There is a need for a mutual exchange of information. 8. There has to be adequate financial support. The community can identify a whole range of needs, but does not have the means to take care of them. The federal government has to commit financial resources. According to the community, the Northwest Territories are a federal jurisdiction, and the federal government must assume financial responsibility and provide total (100%) support. 9. It must be recognized that the development of the minority community benefits the community at large in many sectors (youth, economy, and health). Investments do not only benefit the francophone community, but also contribute to the Canadian linguistic duality. The community wants to work in partnership in an inclusive way. 	

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
NUNAVUT	<p>1. The upcoming cooperation mechanism must be based on, and continue, what has already been implemented, while keeping Nunavut's reality in mind:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nunavut is the foundation of Canada's affirmation of sovereignty in the Far North and its affairs are considered a priority by the current federal government. • The cost of living in Nunavut is the highest in Canada; the budgetary envelope has to reflect this. • Nunavut does not have many infrastructures, but it is developing at a phenomenal rate. <p>2. Some initiatives will help the visibility of the francophone population and services will be offered to help build a community. This must be developed in harmony with the territory's Inuit and indigenous people, rather than with an imperialist approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nunavut's francophone community is expected to grow, but in a way that contributes positively to the territory's social fabric. The community is working on building a new geopolitical entity. Participants emphasized that they wish to add to the vitality of Nunavut's francophone community, while demonstrating the greatest regard for the Inuit population. • Nunavut's francophone youth are sensitive to the Inuit population; they are the Métis of the Far North who will grow up to speak three languages and who will play a significant role in Nunavut's future. It was emphasized that the community has to provide a good foundation for their development. <p>3. The community's development cannot be split up into different categories, because the community is too small, but its energy is fuelled by a desire to build something special. Nunavut is synonymous with a creative spirit, new structures. The francophone population has a role to play. It is rich with possibilities that are based on past experience, but turned towards the future.</p> <p>4. There is no community development history. All options are open. The community wants to learn from others and from any mistakes that others may have made.</p> <p>5. The community's organizations are often referred to as "client organizations" and this is upsetting. A different perspective might be adopted that would view Canadian Heritage as the client that subcontracts to the community to build something. In Nunavut's case, the community would request that the Department award it a contract to</p>	<p>1. An agreement with Canadian Heritage should be based on developing the francophone community in harmony with other cultures. The francophone community should contribute to creating new societal blueprint: the creation of a new territory of Inuit language and culture.</p> <p>2. The Nunavut francophone community is not advocating for itself, but rather, it wants to be part of the solution in carrying out a social development project. It is one of the instruments of change.</p> <p>3. The community finds that it must do the work itself, by building a bit at a time, and by applying for shared financial support. The problem in the territory is mainly one of logistics and available human resources.</p> <p>4. Flexibility is needed to ensure the community's contribution to the social fabric.</p> <p>5. The implementation of the cooperative mechanism should be flexible.</p> <p>6. A solid base is needed to start building.</p> <p>7. Advocacy is not the right approach for Nunavut's consensus decision making culture. Conciliation and a concerted effort are preferable.</p>

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
	develop the community. An agreement would have to be reached on the mechanism, parameters and stages to evaluate progress.	

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
NATIONAL GROUPS	<p>1. Leadership must be shared between the communities and Canadian Heritage. This partnership has to have repercussions on the larger political and programming issues.</p> <p>2. It is necessary to clarify the role and the mission of Canadian Heritage.</p> <p>3. The disengagement of Canadian Heritage must be avoided.</p> <p>4. As a basic principle, both the Department and the communities must be held accountable for outcomes. However, administrative requirements must be reduced.</p> <p>5. A hybrid scenario has to be developed.</p> <p>6. Cooperative efforts have to be developed within the community. National organizations have a different way of intervening in the dynamics of community development. It is difficult to bring it in line with the dynamics of the provinces, territories, and different sectors. Principles of cooperation may therefore be different from the ones applicable at the provincial-territorial levels.</p> <p>Consultations for a successful global development plan were not as productive at the level of national organizations as they were at the level of provinces and territories. National organizations target different clients and issues. The discussions must deal with objectives and outcomes. It's difficult for national organizations to move forward in setting priorities. Many believe that there comes a time where some arbitration is necessary.</p>	<p>There should be three relationship levels inherent to the cooperation mechanism.</p> <p>1. A bilateral relationship between each organization and the Department.</p> <p>Part of the challenge with having a positive relationship with the Department is the need to synchronize the development work of the global development plans with the one in the sectoral plans. The first is based on geography and consultations with provincial and territorial communities, while the second comes from consultations with national groups and reflects a pan-Canadian perspective and the variances that can exist within the same sector. There can be sectoral mandates at the national level that are not necessarily synchronized with global development plans based on geography; these could be planning development work that is ahead of existing field conditions.</p> <p>Because of its ability to play an interdepartmental role, Canadian Heritage should interact directly with national groups on sectoral mandates and contribute a strategic global view for the long term.</p> <p>2. Common interest tables to support the mechanisms.</p> <p>To achieve a shared and efficient plan of action, there has to be a place where sectoral organizations can meet and participate as equals with their counterparts in the Department. Common interest sectoral tables are much more functional than a national table because organizations are more focused on the needs of the sector than on financial support.</p> <p>3. A meeting point for the community and the Department.</p> <p>There needs to be shared and transparent global planning to determine what will be</p>

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	THE COOPERATION'S MAIN FEATURES	PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTING MECHANISMS
		<p>done in terms of community development.</p> <p>Cooperation mechanisms between the Department and the national groups should include the following non-financial support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A shared leadership between the communities and Canadian Heritage is necessary. Joint planning should be focussed on broad issues and convergent results and should stay away from discussing action plan details. 2. The choice of representatives for the shared national discussions could be made by common interest tables and the Department. The participation of organizations that are not part of a sectoral table or advocacy group must be assured. 3. Canadian Heritage's role in official languages should be made clearer, especially concerning its powers and responsibilities. Specifically, what should be the extent of its coordinating and "watchdog" roles at the federal level or with its portfolio agencies (the NFB, Telefilm Canada, etc.) or concerning the relationship between Official Languages and other departmental programs. It is also important to specify the role of the Privy Council in official languages. 4. The administrative process must be streamlined. 5. The mechanism for allocating funds should be separated from the cooperation mechanisms and should fall under the responsibility of Canadian Heritage. The Department must remain transparent with regards to admission criteria and decisions regarding financial support.

SECTION 2: FINDINGS AND POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS

8. THE MAIN FINDINGS AND POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS ENSUING FROM THESE FINDINGS

Under the mandate granted our firm, we must include in this summary report, on the one hand, the principal findings resulting from the consultations, and on the other hand, the possible directions that ensue from these findings.

This is due to the fact that our firm facilitated all the consultation sessions. The Department, therefore, wants an overview that may set out the next phases of the process.

Contrary to the preceding sections of the report, which objectively present the outcomes of the sessions, this section presents the subjective views of the authors, and it must be considered as such. It does not represent the positions of either the Department of Canadian Heritage or of the communities.

There is a risk of oversimplification when one summarizes findings based on consultations in communities whose different natures, developmental levels, and particular situations vary so greatly. It is likely that a course of action which may apply to a community of 800 people in the Northwest Territories may not be at all suited to a Franco-Ontario community with a population of 500,000. And one that is suited to the English-speaking community of Îles de la Madeleine will not necessarily be appropriate for the English-speaking community of Montreal. On the other hand, certain measures may apply equally well to a large English-speaking minority community as to a small French-speaking minority community.

At each session, a Department representative explained the aim of these consultations in the following terms:

Ultimately, we want today's discussion to help identify the values, common ground and compromises that will make it possible to:

- Ensure more stable and predictable funding for organizations that participate in community development;*
- Strengthen the ability of the community development architects to focus their energies on results—centred on a shared global vision and strategic sequencing of actions to be undertaken;*
- Clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Department and of the network of community groups.*

We will address these expectations one by one, presenting the principal findings that emerged from the consultations and the leads that may result from them.

8.1. Ensure more stable and predictable funding for organizations that participate in community development

Asserting the catalytic role for development played by the community network funded by the Department

An overview of all the sessions makes it possible to observe that the principal foundation of the relationship between Canadian Heritage and the communities is the mutual acknowledgement that the community network funded by the Department is the catalyst of the development of the communities.

The participants repeatedly underscored and demonstrated that the community networks have often been the incubators of development initiatives, be it in education, culture, health, the economy, or initiatives with regard to women, children, the elderly, or new immigrants.

Experience has shown that once the community network has developed an initiative and done the necessary legwork, the official institutional network ensures its implementation. This process may take several years.

The official institutional network may include health centres and hospitals, school boards, community colleges, chambers of commerce, and so forth. Quite often, the initial work of the community network led to the creation of a minority institutional network.

In the case of the smaller provinces or territories, aside from the schools, there is no extended institutional network. In these regions, the community network funded by the Department is also the institutional network that offers services directly to the community. In such cases, the community network supported by the Department plays a dual role.

The effect of Canadian Heritage actions greatly surpasses the direct impact that results from granting monies. The support of the Department gives the groups in the community legitimacy with regard to other government stakeholders as well as with regard to the majority.

Multi-year funding

Given the importance of the community network, we feel that the relationship between Canadian Heritage and this network, in matters of community development, should be significantly inspired by the *Accord Between the Government of Canada and the Voluntary Sector*, signed in December 2001.

The Accord is a framework document that sets out values, principles and commitments to guide the relationship of the Canadian government and the voluntary sector into the future.

The Accord represents a public commitment to more open, transparent, consistent and collaborative ways for the voluntary sector and the Government of Canada to work together in the 21st Century. It has as its base the values aspired to by Canadians. These include active citizenship, democracy, equality, diversity, inclusion and social justice.

The Accord is also based on five guiding principles. It acknowledges that the Government of Canada and voluntary sector are independent of each other, but that some of their goals are interdependent. It recognizes that, if the relationship is to be mutually rewarding, both parties must adhere to the principles of ongoing dialogue, cooperation and collaboration.

The *Code of Good Practice on Funding*, which builds on current funding policies and practices, includes specific recommendations to improve direct funding practices. This code is consistent with the financial management framework of the Government of Canada, which includes the *Financial Administration Act*, and policies on transfer payments, contracting, procurement, evaluation, expenditure management and risk management as well as international trade agreements.

This Code recommends the use of multi-year funding agreements and the development and implementation of mechanisms to facilitate their use, in appropriate circumstances, in order to enhance organizations' stability and capacity for longer-term planning.

The consultations have made it possible to conclude without any doubt that the community and the Department would mutually benefit from negotiating and implementing multi-year funding mechanisms for numerous groups. The specific means remain to be determined in each province and territory. While fully respecting the *Financial Administration Act*, new means should be explored to enable the Department and the communities to institute various pilot experiments in this regard.

Examples of pilot experiments might include five-year funding, with the appropriate reporting mechanisms, in certain cases. In other cases, the Department and the communities should explore the possibilities of third-party agreements. By this means, a community guarantor would become the legal and financial sponsor in terms of the accountability of the funds disbursed by the Department, and would redistribute these funds according to the priorities set by the community. Such a model might apply to a sector of activity in certain cases, or to a province or territory as a whole in other cases.

The cooperation mechanism: a funding flow-through mechanism for other federal government departments and agencies

In certain cases, Canadian Heritage might act as technical facilitator and develop a cooperative link with other federal stakeholders in matters of supporting community development. Thus, other federal organizations could channel their funding to the community by means of the cooperation mechanism established with Canadian Heritage. In this case, the mechanism would act as a gateway between Canadian Heritage, the other federal organizations and the communities. The same mechanism should operate with a one-stop service approach in matters of reporting, while respecting legal and administrative prescriptions.

8.2. Strengthen the ability of the community development architects to focus their energies on results—centred on a shared global vision and strategic sequencing of actions to be undertaken

Community arbitration

Several sessions brought to the fore the arbitration that would be necessary in the community. By this we mean the decisional process that leads to choosing how funding is to be allocated.

There must be arbitration. The question discussed was the following: Should arbitration be handled by the Department or by the community?

Certain sessions made it possible to hear communities explain how past experiences, as well as the mechanisms implemented through the Canada-community agreements process, enabled the community to become significantly stronger. These communities do not want any regression in this respect. In fact, they now want to move to the next level, that is, go beyond arbitration associated to the allocation of funds and address arbitration of strategic sequencing of the actions to be undertaken, which will concern many more players, with the aim of community development. This sequence will obviously have a major impact on the allocation of funds.

From other communities, we heard the opposite. The arbitration processes surrounding the allocation of funds created such tension that several communities want to hand this function over to the Department, which would act within a strategic priority framework set by the community.

The consultations made it possible to observe the extent to which arbitration associated to resources allocation became a major strength for a community, when it managed to do it internally. It is clear, also, that the arbitration of resources allocation is the culmination of a long process of community reflection that encompasses several major phases, including the following: collective identification of major issues confronting the community, internal negotiation with regard to implementing strategies to deal with these issues, development of democratic community processes, creation of decisional entities that are effective and whose decisions are accepted by the community, creation of bridging mechanisms with the Department that are efficient and transparent.

The consultations made it possible to confirm the principal findings that emerged from the evaluations of existing mechanisms: community tensions rise when the debate is centred on the arbitration of resources allocation, in the absence of arbitration with regard to community priorities.

All the sessions gave rise to discussions about the importance of the communities' global development plans. According to the participants, these plans are indispensable tools for community development. The discussions of the various sessions made it possible to see that the more the global development plans embodied complex social projects, involving players that are not funded by the Canadian Heritage budget, the more there seems to be a willingness to handle the arbitration within the community. The consultations made it possible to confirm that drawing up global development plans helped increase cohesion within the communities.

The Department wants to rethink the way it operates and its cooperation mechanisms. The future direction of resources arbitration will be at the core of this reflection. There will be asymmetrical decisions made in the provinces and territories. The Department will not remain passive in the matter of these decisions. The consultations made it possible to see clearly the power of community dynamics in the provinces and territories that have successfully come through the main phases of arbitration. We feel that revoking the funding allocation functions would represent a significant step backward in the process of communities taking responsibility for their own development. This process is phased over several planning cycles and time must be allowed for new dynamics to take root.

In the discussions surrounding this question, the Department might adopt a general policy asserting that progress of the community toward taking charge of its arbitration functions would be a way to maximize the contribution of the *Cooperation with the Community Sector* component.

This being said, it is important to note the great complexities that prevail in certain regions. By no means are all the communities at the same level in this respect. By taking as a starting point the current situation of each community, the Department may encourage, support and lead the community to carry out better arbitration in the establishment of the next cooperation mechanism. Developing a relationship of mutual trust, and positioning the groups and the Department as collaborators in a common project should facilitate this essential work by the Department.

This approach would be furthered by recognizing that community concerted efforts are not an administrative activity but in fact an important outcome to be achieved. In several sessions, some people pointed out that this consultation process can be demanding, lengthy and relatively expensive. The participants, nevertheless, indicated that the community's cohesion depends upon it. Therefore, the resources allocated are an investment in the abilities of the organizations to help communities toward assuming greater control over their development.

A few sessions stressed how this process for concerted action must go beyond solely meeting with groups receiving funds from the budget, particularly because of the effects resulting from the Action Plan for Official Languages, launched by the federal government in March 2003. The Action Plan concerns many new stakeholders, which is very positive. However, the lack of broad concerted efforts of all the players would mean an important element is lost, namely that all the stakeholders recognize that they are contributing to a unifying societal blueprint.

Hence, certain sessions recommended that the function of setting the main priorities of the community be separate from the arbitration function of the allocation of funds from the Canadian Heritage budget. The first function concerns a much greater number of stakeholders than the second. However, the budgetary contribution will be maximized provided it falls within the main priorities of the community. Furthermore, consultations on priorities have the effect of reinforcing volunteerism, because societal projects, rather than administrative management, are what motivate volunteer action.

8.3. Clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Department and of the community network

Four major facets of the role of the Department emerged during the sessions.

Firstly, the Department acts on behalf of the federal government and offers financial support to the community network. This financial support dates back to 1968 and has since then been the crucial instrument that enabled the development of the official-language communities in minority situations. The first role of the Department is, therefore, to continue to offer this financial support.

Secondly, the Department must be accountable for its actions to Canadian citizens. Several sessions suggested that the Department amplify its message and proudly proclaim to Canadians that it contributes to the cohesion of the country by providing sustained support to official-language communities in minority situations.

Thirdly, the participants wanted the Department to have even greater knowledge of community development issues and to have the capacity to influence federal, provincial and municipal stakeholders, whenever applicable. According to the participants, this would require much more proactive interdepartmental action than currently exists.

Finally, another major role attributed to the Department is that of leading communities to more effective arbitration. People want the actions of the Department to increase community cohesion.

Five major facets of the role of the communities came to light during the sessions.

Firstly, it is up to the community to define its own development issues.

Then, the community must determine its priorities in terms of actions and the sequencing of actions to be implemented.

Also, the participants insisted on the need to develop real community partnerships with the community groups and institutional networks. These partnerships must go beyond a letter of support being sent, and must result in sustained action.

Moreover, the issue of inclusiveness in the community was the object of discussion in most of the sessions. People want the full diversity of the community to be reflected in every aspect of activity.

Finally, several participants stated that one of the roles of the community network is to cast a critical eye on its community infrastructure.

At another level, the national session made it possible to further clarify the roles played by national groups. National groups play a different role in the community development dynamic. The national groups bring pan-Canadian perspectives and a reading of the discrepancies within a sector or between geographic regions.

On a national level, there are sectoral mandates that are not necessarily synchronized with the global development plan based on geographic location. These mandates and national plans may allow for development work that is in advance of field conditions. Given the complexity at the national level, the sectoral tables are relatively more functional than a national table. Regardless of the method used, it is important that the major development players be given opportunities to work together.

CONCLUSION

By way of conclusion, it is important to mention the invaluable participation of a great number of people who contributed to the success of these consultations. Firstly, we would like to thank the participants, who gave up a day of their time in addition to doing the preparatory reading. Furthermore, we would like to acknowledge the considerable time that was dedicated to the consultation process by program officers of the Department of Canadian Heritage, who drew up guest lists and who participated in the organization of the meetings. And finally, we would like to thank the consultation team and the logistics team. We are confident that these consultations will be of great use in improving the cooperation mechanisms between the Department and the communities.

APPENDIX 1: NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE SESSIONS

SESSION IDENTIFICATION	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH DIALOGUE SESSION AND NUMBER OF YEARS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE, NUMBER OF PRE-SESSION AND POST-SESSION QUESTIONNAIRES COMPILED AND NUMBER OF EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES COMPILED				
	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE	AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE	NUMBER OF PRE-SESSION AND POST-SESSION QUESTIONNAIRES COMPILED	NUMBER OF EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES COMPILED
BRITISH COLUMBIA	33	400	12	31	31
ALBERTA	32	650	20	31	27
SASKATCHEWAN	33	565	17	33	32
MANITOBA	32	735	23	31	26
NORTHERN ONTARIO	20	585	29	20	20
SOUTHERN ONTARIO	28	540	19	25	22
EASTERN ONTARIO	36	800	22	36	30
RURAL QUEBEC	17	325	19	17	15
URBAN QUEBEC	24	550	23	20	18
NEW BRUNSWICK	37	770	21	34	29
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	22	470	21	20	22
NOVA SCOTIA	35	575	16	35	32
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR	21	430	20	19	17
YUKON	15	175	12	14	12
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES	22	320	15	16	18
NUNAVUT	11	80	7	9	8
NATIONAL GROUPS	37	660	18	34	32
GRAND TOTAL	455	8,630	19	425	391

APPENDIX 2: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SCENARIOS

Participants in the consultations were asked to fill out a pre-session "Initial Thoughts" questionnaire and a post-session "Final Thoughts" questionnaire. The two questionnaires briefly presented each of the three scenarios from the deliberative dialogue guide and provided the following instructions: "For each scenario, please indicate how favourable or unfavourable you feel towards it, on a scale of 1 to 6, where 1 means totally unfavourable and 6 means totally favourable. Circle the number that best reflects your opinion." On a scale of 1 to 6, the median value is 3.50.

Of the 455 participants, 425 filled out and returned the scenario evaluation questionnaires. To measure the opinion shift, the two questionnaires from a single kit were identified by the same number. No connection between the questionnaire numbers and the name of the participant was recorded. Consequently, the questionnaires remain anonymous and fully confidential.

Scenario 1 is certainly not the basis on which the relationship between the Department and communities will be built. Scenario 3 was more popular, but the workshop dialogue revealed that this scenario is vague and hard to understand for a good number of people. Furthermore, a large share of participants indicated that strengthening communities' capacities for social action was more a strategy to apply than a model on which the relationship between the Department and communities might be founded.

Table 4 - Evaluation of the scenarios before and after the sessions: frequency of the 5 or 6 rating

FREQUENCY OF THE 5 OR 6 RATING BEFORE AND AFTER THE SESSION			
	SCENARIO 1	SCENARIO 2	SCENARIO 3
PRE-SESSION	32	236	122
	8%	56%	29%
POST-SESSION	27	269	100
	6%	63%	24%

This table shows the number of times a scenario obtained a rating of 5 or 6, before and after the session.

The important facts are as follows:

- 32 respondents (8%) gave a rating of 5 or 6 to Scenario 1 before the session, and 27 respondents (6%) gave it a rating of 5 or 6 after the session.
- 236 respondents (56%) gave a rating of 5 or 6 to Scenario 2 before the session, and 269 respondents (63%) gave it a rating of 5 or 6 after the session.
- 122 respondents (29%) gave a rating of 5 or 6 to Scenario 3 before the session, and 100 respondents (24%) gave it a rating of 5 or 6 after the session.

The table below presents individual opinion shifts for each scenario.

Table 5 - Evaluation of the scenarios before and after the sessions: individual opinion shift for the scenarios

INDIVIDUAL OPINION SHIFT FOR THE SCENARIOS BEFORE AND AFTER THE SESSION			
	SCENARIO 1	SCENARIO 2	SCENARIO 3
RATING INCREASED	72	128	78
	17%	30%	18%
RATING REMAINED THE SAME	227	213	176
	53%	50%	41%
RATING DECREASED	126	84	171
	30%	20%	40%

This table shows the rating shift for each scenario between the pre-session and post-session questionnaires by the same respondent.

The important facts are as follows:

- 126 respondents (30%) gave a lower rating to Scenario 1 after the session, while 72 respondents (17%) gave it a higher rating.
- 128 respondents (30%) gave a higher rating to Scenario 2 after the session, while 84 respondents (20%) gave it a lower rating.
- 171 respondents (40%) gave a lower rating to Scenario 3 after the session, while 78 respondents (18%) gave it a higher rating.

This table confirms that the approaches of scenarios 1 and 3 cannot be the basis for the relationship between the Department and communities. After in-depth reflection in the workshop and examination of the strengths and weaknesses, 30% of the respondents gave a lower rating to Scenario 1 after the session, as compared to 20% who gave it a higher rating. Forty percent (40%) of respondents gave a lower rating to Scenario 3 after the session, as compared to 18% who gave it a higher rating.

Scenario 2 may be the basis for the relationship between the Department and communities. It is the only scenario that obtained a higher rating after the session.

APPENDIX 3: DATA ON THE SESSION EVALUATIONS

Of the four hundred and fifty-five (455) participants involved in the consultations, three hundred and ninety-one (391) filled out and returned an anonymous evaluation questionnaire at the end of the session.

The evaluation questionnaire was made up of nine (9) multiple choice questions and four (4) open-ended questions.

For the multiple choice questions, the respondents were asked, for each statement, to check only one of the five boxes, which were as follows:

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Somewhat disagree	3 Undecided	4 Somewhat agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------------------	----------------	------------------------	------------------------

The nine statements were:

- A. I received the materials in time to review them before the session.
- B. The 'Guide for Deliberation' was easy to understand.
- C. The background document provided me with useful information I needed to participate.
- D. The process allowed for an interesting exchange between participants that added to my own thinking about the issues.
- E. The facilitators kept the dialogue on track, but did not stifle participants.
- F. The process allowed me to express my views and ideas.
- G. Participants represented a good cross-section of the stakeholders interested in this issue.
- H. The facilities and refreshments helped make for a productive day.
- I. Overall, I am pleased with the consultation and its output.

The questionnaires were compiled by assigning a value of 1 to 5 based on the selection made by the respondent. The median value on this scale is 3.

It must be noted that the profile of the communities (see question C) was handed out on site for information and was not used during the sessions.

The open-ended questions were as follows:

- J. What issues, if any, remain unfinished or neglected in your view, and need further attention?
- K. What are some of the features of the day that you particularly liked?
- L. What are some aspects you would suggest changing or improving?
- M. Other Comments

The results of the evaluation for the nine multiple-choice questions (A to I) for each of the 17 sessions are presented in the table on the next page.

Table 6 – Quantitative data of the session evaluations

QUANTITATIVE DATA OF THE SESSION EVALUATIONS

QUESTION	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
SESSION									
BRITISH COLUMBIA	4.58	4.32	3.68	4.61	4.81	4.71	4.52	4.65	4.52
ALBERTA	3.56	4.56	3.78	4.81	4.89	4.81	4.37	4.48	4.74
SASKATCHEWAN	3.66	4.28	2.91	4.81	4.81	4.66	4.38	4.56	4.75
MANITOBA	4.46	4.38	3.58	4.77	4.42	4.69	4.62	4.62	4.58
NORTHERN ONTARIO	4.50	4.60	3.65	4.80	4.25	4.70	4.65	2.25	4.65
SOUTHERN ONTARIO	4.32	4.50	3.68	4.86	4.73	4.82	4.55	4.45	4.82
EASTERN ONTARIO	4.00	4.27	3.13	4.47	4.10	4.47	4.03	4.10	3.93
RURAL QUEBEC	3.54	4.46	4.00	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.00	4.21	4.07
URBAN QUEBEC	3.53	4.18	4.56	4.50	4.33	4.61	3.56	4.72	4.28
NEW BRUNSWICK	2.79	4.00	2.72	4.90	4.86	4.93	4.62	4.24	4.62
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	2.91	4.14	2.95	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.32	4.73	4.36
NOVA SCOTIA	3.91	4.44	3.28	4.41	4.56	4.66	4.56	4.63	4.47
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR	3.82	3.94	3.47	4.65	4.82	4.65	4.59	4.00	4.47
YUKON	3.67	4.25	2.83	4.17	4.00	4.42	4.42	4.00	3.75
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES	2.94	4.11	2.83	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33	3.39	4.17
NUNAVUT	4.50	4.63	3.00	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.63	4.88	4.88
NATIONAL GROUPS	4.09	4.38	s/o	4.63	4.50	4.69	4.66	4.38	4.41
GLOBAL RATING (ALL PARTICIPANTS)	3.82	4.31	3.37	4.66	4.60	4.68	4.42	4.29	4.46