



**PARTNERSHIP STUDY,  
NATIONAL STRATEGY ON COMMUNITY SAFETY AND  
CRIME PREVENTION, PHASE II**  
Technical Report

**November 2002**

**Evaluation Division  
Policy Integration and Coordination Section**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2. OVERVIEW OF THE METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1 National Level: Procedure and Selection.....	3
2.2 Project Level: Procedure and Selection .....	4
2.3 Data Collection Instruments .....	7
<b>3. FINDINGS: NATIONAL LEVEL</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.1 NCPC Managers’ Perspectives on Partnership.....	9
3.2 National Partner Organizations’ Perspectives on Partnership .....	15
<b>4. FINDINGS: PROJECT LEVEL</b> .....	<b>21</b>
4.1 Project Managers’ Perspectives on Partnership.....	21
4.2 Project Partners’ Perspectives on Partnerships .....	33
<b>5. CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>41</b>

**APPENDIX A: Partnerships Backgrounder**

**APPENDIX B: Interview Guides**

**APPENDIX C: Literature Review**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This Report provides the results of the survey component of the Partnership Study, which was conducted by JamiesonHartGraves on behalf of the Evaluation Division, Department of Justice Canada and the National Crime Prevention Centre. It includes:

- An overview of the survey methodology
- The key findings of the survey at the national level and the project level.

A summary of this study and key findings has been produced under separate cover. For a copy of this report, please contact the Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice, Canada.

## **2. OVERVIEW OF THE METHODOLOGY**

### **2.1 National Level: Procedure and Selection**

#### **2.1.1 National Crime Prevention Centre Manager Interviews**

The study methodology called for interviews with National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC) staff. The NCPC provided a contact list of 15 staff members including senior managers, directors of the various NCPC funding streams and regional liaison coordinators. Interviews were completed with fourteen of these fifteen NCPC managers.

#### **2.1.2 National Partner Organization Interviews**

This study focused on partnerships between NCPC and national level, non-governmental partner organizations. Fifteen national partner organization interviews were planned. NCPC identified 27 national level organizations with which they had worked. From this list, national partner organizations were selected to ensure that organizations concerned with the target populations of the national strategy – Aboriginal peoples, girls and women, children and youth – were represented. In addition, some national partner organizations with traditional involvement in crime prevention as well as some that could be considered “non-traditional” (health, recreation, social services and education) were selected.

A total of 21 national partner organizations were contacted. 15 interviews with national partner organizations were completed. Four national partner organizations did not wish to participate indicating that they had limited contact with NCPC or that the contact person was no longer with the organization. These national partner organizations were replaced with alternatives. In selecting replacement national partner organizations, the study matched for target population and sector whenever possible. Two national partner organizations could not be contacted.

## **2.2 Project Level: Procedure and Selection**

### **2.2.1 Project Sample Selection**

In the initial stages of the project, the study experienced challenges and observed deficiencies with the Project Control System (PCS) in providing accurate and current project-level information, including information on partnership development and accomplishments. Consequently, the methodology was amended to increase the number of key informant interviews at the community project level to obtain better information on partnerships.

The NCPC provided a list of all projects funded as of April 1, 2001, for each of the four funding programs. The project files list was organized by fiscal year, province/territory and community. The list included project contact information. A random sample of 60 projects was drawn including projects from each of the four funding streams (the Community Mobilization Program CMP), the Crime Prevention Partnership Program (CPPP), the Business Action Program (BAP) and the Crime Prevention Investment Fund (CPIF). Given the size of the sample and the overwhelming number of CMP projects compared to those of other funding streams, the following quotas were adopted:

- 42 CMP projects from 1,899 funded projects in this stream (2.1%)
- 11 CPPP projects from 91 funded projects in this stream (12.1%)
- four BAP projects from 33 funded projects in this stream (12.1%)
- three CPIF projects from 27 funded projects in this stream (11.1%)

The sample quotas under-represents the proportion of CMP projects and over-represents the proportions in the other three funding streams (see Table 1). The projects included in the sample were randomly selected from lists within each stream using a random start and selecting every nth case until the sample was complete. For example, in selecting the BAP projects, using a random start, every eight project was selected until we had four projects (33 divided by eight = four). Replacement sites were also selected for each of the streams. The sample was then reviewed to ensure that it included at least one site from each of the five regions including: B.C. and the Yukon, the Prairies and the NWT, Ontario, Quebec and Nunavut, and the Atlantic (see Table 2). The final sample included 60 sites and 14 replacements chosen by stream and in accordance with specifications provided by the Project Authority. Specific details about the sample are provided in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Breakdown of all community project files and sample files by Funding Stream**

Funding Stream Program	All Files		Sample Files	
	No. of Projects	%	No. of Projects	%
BAP	33	1.6	6	8.1
CPIF	27	1.3	5	6.8
CMP	1899	92.6	49	66.2
CPPP	91	4.4	14	18.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The original sample was 60 projects + five replacements per Region for a total of 85 projects. One project had to be deleted as it failed to meet the sample criteria.

Table 2 presents the regional breakdown of the sample. There were 20 projects from Ontario, 14 from Quebec & Nunavut, 10 from the Atlantic region and eight each from B.C. & the Yukon, and the Prairies. There was at least one project selected from each province and the territories except the Northwest Territories.

**Table 2: Breakdown of Regional Representation in the Community Project Sample**

Region	Number of Projects	Number of Replacements Projects
B.C. & the Yukon	8	2
Prairies & NWT	8	2
Ontario	20	5
Quebec & Nunavut	14	4
Atlantic	10	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>14</b>

## 2.2.2 Project Manager Interviews

The study attempted to contact representatives of 75 NCPC funded projects. This resulted in interviews being completed with 54 project managers. Representatives from twenty-one of the projects selected in the sample could not be contacted. Reasons for lack of contact included the following: the organization was no longer operating, the phone number had been disconnected, the contact person was gone and no one else was able or willing to answer questions about the project in question. In the end, all four funding streams were still represented in the completed interviews: CPIF (six of 54), BAP (six of the 54), the CPPP (eight of the 54) and CMP (34 of 54). The projects were in all provinces and territories except the Yukon. Nineteen projects were in Ontario, 13 in Quebec, four each in Nova Scotia and British Columbia, three each in Saskatchewan and Alberta, two in Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Nunavut and one in Prince Edward Island and the Northwest Territories.

The agencies contacted were operating at a variety of levels (see Table 3). Twenty-three (42.6%) were local or neighbourhood organizations, nine (16.7%) were national level organizations, nine (16.7%) were municipal level organizations, seven (13.0%) were provincial or territorial organizations, four (7.4%) were band councils, and two (3.7%) were international organizations.

**Table 3: Organization Levels**

Level	Number	%
Local or neighbourhood	23	42.6
National	9	16.7
Municipal	9	16.7
Provincial or territorial	7	13.0
Band councils	4	7.4
International	2	3.7

The organizations worked with a variety of client groups (see Table 4) and most had more than one client group. Twelve reported that specific communities or ethnic groups were their client group, 16 indicated that their focus was the community at large. Most of the projects were directed at children or youth. This included 12 projects directed towards children between the ages of 0 and 11 and 26 directed at youth from 12 to 17 years of age. Eight projects focused on young adults, six projects were directed at women and girls, while six focused on aboriginal communities.

**Table 4: Types of Client Groups**

Groups	Number
Specific communities or ethnic groups	12
Community at large (mostly children or youth)	16
Children (0-11 years)	12
Youth (12-17 years)	26
Young adults	8
Women and girls	6
Aboriginal communities	6

### **2.2.3 Project Partner Interviews**

Project managers were asked to identify up to five project partners according to their level of involvement in their projects. Partner agencies were selected for participation in the order they were identified. Sixty-seven project partners were interviewed.

### **2.3 Data Collection Instruments**

Data collection instruments, as well as the interview protocol are included in the appendices. In addition, for project level interviews, basic information from the Department's Project Control System (PCS) on each project was used to help situate the interviewer.



### **3. FINDINGS: NATIONAL LEVEL**

To develop information on national level partnerships NCPC managers were interviewed as well as staff and individuals from national non-government organizations who were identified as national partner organizations.

#### **3.1 NCPC Managers' Perspectives on Partnership**

##### **3.1.1 Understanding of Partnership Within the Strategy**

NCPC managers were asked about their understanding of partnership in the four funding streams. Specifically, managers were asked how familiar they were with the four funding streams and how the funding streams with which they were familiar, supported partnerships. Most NCPC managers (11 of 14) were familiar with all four funding streams. Two were unfamiliar with all four streams, and one was unfamiliar with the Business Action Program.

##### **3.1.2 Strategy's Support for Partnerships**

NCPC managers indicated that the National Strategy's programs supported partnership in a variety of ways (see Table 5). All four streams provide support for partnerships by providing resources, facilitating contacts, assisting in building networks and in promoting Crime Prevention through Social Development (CPSD). NCPC managers noted that partnerships are integral to a CPSD philosophy. In addition, each of the funding streams facilitates partnerships in its own way. The Crime Prevention Partnership Program (CPPP) supports the development of tools and resources that are of interest to a range of groups in crime prevention—bringing them into partnerships. The Community Mobilization Program is premised on Joint Management making partnerships essential to what NCPC Managers do. The Crime Prevention Investment Fund (CPIF) is issue focused and attracts diverse groups who are interested in a particular issue. It has also made partnerships an integral part of both the program and each funded project.

**Table 5: How Funding Programs Support Partnerships?  
NCPC Managers' Perspectives**

Funding Stream	CPPP	CMP	BAP	CPIF
CPSD Philosophy (partnerships integral)	●	●	●	●
Provide Resources	●	●	●	●
Facilitate Contacts/Build Networks	●	●	●	●
Disseminate Information	●			
Develop Tools	●			
Joint Management		●		
Issue Focused – Attracts Diverse Groups				●
Integrated Process				●

### 3.1.3 Involvement of Non-Traditional Partners

NCPC managers felt that the four program streams were attracting non-traditional partners (partners who do not have crime prevention through social development as part of their traditional role). However, the responses were quite interesting when NCPC managers were asked to identify traditional and non-traditional partners. Most NCPC managers identified criminal justice system representatives as traditional partners (police, correctional and court officials) as well as national non-government organizations (Elizabeth Fry and John Howard, Canadian Association of Chief's of Police, Canadian Criminal Justice Association) involved with the justice system. Provincial crime prevention associations, municipalities, and local agencies such as Block Parents and Neighbourhood Watch are also seen as traditional partners. These partners are all working in areas related to the criminal justice system or identify crime prevention as their main role.

Some NCPC managers also included agencies that do not traditionally work within the criminal justice system or with offenders in their definition of traditional partners. They mentioned national NGOs such as the YM/YWCA, the Canadian Association of School Principals, local merchants' associations, women's groups, youth serving agencies, and social service providers in this regard. This suggests that the definition of traditional partners in crime prevention is expanding across sectors.

According to NCPC managers, the programs are attracting a wide range of non-traditional partners. NCPC managers identified a number of non-profit organizations including: the Canadian Safety Council, Boys & Girls Clubs, YM/YWCA, National Association of Youth in Care, the Aboriginal Nurses' Association, Canadian Council on Aging, Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Canadian Principals Association, transition houses, the Retail Council of Canada, the Girl Guides, parenting organizations, and literacy groups. They also identified other federal departments as key non-traditional partners in crime prevention (Health Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Solicitor General Canada), businesses, universities (and academic researchers), churches, schools, the media, and local residents.

Perhaps the most important finding in this area is that NCPC managers noted that there has been a shift not only in who partners in programs but in how partners are involved. In particular, the CPSD focus of crime prevention is leading traditional sectors (such as law enforcement) and non-traditional sectors (such as public health and social services) to become involved with each other in crime prevention in more integrated ways. Indeed, the distinction between (or dichotomy of) traditional and non-traditional partners may no longer be useful. NCPC managers indicated that the CPSD approach has been adopted by most agencies. They indicated that agencies are engaging in different ways of 'doing business' which requires all agencies to understand their responsibility for developing broader relationships, working together and forming partnerships.

### **3.1.4 How Partnerships are Working at the National Level**

A range of questions was asked to elicit information on how partnerships were working at the national level. This included the approach to partnerships, contributions of partnerships to crime prevention, what's working well and not so well with national partnerships, and how partnerships at the policy level could be improved.

NCPC managers indicated that the approach that the NCPC has taken has contributed to partnerships in a variety of ways. First, formal partnerships have been defined as key to the Strategy and the NCPC has been successful in developing these partnerships. The CPSD philosophy has contributed to partnership development as well. It has helped the NCPC to disseminate information about CPSD, to bring groups and individuals together, and to break down 'silo thinking.' It has also led to the NCPC itself using consultation in planning how to proceed with implementation of the Strategy. Finally, NCPC funding has provided an incentive to partnership development.

The NCPC's approach has also contributed to crime prevention in a variety of ways. Crime prevention through social development is more effective in preventing crime than other approaches to crime prevention. Thus, by supporting this approach and the partnerships CPSD requires, the NCPC has been effective by supporting the acceptance and implementation of a CPSD approach. More importantly, by focusing on both prevention and increasing awareness, a preventive approach to crime has become widely accepted in the Canadian context.

NCPC managers were asked what was working well with respect to developing partnerships. The responses clustered around how the NCPC provided projects with concrete factors (e.g., tools), with a philosophy or approach to crime prevention (CPSD), with information, and with a commitment to partnership. In addition, NCPC managers reflected on what the NCPC had done to support partnership and noted that the NCPC had also contributed to partnerships by ensuring that tools, ideas and information were effectively disseminated. According to NCPC managers, this has resulted in the following:

*Awareness of CPSD and the need for multi-sectoral approach* has reached those people with whom NCPC managers have contact and this awareness is leading them to seek partnerships in projects not funded by the NCPC.

- An increased awareness, among those people with whom NCPC managers have contact, of the importance of *effective communication* has led to increased efforts to communicate ideas and information.
- Making *partnership a funding requirement* has contributed to groups and organizations seeking partners.
- *Commitment to partnerships* – seeing them as important and necessary – has led the NCPC to support their development and to encourage those asking for funding to seek partners.
- *Outreach has been a cornerstone of the Strategy*. The NCPC has successfully developed horizontal ties both within and outside the federal government. These ties have contributed to the development of trust and rapport with a wide range of agencies. These ties endure and can be expanded.
- *Tools have been developed* which assist groups in forming partnerships and in pursuing particular crime prevention issues.
- *Multiple programs allow many different groups to apply* for funding. For example, the BAP has been successful in bringing businesses into crime prevention activity.
- *NCPC Staff are assigned to each region*. Having regional staff has been effective for reaching all regions of the country. Regional staff are developing knowledge and experience

that is making them more effective. For example, they are becoming better at guiding communities in the development of proposals because they know what is possible, what works well, and what the pitfalls are.

NCPC managers were also asked what was not working so well with respect to the development of partnerships. Responses clustered around three categories – factors related to the ability to implement partnerships (human resources and time frames), issues external to NCPC related to jurisdiction and willingness for agencies to work in partnership, and finally a concern about whether or not partnerships are sustainable.

- *Unrealistic time frames* – NCPC managers noted that it takes time to build partnerships and this must be done before a project can be undertaken in partnership. Time frames are based on the delivery of a program or development of a product and don't take into account the time needed to develop partnerships.
- *Lack of human resources* – there are not enough staff to do all the tasks related to partnerships. These tasks included: sharing information, providing assistance on proposals, connecting groups and organizations who could potentially partner, assisting partnership development once projects are funded.
- *Different jurisdictional approaches to crime prevention* – there is a sense that the acceptance and application of the CPSD approach varies across jurisdictions, and therefore partnership development and implementation is progressing in different stages. In some jurisdictions there is a perceived resistance to partnering.
- Individuals within organizations continue to employ “*stove pipe*” thinking – they view issues/projects from the perspective of their own organization and do not consider connections to other groups or organizations.
- While projects are successful and partnerships are formed around projects, there is a concern that these partnerships may not be *sustainable* once the project funding period is over.

### **3.1.5 Factors that Contribute to Successful Partnerships**

NCPC managers have, generally, worked with many different projects. Asked what, in their experience, had contributed to and what limited partnerships, NCPC managers provided a range of factors (see Table 6). They reported that partnerships were facilitated by a shared commitment to a CPSD approach, adequate resources, and a requirement that they find partners, clear objectives, knowledge, outreach and information sharing. These factors work to encourage

groups and organizations to partner with others, build strong ties among groups and organizations that partner, and assist in partnerships working effectively.

**Table 6: Factors that Contribute to Community Project Partnerships**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>How factors contribute to project partnerships</b>
Commitment to CPSD	Requires a multi-disciplinary approach, means common goals and common values
Resources	Sufficient and adequate funding, human resources, and time to build partnerships and run programs/projects
Partnership as a funding condition	Forces groups/organizations to look for partners and to develop partnerships as integral to crime prevention activity
Attitude to partners	Trust, openness, respect, inclusion are all essential to having good working partnerships
Clear Objectives	Clarifies roles and expectations, helps to avoid potential conflicts
Knowledge	Contributes in a number of ways – information on how to build partnerships, on tools and effective strategies
Outreach by NCPC	Has helped groups to find partners
Information Sharing	Between/among partners helps to build trust and to ensure that partnerships are effective

According to NCPC managers, the factors that limit partnerships are the absence of those factors that contribute to partnerships. Thus, a lack of knowledge, inadequate resources, the absence of communication, and resistance to partnering (a lack of commitment to CPSD) limit the formation of partnerships. Resistance to partnerships comes for a variety of reasons. In part, it is due to conflicts over scarce resources (turf wars). But, it is also due to the costs of partnering being too high. Partners may find that in some partnerships, they are expected to ‘rubber stamp’ decisions rather than to participate in a meaningful way. Resistance is likely where partners abuse power or act in ways to limit trust, are non-inclusive, do not share information, and where they are non-cooperative.

## **3.2 National Partner Organizations' Perspectives on Partnership**

### **3.2.1 Definitions of Partnership**

National partner organizations were asked to define partnership and they provided a diverse range of definitions. Common to the definitions was that partnership involved working together towards a common goal. Partnership was defined as requiring common goals, purpose or objectives by nine national NGOs.

The nature of the working relationship, however, varied considerably. Some national partner organizations sought partnerships where information and/or funds were exchanged but each participant works separately. Other national partner organizations sought working relationships that were egalitarian, endured over time, included on-going communication, consultation, planning and intermingling of resources. Five organizations identified working together, information exchange, and planning or setting priorities as core to partnerships. Three national partner organizations reported that partnerships involved the provision of funds or other resources. According to two national partner organizations, partnerships involved identifying new areas in which to work. Two national partner organizations indicated that “true” partnerships involve equality between partners and that partnering is only possible when it is non-hierarchical.

National partnership organizations were asked whether or not they would describe their relationships with the NCPC as partnerships given their definition of partnership and past involvement with the Centre. First and foremost, we found that national partner organizations want different kinds of partnerships and, as a result, have different expectations about their partnerships with the NCPC. Some national partner organizations had a utilitarian approach to partnership. They wanted the NCPC to provide information and/or funding as their role in partnerships. Partnership was a way to improve, continue or to expand work done by their national and/or network agencies. In return, the national partner organizations would use their network to disseminate the information and do community-based work (deliver programs). Other national partner organizations wanted to participate more fully with the NCPC – they sought input into the discussions around policy directions. The requirements that national partner organizations had depended on what their agency focus was – project development (community/local focus); program development (program of activities/approach), or policy development (set policy directions). Information, tools and funding were key for national partner organizations with a project focus. Program-focused national partner organizations wanted two-way information flow, the opportunity to sit on advisory committees and a plan for

communicating the CPSD approach to a wider audience. National partner organizations that sought policy development partnerships want the opportunity for meaningful consultation, input into policy decision and to policy direction.

### **3.2.2 Contact with the NCPC**

The nature of the contact between national partner organizations and the NCPC varied. National partner organizations were asked if they had worked with the NCPC in any of four ways – consultation, advisory capacity, receiving and sharing information, dissemination of information and other contact. Each form of contact is described below.

- Consultation on NCPC policy: Nine of the 15 national partner organizations indicated that they had participated in consultations on NCPC policy issues. However, of these, five indicated that they had been consulted early on (several years earlier) but had not been involved since and one indicated that their involvement was indirect. For the remaining three national partner organizations, consultation is ongoing.
- Acting in an advisory capacity. Three national partner organizations reported participating in an advisory capacity with the NCPC. These were the same three national partner organizations that reported on-going consultations with the Centre.
- Received information from the NCPC on their activities: Most of the national partner organizations (12 of 15) had received information from the Centre. However, they were interested in regular updates, more information on recent activities, new tools, and on a wider range of issues.
- Shared information with the NCPC: Eleven of the 15 national partner organizations had provided the Centre with information on their organizations and activities. Again this was not always shared on a regular basis. In some cases, information was requested from them.
- Disseminated NCPC information to others: Nine national partner organizations had disseminated NCPC information to others. This included dissemination to their member agencies and to other organizations.
- Other contact: These responses varied. For example, six national partner organizations had NCPC funded projects and two national partner organizations sat on committees that the NCPC was also on. Three national partner organizations reported that their contact was irregular. It was usually initiated by the NCPC when it was interested in information on a particular issue or when it was seeking someone to do some work in a particular area.



Currently, the NCPC and national partner organizations have a variety of different relationships. Two national partner organizations identified themselves as having on-going, long-term, comprehensive relationships with the Centre – partnerships. The remaining national partner organizations have relationships that are more limited, informal and consultative. The relationship expectations break down into three categories:

- Instrumental/Contributory – national partner organizations want the NCPC to provide them with information, funding, and project guidelines.
- Consultation – national partner organizations want the NCPC to consult them on an on-going basis, on both issues that they work on and on other issues.
- Collaboration – national partner organizations want input into planning and decision-making, including setting goals and directions.

National partner organizations indicated that when you evoke the term partnership, you are referring to a process of working together towards common goals. While partnerships may begin with consultation, they also grow beyond this type of relationship. It is important to clarify the kinds of relationships that the NCPC wants with national partner organizations and to be clear with these national partner organizations about the nature of their relationships. It was suggested that the term ‘partnership’ be reserved for only those relationships that meet the expectations that each of the participants have of partnerships.

### **3.2.3 Identification as an NCPC Partner**

In addition to the nature of the relationship, national partner organizations’ expectations also played a role in whether or not they saw themselves as partners with the NCPC. For example, seven national partner organizations identified themselves as partners with the NCPC. Of these, three reported that they had partnered with the NCPC on a specific project and saw funding as the NCPC’s contribution to the partnership. Another three national partner organizations indicated that they had on-going contact with the NCPC and either sat on an NCPC advisory committee or had asked the NCPC to sit on one of their advisory committees. Finally, one national partner organization reported that their partnership with the NCPC was currently underdeveloped. They had done a project for the NCPC but saw the potential for more extensive involvement. National partner organizations noted that they had been consulted a number of years ago but most also said that they had not really been consulted since then. Their contact was often informal and sporadic – centering around a particular issue or call for proposals. Only

two national partner organizations had long-term, comprehensive relationships that could be termed partnerships in the fullest sense of the term.

Five national partner organizations reported that their agencies were not partners with the NCPC. Their reasons included that the NCPC was not an active partner; they did not work together but they had similar goals and values; that they had limited contact with the NCPC; that the NCPC is not focused on national partner organizations and that this could not be a true partnership because the NCPC came to them after all the key decisions had already been made. Two national partner organizations indicated that their partnerships were not what they could be – that they were not true partnerships. One national partner organization indicated that the partnership had not gone beyond the NCPC being a funding source and one indicated that the power differences between them and the NCPC limited the extent of partnering. One national partner organization was unable to answer this question.

### **3.2.4 Involvement of Non-Traditional Partners**

While NCPC managers felt that crime prevention partnerships had extended beyond traditional criminal justice partners and had engaged traditional partners in different ways, the experience of national partner organizations did not coincide with this perception. Most national partner organizations felt that they had limited involvement with the NCPC. Of the three national partner organizations, which indicated they had strong, ongoing partnerships, only one represented a non-traditional national partner organization. Importantly, most non-traditional national partner organizations were involved at the project-level as opposed to the program level.

### **3.2.5 Strategy's Approach to Partnership**

National partner organizations were asked how the National Strategy approached partnerships at the national level and how this contributed to reducing crime and victimization. Eight national partner organizations indicated that the NCPC's approach had contributed primarily to project-level partnerships. They noted that project-level partnerships were inter-sectoral and based on a CPSD approach. Three national partner organizations noted that their experiences included consultation by and with NCPC, a process of building consensus, and three noted that NCPC's closest ties were to large mainstream organizations. One national partner organization noted that there was considerable potential for policy-level partnerships but this remains an underdeveloped area. Finally, three national partner organizations reported that they did not know.

When asked how the NCPC's approach to partnership helped reduce crime and victimization, national partner organizations provided four general answers. First, they noted that the NCPC had been effective in getting the message about CPSD out to a wide range of groups and organizations. They noted that CPSD encouraged groups to "get the whole picture and made responses more effective." Next they reported that through sharing information and developing tools, the NCPC had assisted in improving service delivery across the country. The NCPC was credited with identifying issues that needed to be addressed through their consultations with national partners – an approach that led to better priority setting and kept the Centre in better touch. One national partner organization noted that the NCPC was aware of regional differences and was flexible in responding within the different regions.

### **3.2.6 How Partnership is Working at the National Level**

Finally, national partner organizations were asked what is working well and not so well with respect to policy level partnerships. They were also asked how these partnerships could be improved. Here, some national partner organizations focused on project-related issues while most considered the links between the NCPC and national organizations.

National partner organizations indicated a number of positive features of the current approach to partnering. Seven national partner organizations indicated that NCPC staff were key to partnerships working well at the policy level. NCPC staff members were praised for their openness, good will, being easy to deal with, having an objective approach to issues and for being a stable point of contact. Four national partner organizations identified information sharing as a positive feature; this included the high quality of their information, for effective sharing of information and tools, and for ensuring that communication of information was ongoing. Three national partner organizations thought that the funding commitment generally and multi-year funding, in particular, were working well. Two national partner organizations said ongoing dialogue between their agencies and the NCPC were working well and two found the funding process was clear and well supported. Finally, one national partner organization indicated that nothing was going well because the partnerships were at the project-level rather than at the policy-level.

National partner organizations provided a variety of answers to this question – some reflected general concerns with partnerships between national partner organizations and the NCPC, while others reflected particular problems they had had when applying for or reporting on funded projects. In the former category were five national partner organizations that felt that the NCPC should expand its work on partnerships at the policy level. They felt that partnerships were

currently underdeveloped and that the NCPC should and could work more fully with national level organizations. Two national partner organizations were concerned that current consultations were too narrow – leaving some groups on the margins. Two national partner organizations thought that the NCPC should improve its information sharing. One national partner organization was concerned that the NCPC was under-staffed resulting in staff having to “fragment” themselves to try to get the job done. The remaining concerns were related to the project funding and/or reporting process – two national partner organizations were concerned that the funding process and financial recording process were too complex, two were concerned with the lengthy time delays in applying for funds.

Seven national partner organizations recommended that the NCPC improve partnership development through increased dialogue and discussion with organizations. They recommended that these discussions be inter-sectoral, work on improving coordination of efforts, and work towards building coalition and consensus. One concrete recommendation was to focus consensus building around a number of themes – an approach that one national partner organization felt would lead to more focused and effective efforts. Three national partner organizations wanted better information flow/sharing and better follow-up. One wanted the project application process streamlined, another wanted the staffing shortages addressed while one felt that NCPC needed to see national partner organizations as allies.

## **4. FINDINGS: PROJECT LEVEL**

To assess partnerships at the project level, project managers and their project partners were interviewed.

### **4.1 Project Managers' Perspectives on Partnership**

#### **4.1.1 Awareness**

These interviews began by asking questions about the project managers' awareness of the NCPC's crime prevention strategy; the NCPC's approach to partnerships and other NCPC partnerships involving the respondent's organization (see Table 7). Familiarity with the Strategy was high. Twenty-seven (50.0%) of the 54 project managers were very familiar with the NCPC's crime prevention strategy, 24 (44.4%) were somewhat familiar and three (5.6%) were not at all familiar. Project managers were slightly less familiar with the NCPC's approach to partnerships – 24 (44.4%) were very familiar with the approach, 25 (46.3%) were somewhat familiar and five (9.3%) were not at all familiar with it. Most project managers (38-70.4%) reported that they were not involved in any other NCPC partnerships while 15 (27.8%) project managers were involved in another partnership and one did not know if his/her organization was involved in any other partnerships that included the NCPC.

**Table 7: Familiarity with Strategy**

Familiarity with strategy	Very Familiar	Somewhat familiar	Not at all familiar
	50.0%	44.4%	5.6%
NCPC approach to partnerships	44.4%	46.3%	9.3%
Involved in other NCPC partnership	No 70.4%	Yes 27.8%	

#### **4.1.2 Types of Project Activities**

The project managers were then asked about the specific project they had managed. They provided a variety of descriptions of the main activity of their projects. Some project managers provided more than one description of their main activity reflecting the fact that projects were directed at a number of different sites or groups within the community (see Table 8). Twenty-three projects involved service delivery as an activity or the only activity of the project. Forty-one were involved in community mobilization and twenty-seven described projects directed at public awareness. In addition, three project managers indicated that their projects had other primary activities.

**Table 8: Types of Project Activities**

Service delivery as an activity or the only activity of the project	23 projects
Community mobilization	41 projects
Public awareness	27 projects
Other primary activities	3 projects

#### **4.1.3 Identification of Partners**

It is interesting to note that some project managers identified the NCPC as a project partner which meant that while there was a provision of financial assistance, assistance with proposal preparation and some planning assistance, involvement in service or program delivery was limited. This re-enforces the idea that partnership is being thought of in a very broad way – as a relationship between an organization and others. While some relationships involve working together with a shared vision and shared responsibilities, most do not.

#### **4.1.4 Expectations of Partnership**

Project managers were asked what they expected their partnerships would involve. They were asked to indicate if they expected partnerships to involve consultation (i.e., information sharing), cooperation (provision of assistance if required), coordination (coordination of activity or effort), or collaboration (working fully together). All responses that applied to them were recorded. Most (38 – 70.4%) project managers indicated that they expected their partnerships to involve all four dimensions – that is, that their partnerships would involve sharing information, provision of assistance, coordination of activities and working together. Ten indicated that their partnerships involved coordination, five expected cooperative partnerships and one wanted a consultative partnership.

The nature of the partnerships varied, to some extent, by the type of project involved. For example, when project managers were involved in the research and planning phase but not in the implementation phase of a project, their expectations were quite different from projects where project partners were expected to be involved in the planning and delivery of services. In the latter case, partnerships were typically collaborative. In the former, the partnerships required only consultation and cooperation.

It is important, however, to recognize that partnerships vary depending on the nature of the project. In particular projects, project partners may not be involved in all phases of the project and their input may be limited to consultation. In others, 'partnership may require that the project partners collaborate – work together, share decision-making and responsibility. The definition of what constituted a partnership largely depended on the nature of the project and the expectations of the participants.

Project managers' expectations about partnerships were generally met. Thirty-seven of the 54 project managers (68.5%) indicated that their expectations about partnerships were fully met, 15 (27.8%) indicated that their expectations were partially met and two (3.7%) indicated that their expectations were not met at all. The extent to which expectations about partnership were met needs to be qualified because not all of the projects had reached fruition and thus while their expectations were fully, partially or not at all met at the time of the interview, this may change once the project is completed.

#### **4.1.5 Partner Involvement in Projects**

Next, project managers were asked for more details about the nature of project partners' involvement at the proposal stage, once funding was received and once the project was up and running (see Table 9). The number of project partners involved in each project varied. Project managers reported having from one to twenty project partners. However, when project managers were asked to identify project partners by name and provide a contact person, their capacity to do so was limited. Of the 32 managers who said they had six or more project partners, four could identify no project partners by name, one identified only one project partner by name, one identified only one project partner, one identified only two project partners, six identified three project partners and four identified four project partners. Only 10 were able to identify five or more project partners by name. One project was not up and running yet and had not contacted any project partners. Even considering that some projects were not up and running and that some had limited institutional memory about past projects, this suggests that there may be some exaggeration of the number of project partners.



When asked if their project partners received a copy of the proposal prior to funding, less than half (23 of 53) of the project managers indicated that all had, eight (14.8%) indicated that most had, and eight (14.8%) reported that some had, four (7.4%) had provided a few of their project partners with a copy of the proposal and 10 (18.5%) reported that none of their project partners received a copy of the proposal. Project partners were also active in providing letters of support. Twenty-two project managers (42.3%) indicated that all their project partners provided letters, 11 (21.2%) said that most of their project partners provided letters, ten (19.2%) reported that some project partners provided letters of support, two (3.8%) said a few provided letters, and seven (13.5%) indicated that none of their project partners provided letters of support. Few project managers reported that project partners sat on a committee that met to draft the proposal – (nine had all, eight had most, 13 had some, four had a few and 19 (35.8%) had no project partners at a committee meeting at the proposal stage). It appears that while project partners are consulted and provided with information, most project proposals are prepared in-house or with select project partners. Again, this may be linked to the type of project. For example, projects that do work in multiple communities tend to have core project partners at the planning stage and front-line project partners involved at the program/service delivery stage.

**Table 9: Nature of Community Project Partner Involvement: Project Managers' Perspectives**

	All	Most	Some	Few	None
Received a copy of the proposal <sup>1</sup>	43.4%	15.1%	15.1%	7.5%	18.9%
Wrote a letter of support <sup>2</sup>	42.3%	21.2%	19.2%	3.8%	13.5%
Member of committee at proposal stage <sup>1</sup>	17.0%	15.1%	24.5%	7.5%	35.8%
Planned for implementation <sup>1</sup>	26.4%	17.0%	22.6%	11.3%	22.6%
Responsible for implementation <sup>1</sup>	26.4%	15.1%	35.8%	15.1%	7.5%
Provided financial assistance <sup>1</sup>	17.0%	9.4%	26.4%	11.3%	35.8%
Provided human resources <sup>1</sup>	37.7%	15.1%	32.1%	9.4%	5.7%
Provided in-kind assistance <sup>1</sup>	26.4%	24.5%	30.2%	11.3%	7.5%
Coordinated activities <sup>2</sup>	28.8%	21.2%	23.1%	19.2%	7.7%
Developed protocols <sup>2</sup>	30.8%	21.2%	11.5%	15.4%	21.2%
Had decision making responsibility <sup>2</sup>	26.9%	13.5%	28.8%	11.5%	19.2%
Responsible/partially responsible for fiscal management <sup>2</sup>	13.5%	7.7%	9.6%	19.2%	50.0%
Responsible/partially responsible for reporting results <sup>1</sup>	17.0%	11.3%	7.5%	30.2%	34.0%

<sup>1</sup> One case missing. <sup>2</sup> Two cases missing.

Once funding was received, project managers indicated that project partners were involved in a variety of ways. In 23 (43.4%) of the projects, most or all of the project partners met to plan for implementation. At least one project partner met to plan for implementation in 77.4% of the projects (22.6% had reported no involvement in planning) In only seven projects, project managers (13.5%) reported that none of the project partners met to plan for implementation. Responsibility for implementation also varied. In 14 projects (26.4%) all of the project partners were responsible for implementation, in eight (15.1%) most were responsible, in 19 (38.5%) some of the project partners were responsible for implementation, in eight (15.1%) a few were responsible while in four projects, none of the project partners were responsible for implementation.

What kind of resources did project partners provide to projects? According to project managers, in almost half of the projects (47.1%) few or none of the project partners provided financial assistance while in nine projects (17.0%) all project partners provided financial assistance. The provision of in-kind resources was more common. Twenty-seven project managers (50.9%) reported that all or most project partners provided in-kind resources, sixteen (30.2%) had some and ten (18.8%) had few or no project partners who provided in-kind resources. The provision of human resources also varied. In eight projects (15.1%), project managers reported that few or no project partners provided human resources and in 28 (52.8%) all or most project partners provided human resources.

What kinds of activities were project partners involved in and what were their responsibilities to/for the project? Project managers indicated that participation varied. In 26 projects (50.0%), project managers reported that all or most project partners coordinated their activities with the funded agency, 12 (23.1%) had some project partners who did this and 14 (26.9%) had no project partners who were coordinating activity. Protocols were developed with all or most project partners in 27 projects (52%), six project managers indicated that they had protocols with some project partners, while 10 project managers had no protocols with project partners. Protocols identified by project managers addressed issues such as information sharing (27), evaluation (12), contact (one), referrals (18), and working together (seven). Protocol development was related to the type of activity involved. For example, service provision – working directly with clients – was more likely to result in protocol development than was involvement in public awareness campaigns.

Partnering involved some responsibility for project management. Project managers reported that none of their project partners had responsibility for fiscal management in 50.0% of the projects and no responsibility for reporting project results in 34.2% of the projects. They also reported that in 40.4% of projects, all or most project partners had decision-making responsibility. In

only three cases did project managers report that their project partners were fully involved in the project from the planning stage through implementation to the reporting stage.

#### **4.1.6 Partnerships Within Each Stream**

Data on the nature of partnering relationships are difficult to ascertain. Thus, understanding how partnerships are articulated within the funding streams is challenging. The limited data available here suggest that the different funding streams may vary in the types of partnerships they have developed along a continuum of involvement (see Table 10). First, the different types of partnerships were distinguished based on the kinds of involvement project partners had with the lead agency. Partnerships were defined as *consultative* if the project partner had received a copy of the proposal or written a letter of support. Partnerships were defined as *cooperative* if project partners had co-operated in planning the project through any of the two following ways: receiving a copy of the proposal, and/or written a letter and/or sat on a committee to develop the proposal. Partnerships were also defined as cooperative if project partners provided support (human resources and/or in-kind support) at the implementation stage but did not coordinate their activities or have responsibility for the project. Partnerships involving *coordination* were those, which included at least one of the following: the provisions of resources (in-kind or human) to the project, decision-making or the development of protocols. Finally, *collaborative* partnerships involved six of the following eight items: planning for implementation, responsibility or partial responsibility for implementation, the provision of human, financial or in-kind resources, decision-making responsibility, responsibility for reporting and responsibility for fiscal management.

The Business Action Program, for example, is the least likely to have collaborative partnerships and most likely to have coordinated partnerships. Investment Fund partnerships were the least likely to be coordinated. These results, however, are based on small numbers and need to be interpreted with caution.

**Table 10: Project Managers' Assessment of Partnerships by funding stream**

	BAP	CMP	CPPP	CIFP	Total
Consultation	n=0 (0.0%)	n=1 (2.9%)	n=0 (0.0%)	n=0 (0.0%)	n=1 (1.9%)
Cooperation	n=1 (16.7%)	n=1 (2.9%)	n=1 (12.5%)	n=2 (33.3%)	n=5 (9.3%)
Coordination	n=3 (50.0%)	n=6 (17.6%)	n=1 (12.5%)	n=0 (0.0%)	n=10 (18.5%)
Collaboration	n=2 (33.3%)	n=25 (76.5%)	n=6 (75.0%)	n=4 (66.7%)	n=38 (70.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>n=6 (100%)</b>	<b>n=34 (100%)</b>	<b>n=8 (100%)</b>	<b>n=6 (100%)</b>	<b>n=54 (100%)</b>

#### 4.1.7 Number of Project Partners

Table 11 describes the number of partnerships by funding stream as determined by project managers. It shows that a total of 83.3% of the Business Action Program projects surveyed and 75.0% of the CPPP projects surveyed had six or more project partners. The Crime Prevention Investment Fund program had the least project partners per project with 33.3% (n=2) having zero to two partners. Once again, caution in interpreting these results is warranted given the small numbers involved.

**Table 11: Number of Partners by Funding Stream**

	BAP	CMP	CPPP	CIFP	Total
0 to 2	16.7% (n=1)	11.8% (n=4)	0.0% (n=0)	33.3% (n=2)	13.0% (n=7)
3 to 5	0.0% (n=0)	35.5% (n=12)	25.0% (n=2)	16.7% (n=1)	27.8% (n=15)
6 or more	83.3% (n=5)	52.9% (n=18)	75.0% (n=6)	50.0% (n=3)	59.6% (n=32)
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(n=6)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(n=34)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(n=8)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(n=6)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(n=54)</b>

#### 4.1.8 Sectors Involved

Project level partnerships involve agencies from a wide range of sectors. Of the 54 project managers interviewed, 32 were from social/community service agencies, ten were from education agencies, seven were from health agencies, three were from criminal justice agencies, and two were from businesses. The project managers identified a number of project partners. Twenty-one project managers said they had one to five project partners. These project partners were in a variety of sectors: 43 were social/community service agencies, 32 were in the education sector, 33 were governments agencies (federal, provincial/territorial and municipal), 27 were criminal justice agencies, 10 were businesses, eight were health related agencies, and five were in housing.

#### 4.1.9 Involvement of Non-Traditional Project Partners

Partnerships appear to be an important part of agency activity both within NCPC funded projects and outside them. When asked about partnerships prior to receiving NCPC funding, 47 project managers (87.0%) indicated that they had had partners previously. Since receiving NCPC funding, 39 project managers (72.2%) report reported their agencies had developed new project partners with 31 (81.6%) identifying their new project partners as non-traditional partners.

#### **4.1.10 Satisfaction**

Thirty-four project managers (65.4%) indicated their partnerships went very well, 17 (32.7%) said they went well and one (1.9%) said their partnerships went neither well nor badly. Two projects were not yet working with their project partners and project managers could not rate their partnerships.

#### **4.1.11 Success Factors**

Project managers were asked if any of eight factors identified contributed to successful partnerships and how they contributed (see Table 12). Seventy percent (70.5%) of the project managers felt that strong leadership was important to successful partnerships because it brought groups and individuals to the table. Funding was identified by 58.5% of project managers as important for successful partnerships. Financial assistance was necessary to run projects and hence without funding, building partnerships was difficult. Most project managers (84.3%) indicated that common goals were important and 72.5% said that common values were important. Common goals helped to maintain focus (which assists in achieving anticipated/planned outcomes) while common values provide different groups and organizations with a point of contact. Adequate preparation was identified by 44.4% of project managers as key to successful partnerships – it helps to bring the right project partners together. Shared decision-making (identified by 49.0% of the project managers) and the opportunity to fully participate (identified by 60.8%) provide project partners with a commitment to the project. These factors also provide project partners an opportunity to bring their concerns to the table. Mandates were important for 56.9% of project managers because they set limits and boundaries *a priori*. Finally, the project managers noted that other factors impact on success such as timing – being at the right place at the right time, being able to attract the right project partners (new project partners, traditional and non-traditional project partners) and the nature of the community (resources, structure, level of mobilization).

**Table 12: Factors Project Managers Identified as Contributing to Successful Partnerships**

Factors	Yes	How
Strong Leadership	56.9% (n=34)	Provides out reach, brings groups/individuals into project
Adequate funding	58.5% (n=30)	Need funds to run a successful project
Common goals	84.3% (n=43)	Helps to maintain focus – assists in achieving outcomes
Shared Values	72.5% (n=37)	Provides a point of contact
Adequate Preparation	44.4% (n=24)	Key – assists in knowing who is out there in the community, identifying who to involve
Shared Decision Making	49.0% (n=25)	Allows concerns of all partners to be addressed. Provides a sense of shared responsibility and contributes to joint problem solving
Opportunity to Fully Participate	60.8% (n=31)	Provides a sense of shared responsibility and contributes to joint problem solving
Clear Mandate	56.9% (n=29)	Limits scope a priori, clear what's to be done
Other	29.4% (n=15)	Timing; Bringing together right partners; Nature of Community

#### 4.1.12 Supports for Partnership

A related question was what supports partnerships once they are developed. Here project managers provided open-ended answers. Responses covered a wide range of factors (see Table 13). Resources were seen as important with 20 project managers identifying funding as key. Project managers reported that partnerships needed other resources – such as sufficient time and staff to continue (seven respondents). A total of 13 project managers identified ongoing communication as important while seven project managers said networking and building partnerships were important. Communication with project partners must be ongoing. It is important to share information, consult and work out how to collaborate with project partners. Project partners also need expertise, knowledge, research and tools (12 respondents). Other factors included leadership (which provides motivation), more awareness in the community at large of the issues and CPSD, continued identification of new issues, and working together to avoid duplication.

**Table 13: Factors that Support Continuation of Project Partnerships: Project Managers' Perspectives**

Factors	Number of Respondents
Funding	20
Knowing needs of community	7
Networking, building partnerships	7
Being committed to project/partnership	10
Shared values/common goals	8
Having an impact	5
Common objectives/vision	4
Ongoing communication/dialogue	13
Resources — other than funding	7
Research/knowledge	12
Other	12

To be successful within communities, project partners must identify key contacts and bring them to the table. They must address how to bring marginal groups into the mix. Often, marginal groups lack organizations and leadership that are easily identified. Partnerships are not well supported when these groups are pivotal and are not able to come to the table.

#### **4.1.13 Strategy's Support for Partnerships**

All four streams provide support for partnerships through providing resources, facilitating contacts, assisting in building networks and in their commitment to Crime Prevention through Social Development (CPSD). Project managers indicated that partnerships are an integral to a CPSD philosophy. In addition, the funding streams facilitate partnerships in unique ways. The Crime Prevention Partnership Program (CPPP) develops tools that are of interest to a range of groups – bringing them into partnerships. The Community Mobilization Program is premised on Joint Management making partnerships integral to what NCPC Managers do. The Community Investment Fund Program is issue focused and attracts diverse groups who are interested in a particular issue. It has also made partnerships an integral part of both the program and each funded project.



## **4.2 Project Partners' Perspectives on Partnerships**

### **4.2.1 Awareness**

Project partners had limited awareness of NCPC's role in the crime prevention. Almost three-quarters of project partners (73.1%) were aware that NCPC was the funding source for the project. When project partners were asked how familiar they were with NCPC's crime prevention strategy, 13 (19.4%) reported being very familiar, 35 (52.2%) were somewhat familiar and 19 (28.4%) were not at all familiar. Knowledge of NCPC's approach to partnerships was similar with 12 project partners (17.9%) being very familiar, 32 (47.8%) being somewhat familiar and 23 (34.3%) knowing nothing at all about NCPC's approach to partnerships. Seventeen of the identified project partners were involved in partnerships on other NCPC funded projects.

### **4.2.2 Identification as Project Partners**

The fact that the project partners in the sample were identified by the project managers may mean that the project partners interviewed are not typical project partners but those who were most involved. Sixty-one project partners (91%) identified themselves as partners in the projects. Six (9.0%) did not consider themselves to be project partners. This was because though they were involved in some aspect of the project, they were not working in a collaborative manner. They provided assistance but did not work directly with the lead agency.

### **4.2.3 Involvement in Projects**

Project partners were asked about their involvement in various stages of the project (see Table 14).

**Table 14: Nature of Project Partners' Involvement in Partnerships  
Project Managers' Perspectives**

Nature of Involvement	Yes	No
Copy of the proposal	56.9%	41.8%
Wrote a letter of support	63.9%	36.1%
Sat on committee preparing proposal	50.0%	50.0%
Planned for implementation	67.7%	32.3%
Responsible for implementation	58.8%	41.5%
Provided financial assistance	27.7%	72.3%
Provided human resources	87.7%	12.3%
Provided in-kind resources	67.7%	32.3%
Coordinated activities	69.2%	30.8%
Developed protocols	47.7%	52.3%
Shared decision making	49.2%	50.8%
Responsible for fiscal management	18.8%	81.3%
Responsible for reporting results	48.4%	51.6%

#### 4.2.4 Partnerships Within Each Stream

Information provided by project partners on their involvement in the projects was used to classify these partnerships according to the continuum of involvement – consultation, coordination, cooperation and collaboration<sup>1</sup>. All but four of the projects could be classified. In two of these projects, the project partners indicated that they were not involved in any of the activities. In one case, the information was missing and in the final case, the project partner had planned for implementation and developed a working protocol. This latter case fits between cooperation and coordination. It was classified as cooperative because coordinating activities was deemed critical for a project to be defined as collaborative.

<sup>1</sup> The continuum is described earlier in this report, under the section, Program Managers' Perspectives on Partnership: Partnerships within each Stream.

**Table 15: Project Partners’ Assessment of Partnerships by Funding Stream**

	BAP	CMP	CPPP	CPIF	Total
Consultation	16.7% (n=1)	4.7% (n=2)	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)	4.8% (n=3)
Cooperation	16.7% (n=1)	20.9% (n=9)	14.3% (n=1)	14.3% (n=2)	19.0% (n=12)
Coordination	33.3% (n=2)	46.5% (n=20)	42.9% (n=3)	42.9% (n=0)	44.4% (n=28)
Collaboration	33.3% (n=2)	27.9% (n=12)	42.9% (n=3)	42.9% (n=4)	31.7% (n=20)
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(n=6)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(n=43)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(n=7)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(n=7)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(n=63)</b>

Table 15 shows the type of partnerships by funding stream based on project partner data. The data are similar to the classifications provided by the project managers. Again, caution is urged when interpreting these results since the totals involved are very small for three of the four funding streams. In all four streams, the most common form of partnership was coordination. In coordination-type partnerships, project partners coordinated their activities with lead agencies. Then, depending on the specific requirements of the project, they had different levels of involvement in the projects. Some provided human and/or in-kind resources. Others developed protocols related to the work but did not work together.

#### **4.2.5 Comparing Project Managers’ and Project Partners’ Perspectives on Involvement**

Both project managers and project partners were asked similar questions about involvement in projects but with different answer categories – yes or no for project partners and all/most/some/few/none for project managers. For comparison purposes few/none responses were combined to estimate the proportion of partners who were likely to not be involved and compared this proportion to the No category for project partners (see Table 16). The all/most/some categories were combined and compared them to the Yes category<sup>2</sup>. For the

<sup>2</sup> The data on the project managers’ responses can be found in Table 9.

planning stage, slightly more than half of the 67 project partners (56.1%) indicated that they had received a copy of the proposal. This is less than the proportion identified by project managers (73.6%) in the All/Most/Some categories. Slightly more than sixty percent (61.9%) of partners reported that they had provided a letter of support – again this is less than the proportion reported by project managers (82.7% - All/Most/Some). Fifty percent of project partners (49.2%) indicated that they had sat on a planning committee at the proposal stage versus 56.6% of project managers reporting that all, most, or some of their partners had met at the proposal stage. The divergence in answers is likely due to the category differences with the project partner respondents being a mix of the most involved and less involved partners. It may be that project managers are over estimating planning involvement.

At the implementation stage, project partners and project managers had points of agreement and of disagreement. For example, they had similar estimates of the number of meetings to plan for implementation with 66.7% of project partners saying they had done so and 66.0% of project managers reporting that all, most, or some of their partners had met to plan for implementation. Two-thirds of project partners (68.2%) reported providing in-kind assistance to the project versus 81.1% of project managers reporting all, most or some partners providing in-kind assistance. Again, project partners and project managers had closer estimates on the provision of human resources to the project with 87.9% of project partners and 84.9% of project managers indicating the provision of these resources by project partners.

Sixty-nine percent (69.7%) of project partners and 73.1% of project managers reported that partner involvement in projects required them to coordinate their activities with the lead agencies. About forty-five percent (47.0%) of project partners reported that they had developed protocols while 63.5% of project managers indicated that protocols had been developed. Project partners indicated that the most common protocols focused on information sharing (n=19), followed by referral protocols (n=nine) and other types of protocols (n=five). Project responsibilities varied between these partners and project manager reports. About twenty percent (18.5%) of project partners reported that they had fiscal responsibility for the project while 30.8% of managers said all, most or some partners had fiscal responsibility. In addition, 47.7% of project partners said they had reporting responsibilities versus 35.8% of project managers. Finally, while 50.0% of partners reported having decision-making responsibilities, 69.2% of project managers said their partners had this responsibility.

The differences between the assessments of the project partners and those of the project managers are probably related, in part, to the different levels of involvement for partners. Partners with extensive involvement and those with fewer responsibilities for projects are likely to share some common features and to diverge on others. The project managers are reporting on

the general trends – project partners on their specific experiences. Because partners are unlikely to know how involved they are in projects in comparison to other partners it is difficult to assess how extensive their involvement is compared to others and to the responses of the project managers. In addition, the partnership requirements may be providing an incentive for Managers to over estimate the involvement of partners. In all but two categories (planned for implementation, responsible for reporting) the Managers estimates of involvement are higher than the Partners.

**Table 16: Nature of Project Partners' Involvement in Partnerships: Comparison of Project Managers' and Project Partners' Perspectives**

Nature of Involvement	Project managers (all, most, some)	Project Partners (Yes)
Copy of the proposal	73.6%	56.1%
Wrote a letter of support	82.7%	61.9%
Sat on committee preparing proposal	56.6%	49.2%
Planned for implementation	66.0%	66.7%
Responsible for implementation	77.3%	57.6%
Provided financial assistance	52.8%	27.3%
Provided human resources	84.9%	87.9%
Provided in-kind resources	81.1%	68.2%
Coordinated activities	73.1%	69.7%
Developed protocols	63.5%	47.0%
Shared decision making	69.2%	50.0%
Responsible for fiscal management	30.8%	18.5%
Responsible for reporting results	35.8%	47.7%

#### 4.2.6 Satisfaction

Project partners were enthusiastic, with 81.5% reporting that the partnership went very well and 18.5% reporting that it went well.

### 4.2.7 Success factors

What factors within the partnerships did project partners think contributed to successful partnerships? As can be seen in Table 17, project partners agreed that a number of factors were important to their successful partnerships. Common goals (86.2%) and shared values (75.2%) were the two most frequently cited factors. These were followed by leadership (67.2%), a clear mandate (60.0%), and the opportunity to fully participate (53.8%). These findings indicate that the factors that make partnerships successful for lead agencies and project partners are quite similar. They also suggest that while partnerships may be an effective and desirable way to deliver crime prevention programs, they are likely to be successful only when project partners have common goals and shared values.

**Table 17: Factors Project Partners Identified as Contributing to Successful Partnerships**

Factors	Yes	How
Strong Leadership	67.2% (n=45)	Provides out reach, brings groups/individuals into project
Adequate funding	41.5% (n=27)	Need funds to run a successful project
Common goals	86.2% (n=56)	Helps to maintain focus – assists in achieving outcomes
Shared Values	75.4% (n=49)	Provides a point of contact
Adequate Preparation	44.4% (n=24)	Key – assists in knowing who is out there in the community, identifying who to involve
Shared Decision Making	36.9% (n=24)	Allows concerns of all partners to be addressed. Provides a sense of shared responsibility and contributes to joint problem solving
Opportunity to Fully Participate	53.8% (n=35)	Provides a sense of shared responsibility and contributes to joint problem solving
Clear Mandate	60.0% (n=39)	Limits scope a priori, clear what's to be done
Other	27.7% (n=18)	Community size, Staff, Flexibility, Provision of Materials

### 4.2.8 Future Partnerships

Sixty-four (94.0%) of the project partners reported that they would pursue partnerships in the future. They indicated that partnerships provided many benefits. They allowed activities that would otherwise not be possible because they would be too costly. Partnerships provided project

partners with higher profiles in communities, with educational opportunities for staff, with information from databases and made their work more effective and successful. Further, partnerships gave project partners a sense of the wider picture.

#### **4.2.9 Motivation**

Project partners were asked how they became involved in the partnership. Some provided more than one reason. For 33 project partners, the lead agency approached them. For 26, the partnership evolved from ongoing interagency discussions while for six respondents, the project partner approached the lead agency. Project partners were also asked what motivated them to participate in the partnership. For most (58 of the 67), it was commitment or concern about the issue/group that was the focus of the project. Goodwill toward the sponsoring organization was a motivating factor for 41 project partners and 39 cited a commitment to interagency partnerships. These data suggest that inter-agency partnerships are being recognized as an effective way of ‘doing business’. It also indicates that partnerships may congeal around particular issues or target groups while cutting across sectors.

#### **4.2.10 Benefits**

Project partners also provided insight into the benefits of partnerships. Partnerships allow project partners to pursue activities that they could not do on their own. Initiatives involving partnerships were perceived by project partners as being more successful. Forty-eight percent (48.4%) of the project partners indicated that programs involving partnerships were more successful. They also provide instrumental benefits to project partners – information, funding, and tools. Project partners also indicated that partnering could be a mechanism for developing common goals – a key for successful partnerships according to both project managers and project partners (see Table 18). Forty-seven percent of the project partners (46.9%) indicated that their agency received benefits from partnering – including access to information and tools, and financial benefits. Partnering also allowed for activities that would otherwise not have been possible. Finally for fifteen project partners (23.4%), partnering increased the resources available to them and/or their clients.

**Table 18: Benefits of partnership –  
Project Partners’ Perspectives**

Perceived Benefit	Number of Partners	
Partnered programs are more successful	48.4%	(n=31)
Provides benefits to partner agency (information, knowledge, tools)	46.9%	(n=30)
Increases resources	23.4%	(n=15)
Allows activities that would not be possible otherwise	21.9%	(n=14)
Provides a sense of the wider picture	21.9%	(n=14)
Common Goals	18.8%	(n=12)



## 5. CONCLUSION

This survey has provided valuable insights into how the National Strategy's approach to partnership development and implementation is perceived and experienced at national and project levels. Approaches to partnership development as well as partnership implementation vary within the funding streams of the Strategy. While there appears to be general agreement that partnerships are a good thing in crime prevention, the survey findings suggest that the perceptions of partnership – and experience in developing and implementing them – vary among partners at national and project levels. Working together is a common definition of partnership, however, in practice partners have different kinds of understandings, expectations, and ultimately experiences and success with this way of working.

This survey revealed that partnership development is a dynamic process. It also brought a continuum of partnership involvement into focus. At the national level, partnerships can be categorized along a continuum of instrumental/contributory, consultative and collaborative partnerships. At the project level, partnerships can be categorized into a continuum of consultation, cooperation, coordination and collaboration.

The survey findings indicate a range of factors that contribute to successful partnerships, as well as a range of benefits that are derived from them. This information, along with survey respondent suggestions to improve partnership development and implementation, can be considered for advancing partnership development and implementation in crime prevention.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Partnerships Backgrounder**

**Partnership Study –  
National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention in Canada**

**Who is doing the study?**

The Evaluation Division of the Department of Justice has engaged the firm of JamiesonHartGraves Consulting to study how partnerships have developed and been implemented within the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention. The data collection will take place between February and March 2002.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine the nature and diversity of partnerships that have been developed within the National Strategy, and the extent to which these partnerships have supported the Strategy's development and implementation. The findings of the study will support the summative evaluation of the National Strategy.

**Why is the Department of Justice doing this study?**

Many different national, provincial/territorial and community-based organizations are participating as partners in crime prevention programs and activities through the National Strategy. Fostering partnerships is a key focus of the National Strategy.

This study will provide the Department of Justice with a working model of partnerships and partnership development in the field of crime prevention through social development. It will provide a sound and dynamic description of the nature and diversity of partnerships that have been developed within the National Strategy (a stronger benchmark). It will assess the extent to which partnerships have supported, or contributed to the Strategy's development and implementation, and it will provide insight into the "value added" of partnership. The study will produce recommendations on how partnership development and implementation within the National Strategy can be improved. The results of the study will provide meaningful, practical information for the summative evaluation.

**Are you evaluating my community? My group?**

The Department of Justice is not evaluating individuals, organizations or communities that are involved in crime prevention. Neither you nor your organization or community will be identified by name in the final report. Rather, our focus is on the examining the nature of partnerships as you have experienced/implemented them. This information will be collected

from 60 NCPC-funded projects across Canada and the results will be assessed from a national perspective.

## **Study Issues**

This study will explore the following issues:

- What is partnership?
- What forms has it taken within the National Strategy?
- How is partnership supported in each of the four funding programs?
- What types of partnerships are found in each of the funded programs?
- To what extent is the NCPC attracting partnerships with organizations, which have not “traditionally” considered crime prevention as part of their mandate or activity?
- What is working well about the National Strategy’s attempts to develop and implement the partnership approach? What is working not so well?
- What is working well at the Project level in terms of attempts to develop/implement the partnership approach? What is working not so well?
- What motivates partners to get involved with activities/projects funded with the National Strategy?
- What would motivate partners to continue to work in support of the National Strategy?
- How do partnerships develop and evolve?
- What are the common elements that contribute to positive partnership experiences?
- What are the implications for the future development of the partnership approach within the National Strategy?
- To what extent are partnerships continuing on after the initial NCPC project funding is over?

### **For more information about this study**

Evan Cobb  
Evaluation Manager, Evaluation Division  
Department of Justice  
284 Wellington Street,  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H8

Telephone: (613) 946-0546  
Fax: (613) 957-7906  
E-mail: [evan.cobb@justice.gc.ca](mailto:evan.cobb@justice.gc.ca)

## **About the National Strategy**

### **What is the National Strategy?**

The National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention is a federal interdepartmental initiative between the Department of Justice and the Ministry of the Solicitor General. The overall goal of the National Strategy is safer communities in Canada. The National Strategy is aimed at developing community-based responses to crime, with a particular emphasis on children, youth, Aboriginal people and women.

### **Objectives of the National Strategy**

The objectives of the National Strategy are to:

- promote integrated action of key governmental and non governmental partners to reduce crime and victimization;
- to assist communities in developing and implementing community - based solutions to problems that contribute to crime and victimization, particularly as they affect children, youth, women and Aboriginal persons;
- increase public awareness and support for effective approaches to crime prevention.

### **Funded Elements of Strategy**

The National Strategy is comprised of three major program elements: the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC), the Safer Communities Initiative and the Promotion and Public Education Program.

#### **1. The NCPC**

The NCPC is responsible for the overall management of the National Strategy and is part of the Department of Justice.

#### **2. The Safer Communities Initiative**

The Safer Communities Initiative consists of four grant and contribution funding programs: the Community Mobilization Program, the Crime Prevention Investment Fund, the Crime Prevention Partnership Program and the Business Action Program on Crime Prevention. These four

programs provide financial support to communities and organizations to develop, implement and evaluate crime prevention models.

### **3. Promotion and Public Education Program**

The purpose of the Promotion and Public Education Program is to increase awareness and knowledge about crime and victimization and effective responses to them.

#### **For more information about the National Strategy**

Toll-free telephone: 1-877-302-NCPC

Consult the web site: [www.crime-prevention.org](http://www.crime-prevention.org)

E-mail: [ncpc@web.net](mailto:ncpc@web.net)

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Interview Guides**

## Policy Managers Interview Guide

### Federal (NCPC) Representatives

<b>Interviewer:</b>	
<b>Interview Number:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Start Time:</b>	
<b>End Time:</b>	

1. How familiar are you with the following Programs:

<p><b>Community Mobilization</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> very familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> not very familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> not familiar at all</p>	<p><b>Community Partnerships</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> very familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> not very familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> not familiar at all</p>
<p><b>BAP Program?</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> very familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> not very familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> not familiar at all</p>	<p><b>Investment Fund?</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> very familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> not very familiar</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> not familiar at all</p>

[NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: For the next questions ask ONLY about those programs that the respondent is FAMILIAR of VERY FAMILIAR with]

2. How do each of the funding programs that you are familiar or very familiar with supports partnerships?

(a) Crime Prevention Partnerships (CPP) program:

---



---



---



---



---



---



(b) Community Mobilization (CMP) program?

---

---

---

---

---

---

(c) (BAP)? Business Action

---

---

---

---

---

---

(d) Investment Fund?

---

---

---

---

---

---

3. **ARE** the funding programs you are familiar or very familiar with attracting partners who have not traditionally considered crime prevention as part of their mandate or activity (e.g. partners whose focus is social development)?

CPP?                       YES                       NO

CMP?                       YES                       NO

BAP?                       YES                       NO

CIF?                       YES                       NO

4(a). Can you give me some examples of the traditional partners in the program(s) you are familiar with?

(a) Traditional Partners

**CPP**

---

---

---

**CMP**

---

---

---

**BAP**

---

---

---

**CIF**

---

---

---

4(b). Can you give me some examples of the non-traditional partners in the program(s) you are familiar or very familiar with?

(b) Non-traditional Partners

**CPP**

---

---

---

**CMP**

---

---

---

**BAP**

---

---

---

---

---

**CIF**

---

---

---

---

---

5. **AT THE PROGRAM LEVEL**, what do you think is working well in terms of developing partnerships within the funding streams you are familiar/very familiar with?

---

---

---

---

---

6. **AT THE PROGRAM LEVEL**, what do you think is NOT working as well in term of developing partnerships within the funding streams that you are familiar/very familiar with?

---

---

---

---

---

7. **AT THE PROGRAM LEVEL**, do you have a sense of the factors that contribute to developing partnerships?

YES                       NO

8. **IF YES**, can you list the factors for me and explain how they contribute to the development of partnerships?

Factors	How do they contribute to Partnerships?

9. **AT THE PROGRAM LEVEL**, do you have a sense of what might impede the development of partnerships?

- YES                       NO

10. **IF YES**, please tell me what these factors are and how they impede partnerships at the program level:

Factors	How They Impede Partnerships

Let's shift the focus to the **POLICY** level.

11. **AT THE POLICY LEVEL**, how does the national strategy approach partnership development?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

12. **AT THE POLICY LEVEL**, how do you see partnerships as contributing to reducing crime and victimization?

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

13. **AT THE POLICY LEVEL**, can you identify partnerships that have emerged around crime prevention – **EXCLUDING** formal partnerships such as Provincial/Territorial partners)

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

**National Policy Partners Interview Guide**

<b>Interviewer:</b>	
<b>Interview Number:</b>	
<b>Sector of Org:</b> <b>1 LAW ENFORCEMENT</b> <b>2 EDUCATION</b> <b>3 BUSINESS</b> <b>4 SOCIAL SERVICE</b> AGENCY <b>5 HEALTH</b> <b>6 LOCAL VOLUNTARY</b> <b>ORGANIZATION</b> <b>7 BAND COUNCI</b> <b>8 NEIGHBOURHOOD</b> <b>ORGANIZATION</b>	

<b>9 LOCAL GOV'T</b>	
<b>10 OTHER</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Start Time:</b>	
<b>End Time:</b>	

We are examining partnerships at the National policy level between NCPC and other National groups and organizations. You have been identified as a national level partner. We would like to ask you a few questions about your role and about partnering with the NCPC.

1. What kinds of activities have you been engaged in involving the NCPC? Have you been involved in (mark all that apply):

- Consultation on NCPC Policy
- Acted in an Advisory Capacity – e.g. Sitting on an ongoing advisory committee on policy discussions
- Received Information from NCPC on their Activities
- Shared Information with NCPC
- Disseminated NCPC Information to Others
- Other (specify)

---



---



---



---



---



---

2. How would you define partnership?

---



---



---



---



---



---

3. Given your answer to the previous two questions would you consider your organization to be working in partnership with NCPC?

- YES                       NO

4. If YES, could you describe the nature of the partnership?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

5. If NO, could you explain why what you do is not a partnership?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

6. From your experience, how does the national strategy approach partnership development in crime prevention?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

7. How does NCPC's partnership development with national level organizations on crime prevention contribute to reducing crime and victimization?

---

---

---

---

---

---

8. In your experience, what is working well concerning NCPC's approach to partnership development with National level organizations? (Please provide examples)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

9. In your experience, what is not working well concerning NCPC's approach to partnership development with National level organizations? (Please provide examples)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



10. How could NCPC's partnership development with national level organizations be improved?

---



---



---



---



---



---

### Project Manager Interview Guide

<b>Interviewer:</b>	
<b>Funding Stream:</b>	
<b>Interview Number:</b>	
<b>NCPC File Number:</b>	
<b>Province/Territory</b>	
<b>Sector of Org:</b> <b>1 LAW ENFORCEMENT</b> <b>2 EDUCATION</b> <b>3 BUSINESS</b> <b>4 SOCIAL SERVICE</b> <b>AGENCY</b> <b>5 HEALTH</b> <b>6 LOCAL VOLUNTARY</b> <b>ORGANIZATION</b> <b>7 BAND COUNCI</b> <b>8 NEIGHBOURHOOD</b> <b>ORGANIZATION</b> <b>9 LOCAL GOV'T</b> <b>10 OTHER</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Start Time:</b>	
<b>End Time:</b>	

This interview examines partnerships within NCPC funded projects. The data will be presented in aggregate form so that no single respondent or project will be identified. Projects were selected at random from NCPC files. Thank you for agreeing to do this interview. I want to

begin with some general questions relating to partnerships and the NCPC and then some more specific questions relating to this project.

1. How familiar are you with the National Crime Prevention Centre's Crime Prevention Strategy:

- Very Familiar
- Somewhat Familiar
- Not at all Familiar

2. How familiar are you with the National Crime Prevention Centre's approach to partnerships?

- Very Familiar
- Somewhat Familiar
- Not at all Familiar

3. Are you currently involved in any other partnerships involving NCPC funding?

- YES
- NO

Now I'd like to ask you some questions specific to project X:

4. What is the main activity of the project?

---

5. Would you describe that activity as being:

- service delivery
- public awareness
- community mobilization/development
- other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

6. What were your expectations about your partnerships in this project? Did you think that they would involve (indicate all that apply):

- consultation (i.e. information sharing)
- co-operation (i.e. provision of assistance if required)

- co-ordination (i.e. co-ordinating activities to avoid duplication)
- collaboration (working fully/extensively together)

7. Overall, were your expectations about partnerships met? Would you say they were

- Fully Met
- Partially Met
- Not Met

8. How many partners have you had in this project?

- none
- one
- two
- three
- four
- five
- six or more (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

9. Can you please identify, in order of importance (that is the extent of their involvement), the names of your partner organizations in this project? I also need the name of a contact person at this organization and a phone number.

**[INTERVIEWER – CODE THE PARTNERS LISTED BY THE SECTOR THEY ARE FROM – PROBE THE RESPONDENT, WHERE NECESSARY.] SECTOR CODES:**

- 1 LAW ENFORCEMENT (POLICE, CROWN, DEFENCE COUNSEL, PROBATION);**
- 2 EDUCATION (SCHOOL, SCHOOL BOARD, COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY);**
- 3 BUSINESS (LOCAL BUSINESS, CORPORATION, BUSINESS ASSOCIATION);**
- 4 SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY (SHELTERS, YOUTH SERVING AGENCIES,);**
- 5 HEALTH;**
- 6 LOCAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION (KIWANIS, SHRINERS, ETC.);**
- 7 BAND COUNCIL;**
- 8 NEIGHBOURHOOD ORGANIZATION,**
- 9 LOCAL GOV'T;**
- 10 OTHER**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>SECTOR</b>	<b>CONTACT PERSON</b>	<b>CONTACT NUMBER</b>
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

10. Now I want some information on how your partner organizations are or have been involved in this project. Were all, most, some, a few or none of your partner organizations involved in:

(a) Receiving a copy of the proposal prior to funding (information sharing)?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(b) Writing a letter of support for the project **at the proposal stage**?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(c) Part of a committee that met **at the proposal stage** to develop the project proposal?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(d) Plan for implementation of the project once funding was received?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(e) Responsible/partially responsible for implementing the project?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(f) Provide any financial assistance

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(g) Provide human resources (e.g. time for staff to attend meetings) to the project?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(h) Provide/providing in-kind assistance (e.g. meeting or office space/ printing or photocopying/ technical equipment/ etc.)

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(i) Co-ordinate/co-ordinating their activities in this area with yours?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(j) Develop any protocol with respect to this project?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

If any developed protocols can you tell me what types of protocols they were? Were they:

- referral protocols  
 information sharing protocols  
 other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

(k) Have decision-making responsibility within the project?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(l) Have responsibility for the fiscal management of the project?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

(m) Have responsibility for reporting the results of the project?

- ALL       MOST       SOME       FEW       NONE

11. Prior to receiving any NCPC funding (i.e. funding for both this project and for any other projects) did you have any partnerships?

- YES                       NO

12. Since receiving NCPC funding have you developed any new partnerships?

- YES                       NO

12(a). If yes, have you developed any new partnerships with organizations where crime prevention was not part of their mandated activities?

- YES                       NO

13. Overall, how would you say the partnership between your organization and AGENCY X went:

- Very Well
- Well
- Neither Well nor Badly
- Badly
- Very Badly

14(a). You indicated that your partnerships went well or very well, how did any of the following factors contribute to the success of the partnership?

- Strong Leadership
- Adequate Funding
- Having Common Goals
- Having Shared Values
- Adequate Preparation
- Shared Decision Making
- Opportunity to Fully Participate
- A Clear Mandate
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

*OR*

14(b). You indicated that your partnerships went badly or very badly, did any of the following factors contribute to the lack of success of the partnership?

- Weak Leadership
- Inadequate Funding
- Lack of Common Goals
- Lack of Shared Values
- Inadequate Preparation
- Absence of shared Decision Making
- Inadequate Opportunity to Fully Participate
- Lack of a Clear Mandate
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

15. Is your organization currently involved in any other partnerships that involve NCPC funding?

- YES
- NO
- DON'T KNOW

16. Will/ have your partnerships continue/continued after this project is finished?

- YES
- NO

17. If yes, can you tell me what factors would contribute to helping these partnerships and how they would contribute?

<b>Factors</b>	<b>How They Support Partnerships</b>

18. Who is the “community” that this project is directed towards?

- Ethnic Group/Community (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- The Community Generally
- Children (0-11)

- Youth (12-17)
- Young Adults (18-24)
- Women and Girls
- Aboriginal Community
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

19. Was your project evaluated?

- YES                       NO

20. If YES, what were the most significant results of the evaluation?

**Project Partners Interview Guide**

<b>Interviewer:</b>	
<b>Funding Stream:</b>	
<b>Interview Number:</b>	
<b>NCPC File Number:</b>	
<b>Province/Territory</b>	
<b>Sector of Org:</b> <b>1 LAW ENFORCEMENT</b> <b>2 EDUCATION</b> <b>3 BUSINESS</b> <b>4 SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY</b> <b>5 HEALTH</b> <b>6 LOCAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION</b> <b>7 BAND COUNCI</b> <b>8 NEIGHBOURHOOD ORGANIZATION</b> <b>9 LOCAL GOV'T</b> <b>10 OTHER</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Start Time:</b>	
<b>End Time:</b>	



I am calling you about the xxx Project run by AGENCY/ORGANIZATION X in your community. They have identified you as a partner in that project. We would like to ask you a few questions about your involvement with the project and about partnerships within NCPC programs. First, we would like to ask you some general questions:

1. Do you consider yourself a partner in this project?

- YES                       NO

2. Prior to this interview, were you aware that the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC) was a funding source for the xxx Project:

- YES                       NO

3. How familiar are you with the National Crime Prevention Centre's Crime Prevention Strategy:

- Very Familiar  
 Somewhat Familiar  
 Not at all Familiar

4. How familiar are you with the National Crime Prevention Centre's approach to partnerships?

- Very Familiar  
 Somewhat Familiar  
 Not at all Familiar

5. Are you currently involved in any other partnerships involving NCPC funding?

- YES                       NO

Next, we would like to ask you some more specific questions about the xxx project.

6. I would like to ask you how your organization is/has been involved in this project. I will read a list of items and ask you to note all that apply

- Was your organization provided with a copy of the proposal (information sharing)?

- Did a representative of your organization write a letter of support for the project **at the proposal stage**?
- Was a representative(s) of your organization part of a committee that met **at the proposal stage** to develop the project proposal?
- Once the project was funded** did a representative(s) from your organization meet as part of a committee to plan for implementation of the project?
- Was/is your organization responsible/partially responsible for implementing the project?
- Did/is your organization provide/providing any financial assistance?
- Did/is your organization provide/providing any human resources (e.g. time for staff to attend meetings) to the project?
- Did/is your organization provide/providing in-kind assistance (e.g. meeting or office space/ printing or photocopying/ technical equipment/ etc.)?
- Did/is your organization co-ordinate/co-ordinating your activities in this area with your partner organization?
- Did/is your organization developing any protocol with respect to this project?
  - referral protocols
  - information sharing protocols
  - other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- Did/does your organization have decision-making responsibility within the project?
- Was/is your organization responsible/partially responsible for the fiscal management of the project?
- Was/is your organization responsible/partially responsible for reporting the results of the project?

7. What motivated your organization to participate as a partner in this project? (indicate all that apply)

- Good will towards the Organization sponsoring the project.
- A commitment to developing inter-organizational partnerships.
- A particular concern about the issue(s) the project focused on.
- Don't Know
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8. How did your organization become involved as a partner in this project:

- Organization approached you
- You/your organization approached the Project Sponsor

- Issue evolved from discussions within an inter-organization meeting
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

9. Overall, how would you say the partnership between your organization and AGENCY X went:

- Very Well
- Well
- Neither Well nor Badly
- Badly
- Very Badly

10. You indicated that the partnership went well or very well, how did any of the following factors contribute to the success of the partnership?

- Strong Leadership
- Adequate Funding
- Having Common Goals
- Having Shared Values
- Adequate Preparation
- Shared Decision Making
- Opportunity to Fully Participate
- A Clear Mandate
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

11. Your indicated that the partnership went badly or very badly, did any of the following factors contribute to the lack of success of the partnership?

- Weak Leadership
- Inadequate Funding
- Lack of Common Goals
- Lack of Shared Values
- Inadequate Preparation
- Absence of shared Decision Making
- Inadequate Opportunity to Fully Participate
- Lack of a Clear Mandate
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

12. Is your organization currently involved in any other partnerships that involve NCPC funding?

- YES                       NO                       DON'T KNOW

13. Would your organization pursue partnerships in the future?

- YES                       NO                       DON'T KNOW

13(a). If yes, why would you pursue another partnership? (What are the benefits/positives of partnerships?)

---

---

---

---

---

13(b). If no, why would you not pursue partnerships in the future?

---

---

---

---

## **APPENDIX C**

### **Literature Review**

## **OVERVIEW**

The literature reveals that partnership involves a complex and broader range of social actors, structures, contexts, issues and approaches. There are many factors that may enhance the success of partnerships, but there are also many challenges that need to be addressed – both within partnerships, and by those who seek to support partnership development. Some of the most critical challenges relate to the need for clarity of purpose and goals, and the need to address power and control issues and resolve conflict effectively. At the broader level, it is critical to situate partnerships in a wider socioeconomic, political and historical context and to acknowledge the impact of community-specific dynamics and realities. It is clear that more research is still needed into both the models and processes of ‘successful’ partnerships. These must be considered in light of both theory and practice.

## **LITERATURE SEARCH STRATEGY**

The literature search strategy was designed to produce a very brief (5 page) point form document of key themes of direct relevance to the crime prevention partnership development, in particular to the assist in conceptualization. To that end the search terms “partnership” AND “crime prevention” were used and focused on literature published since January 2001. Information was also collected from literature reviews on the topics of community mobilization, community development and sustainability. The following databases were also searched:

- 1- Cambridge Social Sciences Abstracts (from January 2001 – present) including, in particular: Sociological Abstracts; Social Services Abstracts; Social Work Abstracts, and
- 2- Criminal Justice Abstracts (from January 2001 to present).

A pool of abstracts and documents was reviewed and 14 additional documents most pertinent to the study were selected (see Reference List). Summary notes on these documents are attached as Appendix A.

## **PARTNERSHIP: HOW THE TERM IS DEFINED**

The term “Partnership” is increasingly used in connection with ways of addressing a wide range of societal issues (including, but not limited to crime prevention). It encapsulates new relationships and new approaches applied through various strategies. The expansion of partnerships is, according to Crawford (1997, p. 55) a “quiet revolution.” The partnership approach offers the potential to:

- Be a holistic, problem-focused approach (Crawford, 1998, p. 170)
- Be more integrated approach
- Foster a grassroots rather than a top-down approach to solving issues (OECD, 1997) and
- Lead partners to produce results that might not have been achieved in isolation (Frank & Smith, 2000, p.5).

The notion that “working together is more effective than working in isolation” is, in fact, the foundation for partnerships, according to Frank & Smith (2000).

The literature often discusses the concept of partnership in terms of its attributes, rather than providing definitions. This may be, in part, because defining partnership is challenging, especially in isolation from other linked concepts. According to Morrison (1996, p. 138), “Partnership and [interagency] collaboration are complex concepts which demand the re-evaluation of old attitudes and the courage to change.” Crawford (1997) points out that not only has the term “partnership” not been well defined to date, it is interconnected with the terms “prevention” and “community” (neither of which has been well defined either). Crawford also notes that interagency partnerships consist of the extension of the concept of ‘community’ to organizations.

Despite the complexity of defining partnership, there are nonetheless a number of concepts (or characteristics) that surface repeatedly when the meaning of partnership – or its definition - is discussed, including notions of:

- Coordination
- Cooperation
- Representation/participation/engagement/involvement
- Inclusion/diversity, and
- Sharing/negotiating (formal or informal) (or mutuality) of:
  - Ownership/authority
  - Mission/goals/objectives/problem focus
  - Commitment
  - Agreements/understandings/plans
  - Information/expertise
  - Resources/investment
  - Accountability
  - Responsibility/risks, and
  - Benefits.

## **PARTNERSHIP TYPES**

There is a vast array of partnerships and there are many different structures and functions of partnerships (Frank and Smith, 2000). Depending on the author, partnerships may be classified by there:

- Purpose
- Function (coordination is often one of the key functions)
- Structure (or specific model of partnership)
- Types/roles of partners, and
- Representation.

### **Classification by Purpose**

An OECD study of rural partnerships in the US (1997) notes that when classification of partnerships by purpose is considered, two categories of partnership, each of which is means to achieve different objectives can be proposed:

- Those that focus on a specific project, and
- Those that focus on less tangible projects, such as:
  - Capacity-building
  - Integration
  - Co-ordination, and
  - Strategic planning.

### **Classification by Function**

In Caputo, Kelly, Jamieson and Hart (2000), an initial conceptualization of “on the ground” partnership types in crime prevention focused on the following functions:

- Cooperation
- Coordination, and
- Collaboration.

Frank and Smith (2000) also identify partnership types by their function:

- Consultative or advisory
- Contributory
- Operational, and
- Collaborative.



### **Classification by Structures/Models**

According to Frank and Smith (2000) there are a variety of partnership structures that serve different purposes, e.g.

- Limited partnership
- Less formal partnership
- Specific purpose partnership, and
- Profit focused (thereby resembling a business or industry arrangement).

Other examples of structures that are equated with partnerships include: “community coalitions”, “interagency partnerships”/ “interagency collaboration”, “issue networks”, and “policy communities.” In turn, inter-agency partnerships encompass a diversity of structures and ‘new systems of local governance’ (Crawford, 1997).

In addition, a number of specific partnership “models” have been identified. For example, Galano et al. (2001) describe The Hampton Healthy Living Partnership as a “partnership investor model”, distinguished from a ‘stakeholder’ or ‘community planning’ model. This model is considered an entrepreneurial investor approach to planning.

In addition, Crawford (1998) located six different models of partnership:

- The ‘independent’ model, with an independent coordinator
- The ‘local authority based’ model
- The ‘police centred local’ model
- The ‘police centred headquarters’ model
- The ‘indeterminate’ model, with no clear leader, co-coordinator or strategy, and
- The ‘corporate’ model with no ‘lead agency’.

According to Crawford, these models are distinguished by differences in Power Relations, i.e. the existence or absence of a clear dominant party within a given partnership (power is central dynamic in inter-agency relations). Other differences are related to:

- Power and management and negotiation of conflict
- Level of collaboration
- Formal or informal relations
- Where the partnership structure is located with an organizational hierarchy, and
- Existence/absence of dedicated co-coordinator for the partnership.

### **Classification by Types of Partners Involved**

The OECD study of rural US partnerships (1997) classifies partnerships by who is involved:

- Public sector partnerships (*Horizontal* referring to co-operation between or among various ministries/departments of governments at the same level – also called intra-governmental partnerships. *Vertical* referring to co-operation between or among federal, and state/regional and local governments – also called intergovernmental partnerships)
- Public-private sector partnerships, and
- Private sector partnerships.

### **Classification by Representation**

Geddes (1998) emphasizes the concept of representation and the relative influence of partners. Geddes notes that there are several different representational structures including:

- Association with a wide membership (open membership)
- Partnership board or management committee (particular patterns of interest representation)
- Partnerships with limited activity, and
- Representation of specific groups (with narrower interests), which allows the representation of those interest in considerable numbers and depth; and
- Limited representation in order to achieve small and ‘tight’ partnerships.

## **FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIPS**

Many different success factors – relating to various aspects of establishing and implementing partnerships – have been discussed in the literature. The key themes have been synthesized and organized as follows:

### **Purpose**

Successful partnerships may seek to achieve:

- New solutions
- Locally based solutions/service delivery
- Community development/empowerment/self-determination
- A sustainable approach, and
- Mutual sharing of the benefits of partnership.

### **Laying the foundation**

Some key preparatory steps include:

- Mutual recognition of the need for collaboration
- Shared understanding of what partnership is (or is not) and its function or purpose
- Shared definitions
- Acknowledgement of interconnection and interdependency, and
- Commitment.

### **Underlying principles/values**

Underlying principles/values could include:

- Clarity
- Empowerment/support (of partners, community members)
- Inclusion
- Efficacy (self, collective)
- Trust
- Patience
- Respect
- Flexibility, and
- Pragmatism.

### **Working structures/processes**

Creating an effective structure and process for partners to work together is important, and may include:

- Establishing a mandate for collaboration
- Putting structures for collaboration in place
- Ensuring appropriate representation
- Facilitating active involvement/engagement/participation (of partners, community members)
- Developing a shared mission
- Determining boundaries
- Establishing linkages
- Ensuring accountability (and this may be at multiple levels)

- Sharing power and decision making (this includes negotiating power and control issues and conflict resolution)
- Sharing knowledge and information
- Ongoing communication, and
- Evaluation.

### **Other Useful Ingredients**

- Leadership\*
- New funding/resources
- Training (including for volunteers)
- Skills
- Public and political support (e.g. champions)
- Protocols, and
- Data collection

\*While a number of authors suggest that leadership is an important aspect of successful partnerships, Chaskin (2001) focuses on the importance of brokering and suggests that a “broker organization” may be a useful means of facilitating partnerships and networking.

### **KEY ISSUES AND CHALLENGES**

According to Crawford (1997), the ethos and practice of ‘partnerships’ embody structural antagonisms and unresolved tensions. For example, notions of “independence” and “partnership” stand in highly ambiguous relation to each other (Crawford, 1997, p. 60).

The literature identifies a number issues and challenges – occurring at different levels and related to various aspects of partnership. The key themes relate to environment, purpose, foundation laying, principles/values, structures/processes and other concerns.

#### **Environment**

Working in partnership can be challenging within a fragmenting, anxious environment.

#### **Purpose**

Partners may have very different professional and organizational priorities. There may be differences in the extent to which collaboration is perceived as mutually beneficial.

### **Laying the foundation**

Establishing common ground can be problematic if there is no rationale for a partnership approach, or there are conflicting paradigms. There may be differences in inter-professional or inter-agency perspectives.

### **Principles/values**

Challenges to underlying principles and values of partnership may include, for example:

- Lack of clarity about important issues (e.g. constraints of confidentiality)
- Failure to be inclusive (especially of those who work with clients)
- Questions of trust\* (a fundamental dynamic in inter-agency relations), and/or
- The reality of competition, conflict and organizational autonomy within the criminal justice system (and elsewhere).

\* According to Crawford (1998), managerialism may be a related issue, e.g. contractual specification can be antithetical to ongoing trust relations.

In some cases, “paper partnerships” or “talking shops” may exist only to satisfy funding requirements.

### **Structures/processes**

There are many issues and challenges for establishing effective partnership structures and processes including:

- Inter-organizational and intra-organizational relations
- Structures and systems, which function as barriers
- Lack of coordination (of multi-agency approach to policy formation and service delivery)
- Lack of systematization (of multi-agency approach)
- Rigid demarcations
- Turfism
- Role boundaries
- Lack of understanding of the roles and responsibilities of different agencies
- Unrealistic expectations of the capabilities of individual agencies, or what they were able to do or undertake
- Status and perceived power
- Reluctance or structural inability to share information, and
- Communication barriers

## OTHER ISSUES/CHALLENGES

The value placed on a program by the community is an issue that can impact on success.

### Broader issues

Crawford (1998) and others have identified many broader issues that need to be addressed to further the conceptualization and practice of partnerships. Examples include the need for:

- Ongoing dialogue – the rhetoric is shifting at the same time as developments from the past continue on
- Recognition of wider socioeconomic/political and historical context of partnerships
- Exploration of the interconnection between notions of prevention and community and related strategies
- Recognition that there has been a fusion of professionalization, bureaucratization, specialization, centralization and division of labour with the “new trilogy of community, prevention, and partnership”
- Integration of the focus for partnerships – it is better not to galvanize community around ‘crime’ but around something that is “integrating” not “bifurcating”, and
- More data and applied research to develop understanding of processes and develop practical tools.

## REFERENCES

- Caputo, T. & Kelly, K. (2001). Discussion paper on the sustainability of social development activities in Canada: Some implications for crime prevention. Submitted to National Crime Prevention Centre, Department of Justice Canada by Jamieson, Beals, Lalonde & Associates, Inc.
- Caputo, T., Kelly, K., Jamieson, W. & Hart, L. (2000). *Crime prevention practices in Canada*. Evaluation sub-study report, National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention, submitted to Department of Justice Canada.
- Chaskin, R.J. (2001). Organizational infrastructure and community capacity: The role of broker organizations. *The Organizational Response to Social Problems*, 8, 143-166.

- Chavis, D.M. (1995). Building community capacity to prevent violence through coalitions and partnerships. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 6, 234-44.
- Crawford, A. (1997). *The local governance of crime: Appeals to Community and partnerships*. Clarendon Studies in Criminology. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 14-62, and 294-313.
- Crawford, A. (1998). *Crime prevention and community safety: Politics, policies and practices* (Longman Criminology Series). London: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Frank, F. & Smith, A. (2000). *The Partnership Handbook*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada Cat. No. MP43-373/1-2000E On-line [www.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/common/partner.shtml](http://www.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/common/partner.shtml)
- Galano, J., Credle, W., Perry, D., Berg, W., Huntington, L., & Stief, E. (2001). Developing and Sustaining a Successful Community Prevention Initiative: The Hampton Healthy Families Partnership. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 21(4), 495-509.
- Geddes, M. (1998). *Local partnership: A successful strategy for social cohesion? European Research Report*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, pp. 5-11; 95-119.
- Hastings, R. & Jamieson, W. (2001) Community mobilization and crime prevention: Report to the National Crime Prevention Centre.
- Home Office, (July 2000). *Calling time on crime: A thematic inspection on crime and disorder conducted by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary in collaboration with the Home office and Audit Commission, Office for Standards in Education, and Social Services Inspectorate*. London: Home Office Communication Directorate 2000.
- Maxwell, S., & Conway, T. (2000). *Perspectives on partnership* (OED Working Paper Series No. 6). Washington, D.C.: The World Bank Operations Evaluation Department.
- Morrison, T. (1996). Partnership and collaboration: Rhetoric and reality. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 20(2), 127-140.
- OECD. (1997). *Partnership in the United States*. Paris, France: OECD, pp. 33-41; 85-91.

Secker, J. & Hill, K. (2001). Broadening the partnerships: Experiences of working across community agencies. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 15(4), 341-350.

Torjman, S. (1998) *Partnerships: the good, the bad and the uncertain*. Ottawa: Caledon Institute: p.1.

Voyle, J.A., & Simmons, D. (1999). Community development through partnership: Promoting health in an urban indigenous community in New Zealand. *Social Science & Medicine*, 49, 1035-1050.



## SUMMARY NOTES

**Chaskin, R.J. (2001). Organizational infrastructure and community capacity: The role of broker organizations. *The Organizational Response to Social Problems* 8, 143-166.**

*Note:* This is an exploratory piece that may have also implications for *sustainability*.

Definition of *broker* organization:

- “Local intermediaries responsible for fostering and convening partnerships and networks of relations among existing organizations.”
- Promoting inter-organizational relations and building community capacity through/by strengthening its organizational infrastructure – see page 145
- *Community building* – an aid to help communities identify priorities and opportunities and to begin developing [positive] neighborhood change and sustaining such change... There are (1) variety of goals to do this and (2) different strategies. One of these may be the “broker” organization.
- The principal role is to mediate and foster relations (resources, collective organizational action, act as a “sustainable community mechanism” [catalyst]
- Key concepts: institution/mechanism/research and development/local governance.

### **Roles and Attributes of Broker Organizations**

- 1- A position at the center of all new/desired relationships;
- 2- An ongoing and well-defined “clear” point of contact;
- 3- Brings organizations together, residents to organizations, and brings organizations to outside resources;
- 4- Potential for effectiveness and efficiency.

*How can the function do this?*

- 1- Broker as matchmaker – brings separate organizations together for particular purposes; and
- 2- Broker as clearinghouse for information and resources; and
- 3- Broker as community representative (advantage here concerns “mobilization” and “influence”) via organizing, decision-making, and joint-action.

The broker must both act and be perceived as facilitating access and not controlling it.

**FACTORS** to engage and be successful (there are ‘threshold issues’):

- Interdependence (acknowledged by potential partner organizations);
- Negotiation of “power” and “control” issues; neutrality and legitimacy
- Benefits of inter-organizational relations must outweigh its cost, over time.
- Social embeddedness of community processes and organizations are important.

NOTE regarding the broader context of “relations and the distribution of power and influence”: (1) the confluence of need, opportunity and capacity as well as (2) the history of relationships, inequality, race, ethnicity, (expectations of) resident participation and community class and economic and policy context of metropolitan, state, and national representation.

### **Conclusion**

- 1- “Broker” organizations are one organizational response to helping communities with problems and increase community capacity.
- 2- They have the potential to facilitate specific inter-organizational partnerships; and
- 3- Disseminate information and improve access to resources;
- 4- Provides a community forum, and
- 5- Can be successful if it can successfully negotiate its position.

There are complex issues across communities that need to be considered along with contextually determined social dynamics. Therefore, two potential directions for theory development and research are:

- 1- *Elaborating our understanding of inter-organizational networks and processes* which influence their development and functioning; and
- 2- *Applied research and practical tools* to allow local organizations to engage in such relations more effectively.

*HOW*: need more existing information on community circumstances and dynamics and collect new information where data does not exist.

**Chavis, D.M. (). Building community capacity to prevent violence through coalitions and partnerships. In (ed.), *Building Community Capacity*.**

*Notes from this Chapter*

Key idea: “*community coalitions*”

Coalition initiatives cover: (1) a range of social and health problems; (2) range of geographic scope (national, state, region, county, city, neighbourhood, and school); and (3) membership strategies (public agencies, public and private agencies, multiple sectors, spiritual institutions, business, government, and grassroots leaders, and others).

See page 82 for Definitions of coalition and partnerships

See page 85 for Functions of coalitions in Prevention Strategies, in particular a “multilevel community partnership”.

Comment: This article is manifest in its advocacy of “coalitions.” The author attempts to make the point that coalitions can work to prevent violence and build community capacity. He appears to equate “mediating institutions” with “community coalitions” – are these really the same?

The argument is rather unclear, abstract and bureaucratic. The conclusion might well be (from page 92), “First, we must renovate the social and local infrastructure so that our institutions can do their jobs.”

**Crawford, A. (1997). *The local governance of crime: Appeals to Community and partnerships*. Clarendon Studies in Criminology. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 14-62, and 294-313.**

**Discussion of the partnership approach and inter-agency partnerships:**

*Synopsis of Crawford*

- ‘Prevention,’ ‘community,’ and ‘partnership’ are three terms that share a considerable degree of ill definition and vacuity (Crawford, 1997, p. 25-26).
- Crawford does not claim to define these terms, but discusses “ways in which those who have sought to influence policy have used them and the ends which they have served.” (Crawford, 1997, p.26)
- Crawford (1997) shows how these terms are not discrete but overlapping and that these terms share elements of a common history.

***Considerations highlighted by Crawford:***

- Criminal justice policies embody to some degree, a perceived need to connect the formal control mechanisms and to involve ordinary working people.
- The assumptions upon which the resultant policies are premised need consideration.
- Must consider their intended purpose.
- Must look at their implications.
- Consideration of the above noted points needs consideration of the empirical findings.

### ***Inter-agency Partnerships***

- 1- Consist of the extension of the concept of ‘community’ to organizations;
- 2- There are a diversity of structures – “new systems of local governance”;
- 3- March and Rhodes (1192:249-51) [Crawford, 1997, p.55) refer to these as ‘issue networks’ or ‘policy communities’;
- 4- Expansion of partnerships, according to Crawford (1997) constitutes a ‘quiet revolution’;
- 5- The idea is found in the United Nations resolutions (1991);
- 6- Crawford states that the multi-agency approach to policy formation and service delivery is “not coordinated, but disparate, with no overall rational. It lacks ‘systematization.’” (Crawford, 1997, p.56) For example, there are issues of conflict versus mutual co-operation; interconnection and mutual dependency;
- 7- ‘Dysfunctional’ may be replaced by practitioners who urge “horizontal ‘partnerships’” which cut across vertical bureaucratic imperatives;
- 8- He traces usage of ‘partnership in UK with crime prevention, child abuse, the probation services, juvenile justice, and criminal justice;
- 9- Quote on page 59 [enclosed];
- 10- The ethos and practice of ‘partnerships’ embody structural antagonisms and unresolved tensions;

### *Some questions which arise, identified by Crawford (1997):*

- 1- The reality of competition, conflict, and organization autonomy [of criminal justice system] versus the ideal of “a premium upon consensus, communication, mutuality, and the sharing of knowledge.” (Crawford, 1997, p.60)
- 2- According to Crawford, “‘Independence’ and ‘partnership; stand in a highly ambiguous relation to each other.” (1997, p.60)
- 3- Consideration of the historical development of discourses and practice (highlighting the appeal to ‘prevention,’ ‘community,’ and ‘partnership’ terminology).

### **Conclusion**

*“It has been suggested that around these inter-connected terms a coalescence of strategies is being formed which needs to be understood for all its nuances.” (Crawford, 1997, p.60)*

- 1- *Professionalization, bureaucratization, specialization, centralization processes, and division of labour* have become fused with the new ‘trilogy’ of community, prevention, and partnership.
- 2- Discursive attacks – continuities with past developments co-existing along fundamental shifts in rhetoric.

- 3- Diverse history within which there is now a complex interplay between “the logics of new discourse” and “practices of old institutions.” Need these terms to be connected to “wider social and political trends and currents.” (Crawford, 1997, p.61)
- 4- Need to understand dynamics of change and development.
- 5- Emphasis taken has important institutional effects – the capitalist state’s claim to monopoly of public power and law is challenged.
- 6- State sovereignty is both denied and symbolically asserted.
- 7- Public interest emerging as central or at least as indispensable.

*Of particular note:*

- 1- **Conflict [avoidance]** - power, resources, and problematizing the language of responsibility;
- 2- **Local governance** - structures/processes;
- 3- **Responsibility** - full participation;
- 4- **Towards an understanding of community;**
- 5- **Multiple levels of accountability;**
- 6- **Democracy viewed** as an ongoing dialogue;
- 7- **Re-envisioning social solidarity/social cohesion;**
- 8- **‘Community’** should not be galvanized around “crime” but rather a foci which is integrating, and not bifurcating such as is crime;
- 9- **Moral position** requires a move beyond exclusive parochialism; vision of social justice and public good; and
- 10- **Pride, respect and tolerance** are critical aspects.

**Crawford, A. (1998). *Crime prevention and community safety: Politics, policies and practices* (Longman Criminology Series). London: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.**

*“A partnership approach allows the co-ordination of expertise and the pooling of information and resources. Most fundamentally, it affords an holistic approach to crime and associated issues which is ‘problem-focused’ rather than ‘bureaucracy-premised.’”*

(Crawford, 1998, p.170)

**Note:** *“However, the concept of a ‘partnership’ approach, while widely endorsed, has been the subject of little analysis or consideration.”* (Crawford, 1998, p.170)

**Difficulties in partnership are seldom addressed.**

**Different Forms**

(A) **Types** [Crawford, 1998, p. 170 referring to the Morgan Report]

- 1) *Power Relations* – existence or absence of a clear dominant party within a given partnership. Power – central dynamic in inter-agency relations and Models – represent the self-proclaimed image as compared to the nature of relations between agencies.
- 2) *Differences* within partnerships related to
  - Power and management and negotiation of conflict;
  - Level of collaboration;
  - Formal or informal relations;
  - Where the partnership structure is located with an organizational hierarchy; and
  - Existence/absence of dedicated co-coordinator for the partnership.

(B) **Issues**

- Questions of trust (fundamental dynamic in inter-agency relations);
- Problems of accountability;
- Inter-organizational and intra-organizational relations;
- Managerialism and partnership (NPM - ‘new public management [NPM] reforms; often the strict adherence to such a process. e.g., contractual specification is antithetical to ongoing trust relations); and
- The extent of ‘partnerships’ [“paper partnerships” or “talking shops” which exist merely for satisfying funding requirements].

**Conclusions**

- The *issues* of problem-oriented methodology or partnerships are not well understood; they are held up as “totems” but “rarely practices in any rigorous or reflexive manner.” (Crawford, 1998, p.193) ***“Policy-makers and practitioners will need to face some challenging and reflexive questions.”*** (Crawford, 1998, p.194)
- *Solutions* – should not be imposed but emerge out of the environment in which they will have to survive, therefore, knowledge and information must be about the nature of local ‘problems.’
- *Negotiation* – tensions, plural sources, legitimate information all affect this partner-process. Conflict must be managed and negotiated openly and constructively, recognizing diverse interests.
- *Aims and Methods* – must be thought-out; need for conceptual clarity.
- *Legitimacy* – of inter-agency network resides at an administrative level, yet, long-term need to be faced at a political level.
- *Process* – inclusion and exclusion, conflict negotiation, agency domination of the policy agenda and accountability are important considerations.

**Frank, F. & Smith, A. (2000). *The Partnership Handbook*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada Cat. No. MP43-373/1-2000E On-line [www.hrhc-drhc.gc.ca/common/partner.shtml](http://www.hrhc-drhc.gc.ca/common/partner.shtml)**

## **Executive Summary**

Definition of partnership:

*"A partnership is defined as a relationship where two or more parties, having compatible goals, form an agreement to do something together. Partnerships are about people working together in a mutually beneficial relationship, oftentimes doing things together that might not be able to be achieved alone."*

(Frank & Smith, 2000, p.5)

### **Factors to be considered:**

- Share authority;
- Have joint investment of resources;
- Result in mutual benefits; and
- Share risk, responsibility and accountability.

### **Function**

- Frank and Smith (2000) list the following types of partnerships:
- Consultative or Advisory
- Contributory
- Operational
- Collaborative

### **Structure**

- Diversity of structure for different purposes
- Limited partnership
- Less formal partnership
- Specific Purpose partnerships
- Profit Focused (thereby resembling a business or industry arrangement)

### **Lessons From Experience**

- Development of shared understanding about what is/what is not a partnership;
- Agreement that this partnership will produce better results than working separately;
- Collaboration is not necessarily partnership;

- Canada has successful partnership 'stories' from which others can learn;
- Vast array of partnerships; and
- Different structures and functions of partnerships but each partner must understand function and purpose, and be committed.

### **Partnership Process**

- **Stage 1** is Initial Development – involves a vision for the partnership; creating goals, understanding the current situation, confirming commitment, selecting partners, and understanding the implications of partnership.
- **Stage 2** is Making it Happen – partners must develop an action plan for the goals, look at resources, roles and responsibilities, and capacity building.
- **Stage 3** is Evaluation and Setting Future Directions – includes also revision, renewal and closure.

**The Partnership Handbook** – is meant to emphasize "community-based partnerships" but the information and processes involved are applicable to most partnership efforts. The foundation for partnerships is that "working together is more effective than working in isolation."

**Geddes, M. (1998). *Local partnership: A successful strategy for social cohesion? European Research Report*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, pp. 5-11; 95-119.**

### **Executive Summary**

#### *Chapter 5 Building Local Partnership*

- Focuses on experiences at the local level in building effective partnerships (processes and working methods).
- Case studies of 30 *local partnerships* and ten member states (OECD) and interviews with policy makers and *practitioners*.
- *Framework*: representation and relative influence of partners; process of negotiating and alliance building; and working methods developed (skills and resources).

### **Representation**

*“The negotiation of an alliance of organizations, actors and interests with the aim of implementing a common strategy and action plan is the essential basis for partnership working...”* (Geddes, 1998, p.98)



There are different REPRESENTATIONAL STRUCTURES:

- 1- Association with a wide membership (open membership);
- 2- Partnership board or management committee (particular patterns of interest representation);
- 3- Partnerships with limited activity, and representation of specific groups (narrower inters). This allows the “representation of those interests in considerable numbers and depth.” (Geddes, 1998, p.99)
- 4- Representation limited (in order to achieve small and ‘tight’ partnerships).

### **Key Actors**

- A. PUBLIC
  1. Public sector organizations;
  2. Local politicians;
  3. Other local, state and quasi-state agencies.
- B. NATIONAL/FEDERAL/REGIONAL government departments and agencies.
- C. SOCIAL PARTNERS, e.g., trade unions, businesses, chamber of commerce and industry.
- D. VOLUNTARY and COMMUNITY SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS; community organizations and groups (which often play a vital role as intermediaries between local people and policy makers).

FACTORS involved in consensus and conflict/negotiation of/in partnership(s):

- 1- New solutions;
- 2- Active leadership;
- 3- Availability of new resources;
- 4- Strength of local identity and ‘dynamic’;
- 5- Managing tension between stability and change;
- 6- Role of politicians/local and political turbulence;
- 7- Variety of economic, social, behavioural and attitudinal problems and aspirations at the local level;
- 8- Degree of “collaborative tradition” in the local area.

This project sums up the factors that assist in building partnership. These include the following.

- Clear identification of the benefits to be gained;
- Strong leadership;
- A strong local identity and dynamic;
- Active involvement of partners in the shaping and implementation of strategy;

- Seeing new solutions to problems; and
- Co-operating to obtain new resources.

IMPORTANT: building partnership needs time and patience.

- **Variety of negotiation strategies, “working methods,”** and modes of operation.
- **Danger** – bureaucratism and focus on funding versus attention to the implementation of consistent strategy.
- **Subcommittees**, working groups or similar mechanisms can be an effective organizational approach within an inter-organizational partnership context.
- **Communication/links** needed are both ‘vertical’ and ‘horizontal’ and there must be effective communication for,
- **Reporting and feedback.**
- **Skills and passion** reflecting commitment by all partners.
- **Resourcing of training and development** is substantial.

### **Conclusion**

Building and maintaining partnerships is difficult and involves a process of:

- 1- Negotiation and communication;
- 2- Bringing together appropriate partners;
- 3- Building a durable alliance around consensual strategy;
- 4- Putting necessary organizational structures and procedures to effect action plan;
- 5- Finding needed skills and resources; and
- 6- Establishing links at local, national, and transnational levels.

**Home Office, (July 2000). Calling time on crime: A thematic inspection on crime and disorder conducted by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary in collaboration with the Home office and Audit Commission, Office for Standards in Education, and Social Services Inspectorate. London: Home Office Communication Directorate 2000.**

### **Executive Summary**

In this recent publication, there are three chapters describing the "critical success factors for effective partnership." The following notes come from the Chapter 4 *Preparing for Success: Foundations for Successful Partnership Working*.

One note of importance to partnering:

## Co-terminus Boundaries

*"There is a need to establish a balance between working in partnership and structuring an organization to provide the most effective service. Individuals involved in partnership activity to reduce crime and disorder should consider the benefits of co-terminus boundaries."* (Home Office, 2000, p.45)

- 1- The importance of **locally based** service delivery
- 2- **Leadership** is a critical success factor
- 3- **Agencies** not fully **engaged** are encouraged and supported to do so
- 4- Partnerships should encourage greater involvement of elected members and where this is not the case, electing a 'community safety portfolio holder' should be considered. All members should understand the benefits of partnership.
- 5- There needs to be consultation, participation, and lead taking.
- 6- Partnership should consider the active involvement of the private sector.
- 7- The voluntary sector should be encouraged to become active in partnerships.

In Summary, Partnership – *Critical Success Factors*:

- Good working relations between partners within co-terminus boundaries
- Locally based service delivery
- Good leadership (including planning and evaluation/performance monitoring and review)
- Active community engagement
- 'Joined' up activities based upon 'joined up' strategies
- Good representation and good links with non-partnership bodies.

**Maxwell, S., & Conway, T. (2000). *Perspectives on partnership* (OED Working Paper Series No. 6). Washington, D.C.: The World Bank Operations Evaluation Department.**

This is a report by The World Bank (Summer 2000) and its' Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF).

See attachment for 'Partnership' definition.

From this review of diverse partnership experiences, the report identifies several common themes that emerge:

- The need for the right values, including a genuine commitment to sharing, on both sides;
- The importance of trust and of taking measures to build trust;

- Partnership based on empowerment of the weaker party;
- The scope (or need) for contracts to back up partnership agreements;
- The need for a long-term perspective and for an incremental, sustainable approach to partnership; and
- The need to be pragmatic in applying partnership blueprints (Maxwell & Conway, 2000, p.9)

### Conclusions

- 1- Even within contemporary discourse, there are “shades of difference” that may imply different approaches to partnership;
- 2- The development of partnership is an organic process, which grows as trust develops [effecting sustainability];
- 3- Mutual accountability appears to be necessary for successful partnership relations and formal procedures and even a legal framework often back up accountability.

**Morrison, T. (1996). Partnership and collaboration: Rhetoric and reality. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 20(2), 127-140.**

This article troubles the concept of *partnership*, and takes note of interagency collaboration. It is based on the watershed situation in the UK and “child protection work.”

**“Practice is likely to become muddled if workers are attracted merely by a concept’s looks rather than by its intellectual origins.”** (Howe, 1992 as quoted in Morrison, 1996, p.129)

Partners must be clear about:

- (1) Who are in partnership;
- (2) About what one is in partnership about;
- (3) To what end.

It is likely a continuum of relationships between agencies and families, from voluntary to statutory...

KEY DIMENSIONS are considerations of:

- 1- Equality (of/in partnerships);
- 2- Distinctions between notions of participation and empowerment;
- 3- Definitions might be twofold [as per Howe, 1992]:(i) *therapeutic* definitions (based on a psychological contract) and (ii) a *social justice* definition (based on respect, sharing, openness, clarity of roles, responsibilities, accountabilities, and involvement in decision making); and

- 4- Its' political complexion (as it relates to *consumerism, citizenship, and handing back responsibility by the state to individuals*).

***"...It is vital that we are clear who it is we are in partnership with, about what, and to what end."*** (Morrison, 1996, p.129)

Morrison (1996) points out that the quality of interagency collaboration has a direct impact on partnerships (between agencies and families), however, this is being effected by (1) a "fragmenting environment" and (2) anxiety ("the anxious environment").

Taken from Stevenson (1989), this article reviews five major barriers to collaboration:

- 1- Structures and systems;
- 2- Communication;
- 3- Status and perceived power;
- 4- Professional and organizational priorities;
- 5- Extent to which collaboration is perceived as mutually beneficial.

## **Conclusion**

***"Partnership and collaboration are complex concepts which demand the re-evaluation of old attitudes and the courage to change."*** (Morrison, 1996, p.138)

Regarding children, children's rights, UN (1989) Convention on the rights of the child:

***"As Brandt Steel (1987) has repeatedly commented, we take for granted the enormous investment needed to prepare an engineer, accountant, doctor, or scientist. Yet we have still to recognize the committed and sophisticated effort required to create a competent, caring, trustworthy, ordinary, but very human citizen for today's world."***

*Example: in terms of children and child abuse*

***"Child protection must be considered within an overall family and social policy context whose aims include combating poverty. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) offers such a framework."*** (Morrison, 1996, p.133)

Morrison goes on to elucidate intervention for families and children at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels.

## **Interagency Collaboration**

- Must consider "partnership with families" together with partnerships between and within agencies.
- Shared recognition for the need for collaboration

- Shared definitions
- Interagency collaboration [in context]

### **Conceptualization Of Collaboration As Building Blocks:**

- Recognition and definition
- Mandate for collaboration
- Collaboration structures, leadership
- Philosophy of intervention
- Policies and procedures
- Training
- Provision
- Supervision
- Quality assurance
- Staff care (“the problem of stress in working [with abuse]...both at the agency and interagency levels) staff care exists when needs for *identity, esteem, efficacy, meaning, belonging, and growth* are attended to by organizations.

Consequences of poor attention to the needs of individuals are: partial engagements which focus on following procedures, rapid staff turnover, personal “survivalism”; then the realities and meanings of the children and families are ignored.

**OECD. (1997). *Partnership in the United States*. Paris, France: OECD, pp. 33-41; 85-91.**

### **Executive Summary**

The definitions suggested here are found on the enclosed attachment. In the United States "Types of partnership have been broadly classified as follows:" (OECD, 1997, p.34-35)

- ***Public sector partnerships – horizontal and vertical.*** Horizontal - co-operation between or among various ministries/departments of government at the same level (also called intra-governmental partnerships). Vertical - co-operation between or among federal, and state (regional) and local governments (also called intergovernmental partnerships).
- ***Public-private sector partnerships***
- ***Private sector partnerships***

Traditionally classifications of partnerships have focused on the partners involved, ignoring the purpose of the coming together of partners. Two categories, which emerge when one looks at purposes of what should be called partnering:

- 1- Focus on specific project;
- 2- Focus on less tangible projects, such as capacity building, integration, co-ordination, and strategic planning.

In both of these ways, partnerships are a means to achieve different objectives.

Since 1990, the United States has moved from a top-down approach to an approach focusing on grassroots approach to resolving issues. The purpose is to achieve a more integrated approach. In so doing, the rural partnership strategy in the United States has developed new mechanisms – THE NATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP (NRDP) and EMPOWERMENT ZONES and ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES (EZ/EC).

Within the NRDP approach several factors are operating (through the State Rural Development Council [SRDC] and the National Rural Development Council [NRDC]):

- Principle of **flexibility**;
- Principle of **diversity**;
- Principle of **collaboration**; and
- Principle of **strategic forum**.

**Secker, J. & Hill, K. (2001). Broadening the partnerships: Experiences of working across community agencies. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 15(4), 341-350.**

### **Executive Summary**

Secker and Hill find that the creation of inter-agency partnerships to deliver mental health services is problematic for the majority of agencies. Through focus group discussions they describe the extent of inter-agency working, the barriers to its development, and consider means to broaden inter-agency working to include a wider range of relevant agencies.

Although there are limitations to this study (because perceptions stem primarily from team members and not other stakeholders in the delivery of these systems), the authors discuss several findings of importance to the development of partnerships. Some of these are:

- Reluctance or structural inability to share information;
- Lack of clarity about constraints of confidentiality;
- Failure to include all those involved with clients in planning care;

- Rigid demarcations;
- Role boundary conflicts;
- Unrealistic expectations of individual agencies capabilities/or what they were able to do or undertake;
- Lack of understanding of the roles and responsibilities of different agencies; and
- Inter-professional or inter-agency conflict of perspectives

Findings suggest that a current emphasis on partnerships between specialist [mental health] or primary care services and social care services is too narrow.

#### Steps Toward Broader Partnerships

- 1- Multi-agency training to address training needs and sharing of perspectives
- 2- Development of local protocols covering joint working and information sharing.
- 3- Multi-agency forums to monitor joint working protocols.

(Secker & Hill, 2001, p. 349)

*"...Our study indicates that community agency staff routinely encounter a significant level of mental health problems amongst clients and that the concept of partnership needs to be extended to include a broader range of agencies if these clients' needs are to be fully met. Multi-agency training and the development of local protocols, monitored by multi-agency groups, are amongst the ways in which this challenge could begin to be addressed."* (Secker & Hill, 2001, p. 349)

**Voyle, J.A., & Simmons, D. (1999). Community development through partnership: Promoting health in an urban indigenous community in New Zealand. *Social Science & Medicine*, 49, 1035-1050.**

**Context** of the community project in this paper: partnership for health promotion between a health group and an urban Maori community in New Zealand (low SES)

**Focus** - partnership between 'professionals' and 'community groups' [urban Maori] "as a way of actioning community development."

**Gap** - "There is frequently a gap between knowing what is needed and knowing how to accomplish it." (Voyle & Simmons, p. 1036)

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** the following conceptual ideas emerge in the paper and are made clear as follows:



- The concept of *self-efficacy* - “Basic to self-efficacy theory is the idea that self referent thought mediates the relationship between knowledge and action (Bandura, 1982).” (Voyle & Simmons, 1037);
- Concept of *collective efficacy* (*perhaps similar here to Durkheim’s collective effervescence* – or at least the theoretical idea that this might be a mechanism of effecting change in community?);
- Synergistic processes;
- Empowerment (see Rappaport, 1987, p. 139-140) and Wallerstein);
- Strategies based on collaboration and coalitions;
- Flexibility;
- Linkages between values and aspirations [of Maori culture] and the philosophy of empowerment and self-determination that underpins community development (see page 1039);
- “*In summary, essential attributes of community development are power sharing and mutual respect among partners or coalition members to ensure equal participation in discussions and decision-making.*” (Voyle & Simmons, p. 1039);
- [regarding research method] *Formative evaluation* and *process evaluation* (i.e., how, as opposed to what outcome is produced); and
- Qualitative data collection is needed.

**KEY ISSUES emerging in this project/article:**

- 1- *Conflicting paradigms of medical research, quantitative assessment and community development;*
- 2- *Building trust;* and
- 3- *The value placed on a health program* (major issue for Maori; also affected by gender, extended family obligations [based on intermarriage and definition based on marriage and birth]).

**How to Proceed to Build Partnerships for Program Development**

“*While the recommendations refer directly to a partnership with Maori and the opportunities offered by a Maori setting, the underpinning themes of community development, empowerment, and self-determination are pivotal to the advancement of the status, health and otherwise, of minority indigenous groups generally.*” (Voyle & Simmons, p. 1045)

- 1- **Preparatory Steps** – aside from evaluation of party resources/budget, etc. it is important to have such things as (a) cultural advisor who knows the local community; (b) a shared

purpose and commitment (with discussion and negotiation); and (c) agreement on the part of both parties.

- 2- **The formation of a partnership committee** (planning and organizational tasks). The committee functions as a “prototype;” and it should have clear aims and communication between all, is vital.
- 3- **Program planning and development** – there needs to be cultural sensitivity; [needs to be clinically] safe, *catering to heterogeneity among the target group.* “*To increase sustainability, the program should utilize and extend the Maoris’ own resources (exclusive of finance) as much as possible, as well as incorporate culturally appropriate clinical (e.g., family doctors) and other resources from the wider community.*” (Voyle & Simmons, p. 1046)
- 4- “Positivist medical research models do not fit well with community development strategies. While quantitative measurements are useful, they are best incorporated as integral to process (e.g., weight measurements in obesity program) rather than being superimposed in a manner that interferes.” (Voyle & Simmons, p. 1046).
- 5- **The appointment of a Maori liaison worker** (assisted with others in this committee). Note: “*Include volunteers as well as paid workers in training opportunities....*”).

## Conclusion

- The importance of historical context as essential consideration to development and delivery of [health] programs.
- Taking note of “counteracting” trends (e.g., cultural renaissance that has gathered momentum...”).
- Consideration of “...philosophy of empowerment for guiding and reinforcing programs aimed at improving the health status and social and spiritual well-being of indigenous people.” (Voyle and Simmons, p. 1047)
- Note quote on page 1045 – highlighted.
- “*Community development is an appropriate strategy because it incorporates empowerment both as means and end.*” (Voyle and Simmons, p. 1047)
- Devolution of power [key] of organizational process underlying successful partnerships and coalitions involving ‘professional groups’...