



PRCS COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP

Held Thursday, April 15, 2004

M.2.004

Richmond City Hall

In Attendance:

Working Group

Danielle Aldcorn
Julie Halfnights
Michael McCoy
Bob Ransford
Harold Steves

Olive Bassett
Shawkat Hasan
Bill McNulty
Greg Robertson
Jim Tanaka

Nicky Byres
Jim Lamond
Sharon Meredith
Linda Shirley
Kuo Wong

Facilitator

David Roach

Recorder

Roxanne Glavina

Staff

Greg Buss
Dave Semple
Cathy Volkering Carlile

Simon Johnston
Kate Sparrow

Consulting Team

Cheryl Hodgson

Absent:

Vince Miele

Joann Wong Bittle

1. Opening Remarks

Opening remarks by David Roach.

2. Record of Meeting # 12

The Record of Meeting dated March 18 was approved. There was discussion with regard to the “revised definition” of Financial Sustainability. It was agreed that the CWG would review any revisions made to the definition by staff, before it is included in the final report.

3. The Role of Community Based Organizations and Non Profit Organizations

(Also see attached flip chart notes.)

The “Role of Community Based Organizations” discussion paper was presented. This paper identified the target organizations or individuals that the City could develop working relationships with.

The following question was raised: “How can support and recognition be given to groups which provide services, but do not have a formal relationship with the City?”

Shawkat Hasan stimulated a discussion by asking what percentage of Richmond residents are currently being served by, or involved in, community based organizations. The discussion focused on how residents are defined as being served or involved in their community. Keeping in mind the City’s goal to serve the largest number of residents, how can the level of participation be maximized?

The Needs Assessment showed there is a desire among the community to be involved and that a small number of volunteers currently contribute the greatest amount of volunteer hours. Discussion revolved around the question of how to stimulate and utilize volunteers in a meaningful way to ensure their continued involvement.

The CWG spent some time brainstorming Community Based Organizations the City might want to develop working relationships with, in both specific and general terms.

The discussion that followed included:

- Would developing this type of list discourage spontaneous grass roots involvement?
- There is a need to make sure there is no overlap or duplication of services.
- Financial restraints may require organizations to be grouped together.
- Accepting that there are effective roles played by groups and given that they may not fit into any of the identified roles, how can they fit into the “system”?
- Can the City act as a concierge to connect the various agencies together?

There was discussion on the existing model and suggestions were brought forth for what the future model could look like. These ranged from “tweaking” the current system based on geographic location or community of interest to restructuring the delivery system into broad bands based on age, program theme or functional areas.

Michael McCoy suggested that the model adopted be an Asset-Based Model as opposed to a Deficit-Based Model. He also stressed that policy, practices, standards and procedures need to be addressed and factored into the model.

Important elements to be consider in planning the new model:

- Identify core services
- Determine the type of delivery – geographically or by program theme or functionality
- Work towards equitable distribution of resources across the City
- Keep what is good in the facilities and work towards equity of resources across the City
- Provide opportunities for residents to participate in their own way
- Do what makes sense
- Help understand the community better
- Broaden the scope of City relationships and investments to ensure a broader reach

- Contract City-wide service providers, in order to create equity among community services offered across the City
- The City as a centralized monitoring / co-ordinating body
- Encourage Community Centres to return to their advocacy roots and ensure that they are “neighbourhood gathering places”
- Use City assets as revenue generators for the City-wide purposes
- Ensure uniformity of services between the different community centres, so that residents are able to move seamlessly between the different community centres for programs
- Remember the have-nots and ensure that there is a commitment to serve the whole community

It was suggested that an “Oversight Body / Committee” should be formed to act as a liaison with the community centres to ensure equity of services across the City.

The City and the Community are responsible for providing leadership, resources and accountability with the City providing expertise.

Components of a Delivery System were identified:

- Governance
 - Management
 - Operations
 - Service Planning & Customer Service
 - Service / Program Delivery
4. Due to time constraints discussion on the Final Report to Council was deferred to the next meeting.

5. Homework assignment

As a homework assignment, each member of the committee was asked to come to the next meeting with a vision of a model that they would want to recommend. Cathy Volkering Carlile will send out a supplemental package to CWG members as soon as possible to assist in the homework assignment.

Adjourned at 9:00pm