Social Inclusion: On the Path to Social Development in Newfoundland and Labrador

Policy Discussion Series Paper No. 6 ❖ January 2000

Preamble

> What is the community? ... [It is] the space in which citizens prevail ... in which citizens in association do the work of problem-solving, celebration, consolation, and creation—that community, that space, in contrast to the space of the system with the box at the top and lots of little boxes at the bottom. ... Modern institutions are new machines redefining us not as people in a place, but as individuals in a system.
>
> *John McKnight* (1995)

The impetus to create this Foundation Paper arose in a specific context. The Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is poised at the start of an unprecedented social initiative: the implementation of its Strategic Social Plan (SSP). In the fifty years since Confederation, the province has undergone massive cultural and social changes, moving from the cohesive structure of small close-knit fishing communities through the upheaval of resettlement to become an industrialized society. Now, at the end of a decade of further change including the cod moratorium, the economic recession, and the restructuring of health, education and social support programs, the challenges of the future promise to be even greater than those of the past. Globalization and the technological revolution have shifted horizons and expecta-

Researched and written by Susan Williams, writer for the Newfoundland and Labrador Reference Group on Social and Economic Inclusion. Members of the Newfoundland Reference Group are: Joyce Hancock, Provincial Advisory Council on Status of Women; Moyra Buchan, Canadian Mental Health Association; Rosalind Smyth, Dept. of Health and Social Services; Jennifer Jeans, Women's Policy Office; Ed Hayden, Doug May and Alton Hollett, Strategic Social Plan Unit, Newfoundland and Labrador; Fiona Chin-Yee and Margie Macdonald, Health Canada; and Carol Amaratunga, Pamela Roy and Linda Snyder, Maritime Centre of Excellence for Women's Health.

Contents

Introduction 3
Social Inclusion and Participation 5
- Social Inclusion 5
- Community Organization and Participation 7
- Participatory Methods . 9

Current Practices 12
- Introduction 12
- Alternative Programs ... 14
- Collaboration and Integration 19
- Participatory Research and Planning 22

Key Processes 30
- Alternative Services 31
- Collaboration and Integration 31
- Participatory Research and Planning 33

Conclusion 34
- Key Elements 35
- Recommendations to Support Inclusion 37

References 38
Bibliography 38

Maritime Centre of Excellence for Women's Health

tions. Lacking traditional options, young people are leaving small communities, the birth rate has dropped, and the population is aging rapidly. The future of whole communities is in question. In this context, the policy framework of the Strategic Social Plan has been adopted, with the purpose of engaging communities in planning their own future.

This paper holds that, at this turning point in our history, it is vital for all citizens to be included in the process of the Strategic Social Plan. The Population Health Model (which the SSP incorporates) recognizes that the well-being of individuals is critically influenced by factors in their environment, called determinants of health. The concept of social inclusion/exclusion enlarges our understanding of how these factors affect people's participation in the community. For example, adequate income, education and strong relationship networks enable people to participate (i.e., be included) as contributing, valued members of society. On the other hand, poverty, disability, unemployment, lack of education or lack of nurturing relationships often marginalize or exclude people from the mainstream activities of society.

The Strategic Social Plan has started by involving those who are already active in their communities as board members and volunteers. A key question is how to overcome the barriers to inclusion and engage people who feel excluded and disempowered. As John McKnight points out, there is a fundamental tension, even incompatability, between community processes and system planning. How can formal systems and communities work in congruence to implement the Strategic Social Plan?

One of the most innovative aspects of the SSP is its commitment to carry out a social audit. The Social Audit Team has already assembled an impressive bank of statistical information about the demographic, employment, income and health status of the population, called the Community Accounts, broken down for individual communities. While this is aggregate information that cannot describe the texture and reality of people's lives in these communities, it provides a view of the provincial and regional landscape, distinguishing the areas which are thriving from those which are struggling, as well as variations in between. This provides an excellent tool for regions to identify where to start.

What is needed now is a parallel "grassroots-up" process. With a view to assisting the progress of the Strategic Social Plan, this project set out to conduct a scan of community development practices which demonstrate effective inclusion of citizens in determining the needs of their communities and in planning and making decisions about their future development.

Specifically, the objectives of the project were:

- to identify examples of such practices in Canada and elsewhere;
- to carry out a survey of examples relevant to Newfoundland and Labrador;
- to include examples of work that is cross-sectoral and involves women, children and youth;

- to identify from these examples several approaches or processes which could be used by communities in this province in their own development process;

- to create a Foundation Document which describes these approaches and will serve as a resource for communities; and

- to identify from these examples some of the key processes and and hallmarks of success, as well as possible barriers.

We had no illusion that any comprehensive model or approach would emerge. Communities are richly diverse; each has its own mix of issues, problems and assets. The examples presented here are not necessarily solutions, but they contain a wealth of information about inclusionary approaches which have been used in various situations. We hope that the ideas and experience they represent will be useful to people in planning the future of their own communities.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Reference Group on Social and Economic Inclusion
November 1999

Introduction

In 1998, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador released its Strategic Social Plan,[1] a policy framework for integrating social and economic development by building on regional and community strengths and investing in people. The Plan has four goals:

i) vibrant communities where people are actively involved;
ii) sustainable regions based on strategic investment in people;
iii) self-reliant, healthy and educated citizens living in safe communities; and
iv) integrated and evidence-based policies and programs.

The Strategic Social Plan emerged during a time of upheaval brought about by the cod moratorium, economic recession and restructuring of social programs. In 1996, the Social Policy Advisory Committee held public consultations around the province, looking for new approaches to social programming. The Committee's first report, *What the People Said* (1997), describes public concern about unemployment, poverty, out-migration, and declining communities. Too many people were "falling through the cracks," excluded from the mainstream because of low income, poor education, disability, gender, age and so on. The Committee's second report, *Investing in People and Communities, A Framework for Social Development* (1997), suggested ways to target these problems, and many of the ideas were incorporated into the Plan.

The province's regional structure of boards and institutions has been the starting point for implementing the Strategic Social Plan. These are the Health and Community Services Boards, hospital boards, school boards and Regional Economic Development Boards, the College of the North Atlantic, and the Federation of Municipalities. The goal is for these regional agencies to partner with non-profit

organizations and local groups to develop community-based services and initiatives. The Plan also calls for provincial departments to integrate their policies and programs, reduce duplication and address gaps and barriers in human services.

Community-level processes are also a focus of the Strategic Social Plan. The Plan emphasizes community capacity-building through support for leadership development, the volunteer base, collective problem-solving, and new partnerships. This capacity-building must be inclusive, allowing a wide range of people—not just traditional community leaders—to participate in finding solutions and creating new initiatives.

The first goal of the Plan is "vibrant communities and regions in which people actively participate in their collective well-being." The Plan states, "people must be able to participate actively in the social development of their community and region." Underlying this goal is a belief in the value of community and citizen participation.

However, there are many people who do not see a way to participate. Often they are experiencing the kind of problems that exclude them from the mainstream of society—low incomes, lack of education, unemployment, or disability. Their role is usually that of recipient rather than participant. There are also communities which, for diverse reasons, are marginalized. The goal of the Strategic Social Plan is to make participation inclusive—that is, to ensure that those who have been left out, both individuals and communities, have the opportunity to be involved.

All people have important knowledge to contribute about the realities of their own lives and experiences. When this knowledge is valued and used, people feel that their views are significant and that they have some control over the issues that affect them. These are basic components of individual self-esteem. At the community level, citizen participation creates better services and a collective voice to identify and to address community needs, making a difference to community well-being. Participation is necessary to the democratic process and to a healthy public policy.

As regions have begun to implement the Plan, there have been questions about how to form effective partnerships and how to engage individuals and communities. The Premier's Council on Social Development, a citizen advisory body for the Strategic Social Plan, is investigating ways to promote inclusion and participation. The Council established a Reference Group to direct research into these issues. At the outset we anticipated drawing on models used in other countries and continents. We found, in fact that our province has implemented essential, well-recognized approaches and that the models are close at hand. Some have worked well in some places and less well in others; a lack of resources has thwarted others. We found no cure-all models for social development. We have written this overview of community organization approaches and examples as a starting point and reference document for people working on these issues.

The following section of this paper looks at the concepts of social inclusion, community organization and participation, and their relevance to the goals of the Strategic Social Plan. We have included some examples of methods used around the world to increase grassroots participation. The next section presents examples

of some initiatives, in this province and elsewhere, illustrating these ideas. These include family resource centres, peer counselling, employment support programs, community video projects, and multi-service centres. The final section consists of practical guidelines for making services and planning more participatory. The paper concludes with a discussion of the importance of social inclusion and some of its key elements. We have also made some recommendations for incorporating inclusionary approaches into the Strategic Social Plan.

Social Inclusion and Participation

Social Inclusion

The Strategic Social Plan states that unemployment and poverty are closely related to problems such as poor nutrition, low educational achievement, discrimination, and community decline. The Plan proposes three strategic directions: building on community and regional strengths, integrating social and economic development, and investing in people. These goals are to be achieved through prevention and early intervention, improved access to services, attention to basic income and education needs, and removal of barriers to participation in community life. The ultimate vision is that of "self-reliant, healthy, educated citizens" living in "vibrant communities where people are actively involved."

This focus on linking economic and social goals, removing barriers and investing in people is similar to the *social inclusion* policies that many governments have adopted to combat the "exclusion of groups from both the labour market and social activities" (Kalisch et al. 1998:21). *Social exclusion* has been described as "a short-hand label for what can happen when individuals or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health and family breakdown" (Scottish Office 1999). People at risk include the long-term unemployed, indigenous populations, people with disabilities, women, children, youth, immigrants, the homeless, and people living in rural and remote communities.

Social exclusion occurs when people lack access to education, employment, decent housing, health care, and other conditions necessary for full participation in society. Economic and social barriers interact with one another, creating long-term effects on individuals and communities. For example, the effects of unemployment are not just financial but social because of the importance of work to one's social role. Inadequate education and health care in childhood have long-term effects into adulthood where they create employment barriers. The effects of one barrier, such as a disability, become the causes of further exclusion, such as social isolation and poverty.

> ... people with limited access to income and resources have a lower health status, lower educational opportunities, experience more social isolation and have fewer opportunities for early childhood development. Conversely, people with lower health status, lower educational levels, who are socially isolated and did not have access to early childhood development are more likely to be or to become poor. This understand-

> ing challenges the concept of individual choice being a primary factor in economic and social status. The emerging definition of poverty becomes "economic and social exclusion". This exclusion remains bi-directional. (*Our Healthier Nation* 1998)

The principles of access, equity and the removal of barriers are important in combatting social exclusion. Others have described social exclusion as the failure of various systems—labour market, welfare, justice, community, and family—that are suppose to integrate people into society but end up alienating them (Kalisch et al 1998).

Social inclusion policy considers work as the key to an individual's role and identity in society. Targeting and removing barriers to work is a high priority, especially with rising unemployment among youth and older workers in many industrialized countries. Governments are also acknowledging that the costs of poverty, unemployment and inequality are borne by the whole society and not just by some individuals.

> Human poverty is deprivation in multiple dimensions, not just income. Industrial countries need to monitor poverty in all its dimensions—not just income and unemployment, but also lack of basic capabilities such as health and literacy, important factors in whether a person is included in or excluded from the life of a community. Human poverty is one side of the story of the backlog of human deprivation. The other side is persisting disparities—often the result of uneven progress in human development,not reinforced by the backlog of human poverty. (UNDP 1998b)

There is a new emphasis on preventive spending to avoid the costs of future exclusion (Andrews 1997). Social inclusion policies include guaranteed income provisions but the main effort is spent on retraining and work incentives. In addition, there are usually measures for excluded rural and urban areas which focus on partnerships with government, industry and the non-profit sector. There is renewed interest in prevention and early intervention programs for children and youth to ensure the inclusion of future generations.

An Example from Scotland

The Scottish Social Inclusion Programme was established in 1997 to combat social and economic exclusion. It calls for the integration of programs within government, and between government and communities. The Programme has four major initiatives:

Providing opportunities for work and learning, through funding and other support to help youth and the long-term unemployed obtain work, training and higher education.

Removing barriers to inclusion, for individuals vulnerable to poverty or discrimination, or facing barriers such as lack of child care, there are supplements to the working poor, affordable child care, increased pension income, health promotion, drug prevention, and support to the homeless.

Promoting inclusion among children and youth, with family centres, pre-school places, an early intervention program, community schools (with education, health and social services under one roof), stay in school strategies, and school sports programs.

Building stronger communities, through partnerships with communities, community housing partnerships, community-based crime prevention, rural economic development programs, services tailored to local needs, and more community decision-making in programs and policies.

The government established a Social Inclusion Network, consisting of government and community representatives, to look at additional measures. These may include programs for excluded youth, an initiative targeting social and cultural barriers, a review of income support and employment programs, and an analysis of the contribution of the social economy. The Network is also looking at ways to devolve decision-making to communities, to build community capacity, and to support community education, sports and culture.

Community Organization and Participation

Social inclusion policies aim to achieve greater citizen participation in economic and social life. Such policies encourage community-level participation. Similarly, the Strategic Social Plan is committed to a "place-based" approach that supports community organizations and community-based delivery. This reflects society's renewed interest in community as a place where individuals can truly make a difference. Governments and agencies everywhere have adopted community-based approaches in response to the power of movements that are based in communities, such as community economic development, sustainable communities and healthy cities/communities. They have turned to non-profit, community-based organizations to deliver public services more effectively and cheaply.

Community development, or community organization, is the process by which people in a community create their own organizations for collective action, decision-making, leadership training, capacity-building, and social cohesion. It describes groups of people organizing at the grassroots level to obtain better services, generate revenue, advocate for their rights, and do other things to improve their immediate lives. Community organization is a continual process:

> ... a collective measure that engages community members in problem solving through planning, organization and action. In the process, communities improve their immediate circumstances and gain strength and power to engage in further challenges (MacNeil 1997:152).

The two basic processes in community organization are *social learning*, a group process through which people learn about conditions in their area and what they want to change, and *social mobilization*, where they organize, gather resources and make changes (MacNeil 1997:152–3). Rothman (1974) described three "models of community organization practice." One is *locality development*, in which people learn how to problem-solve, work in groups, build relationships, co-operate with agencies, and build local capacity. *Social planning* is the more results-oriented

activity of collecting data about an area, usually with the help of planners, and working with officials to create needed services or infrastructure. *Social action* involves both process and results, as groups organize to change unequal power relations, remove barriers and obtain more resources for their communities. *Coalition-building* has also been suggested as a model to describe different groups coming together to work on an issue (Community Tool Box).

The rhetoric of a community-based solution seems to imply a consensus that most people know is not really there, given the realities of unequal power and wealth in communities. Grassroots community organizations have as their goal some form of redistribution of power:

> What is clear is that—in a mostly zero-sum game—the empowerment of some, most of the time, entails the disempowerment of others—usually the current holders of power (Schuftan 1996:260).

Participation, local control and democratic decision-making are basic principles of community organization movements in Canada and around the world. These movements have attempted to take control of local economic and social institutions away from elites and central governments.

Many grassroots movements have formed as a reaction against the typical "community development" approach of governments both here and abroad which has been a "top-down" approach. For example, in international development, United Nations experts introduced new farming techniques into peasant communities with little regard for local knowledge and skills. Many of these aid projects failed because they did not suit local conditions and required inputs that most of the farmers could not afford. The problem was especially clear in the case of women who did not even have access to new techniques because their role in production was not recognized. Failure to support women producers is one reason for the drastic decline in domestic food production in developing countries since the 1960s. Recently, agencies such as the United Nations and the World Bank have recognized that these countries will not thrive unless the poor majority are supported to become self-sufficient. They have begun to introduce popular participation into their aid projects, including the use of local knowledge as a resource, strengthening local expertise, and involving producers in planning, implementation and evaluation (Lane 1995; UNDP 1998a; FAO 1998; World Bank Learning Group 1998).

In developed countries as well, participatory approaches have been incorporated into community health, urban planning, resource management, adult education, and other fields. However, critics argue that community-based programs are still only somewhat participatory. Agencies still define the problem, develop a program to deal with it and invite citizens to "participate" (Minkler and Pies 1997; Smith 1998). Traditional participation techniques used by governments seeking public input tend to exclude marginalized people from the beginning. Public forums, evening meetings and citizen advisory groups do not reach beyond people with the means and the connections to be involved. There are financial barriers such as lack of child care and transportation, and there are socio-cultural barriers that make people feel they have no legitimate right to be present, perhaps because of disability, gender, low income, or lack of education. A major

barrier remains if ordinary citizens sense that their voices will not make a difference (Higgins 1997). In addition, governments and other agencies typically do not have an internal structure that is conducive to participation.

> If public participation staff are managed in a top-down, traditional way, they are likely to manage the public in the same fashion. Alternatively, participatively-managed staff are likely to work with the public more interactively since participation is part of the organizational culture. Before an organization "goes public," some internal organization development is often necessary (Connor 1993:1).

Smith (1995) notes that the internal structure of an agency must change to accommodate initiatives from below. For example, health planning normally originates with a central authority, and the working pattern of a regional agency below it is aligned with this top-down flow. The structure of official planning authorities has to change to incorporate the authority and autonomy of community groups.

Health planner Sherry Arnstein (1969) developed the *Ladder of Participation* (Figure 1) to describe the degree to which citizens actually have power in relation to an agency's plans or programs. *Non-participation* is at the bottom of the ladder: if agencies do present information, it is only to obtain compliance, and community opinions are not heard. The middle rungs of the ladder are *degrees of tokenism*, in which the agency defines the issue, presents a plan and invites questions. The first is informing, as the agency tells people about their rights and responsibilities, and they are heard, but their support is not necessary. Then there are consultation and placation, in which feedback is requested and there is a need for public support but no obligation to follow advice. The agency may give some individuals a decision-making role. At the top rungs of the ladder are *degrees of actual power*, in which the community has a decision-making role and there is a process for involving stakeholders. In partnerships, community and agency share decision-making. Then there is delegated power, in which the community controls a segment of a program. The highest degree of participation is community control, in which the agency provides resources to help the community identify issues and implement solutions.

Participation has to include ownership; otherwise, people may participate but not really be involved. True participation requires that ordinary people achieve some degree of control, power or partnership. Many governments and agencies have tried to incorporate public participation into their programs because local people are more likely to support plans that they have co-developed. Plans imposed from above, no matter how well conceived, are likely to be resisted or treated with indifference because they are not owned by those affected.

Participatory Methods

Different methods have been developed to make research, planning and implementation more participatory and inclusive. Most of the following examples are from international development, for example, guidebooks and manuals published by the United Nations and the World Bank. However, these agencies have adopted methods that were first developed by grassroots movements such as

Asia's Participatory Action Research (peasants collect their own data and design projects), the Chicago organizing school (low-income neighbourhood organizing), and popular education (group learning and action techniques), to name a few.[2]

Stakeholder analysis identifies those with a stake in the success or failure of a project. This includes people with no direct role in the project, or with no voice in general, who may be directly affected. The analysis uncovers broader potential impacts, unintended impacts, unforeseen conflicts, and possible coalitions. The primary stakeholders are the direct project participants or users of a resource. Secondary stakeholders are intermediaries such as funders, town councils and others formally but indirectly involved. External stakeholders are not formally involved, but they may affect or be affected by the activity. Each type of stakeholder needs to be questioned about their expectations of the activity, what benefits or drawbacks they expect for themselves, what resources they will or will not commit, other interests they have which may affect the project, how they view the priorities of other stakeholders, and what other stakeholders they can identify.

Figure 1: Ladder of Participation[3]

Degrees of Actual Power (Community has decision-making role; stakeholder analysis.)

Control
Agency asks community to identify issues
Community decides goals and means
Agency provides resources at every stage
Community in charge of structure, process, resources

Delegated Power
Agency defines issue and what it can support
Community decides on plan within agency limits
Community assumes decision-making over a segment of program

Partnership
Agency defines issue and presents tentative plan
Community able to change plan to varying degrees

Degrees of Tokenism (Agency defines issue, presents plan, invites questions. Community is heard.)

Consultation/Placation
Agency requests feedback, tries to obtain support
Individuals may have a role in formulation
No obligation to follow advice
Agency will modify plan if necessary

Informing
Community informed of rights and responsibilities
Community has no decision-making role
Agency expects compliance

Non-Participation (Agency presents issues and plans. Community is not heard.)
Agency expects compliance

Gender analysis, as a sub-sector of stakeholder analysis, highlights the issue of exclusion of women at the beginning. Women and men are interviewed separately about their roles and the roles of the opposite gender. Women are questioned about their triple role (production, reproduction and community management); their practical gender needs (for carrying out their present roles) and their strategic gender needs (for equity and removal of barriers).

Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) is a popular research technique using local knowledge, qualitative as well as quantitative data about an area. Local people are involved as researchers. PRA is directed to marginalized groups (women, children, youth, the poor, and the illiterate) with research techniques designed to encourage rather than intimidate them. It grew out of a more "top-down" local research technique called Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) in which experts did quick, systematic overviews of an area, its needs and priorities, and the feasibility of various interventions. RRA used information gathered from villagers but in an "extractive" way because the information was analyzed somewhere else and did not return in a usable form. In response, local development workers began to involve villagers in this kind of research, and villagers and workers used the results to plan projects. PRA and RRA use similar research techniques including semi-structured interviews, key informants, participatory mapping/modelling, Venn diagrams, time lines, trend change analysis, oral/life histories, seasonal calendars, daily time use, livelihood analysis, stories/case studies, and secondary sources.

Participatory Action Research (PAR), similar to PRA, was part of a South Asian movement that brought literacy, popular education and community organizing to rural areas. It adopted the Western "action research" approach in which the researcher takes part in a community and is committed toaction on its behalf. With PAR, the community owns the research, local people participate at every stage, and local people are taught research methods.

Project/program planning refers to a set of planning and monitoring tools that are participatory. Stakeholder workshops develop a Project Planning Matrix (PPM) that is used throughout the project. The Matrix includes project/ stakeholder analysis, problem analysis as perceived by stakeholders, and objectives and solutions analysis. Project Cycle Management (PCM) applies similar analysis throughout the project and attempts to involve stakeholders missed the first time. ***Group participatory techniques*** are tools to help groups plan in a participatory way and to help institutions to become more participatory. For example, Future Search planning sessions are facilitated workshops of several days in which stakeholders examine the whole community system, local and global trends, ideal futures, and how to get to them. ***Technology of Participation (TOP)*** is a group of such tools developed by the Institute of Cultural Affairs, a group of international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which adapted Chicago organizing school techniques to community organization and international development, including a town meeting model and problem-solving tools for institutions.

Multi-stakeholder collaboration refers to a consultation approach in which governments and other agencies bring groups together to make recommendations on issues with major social implications. The United Nations (UN) consid-

ers the Canadian Round Table on the Environment and the Economy to be a good model. The Canadian government developed the Round Table to incorporate sustainable environment concepts into policies and programs. The Round Tables were designed to be gender representative, and to bring government, industry and environmental groups together to arrive at some consensus for problem definition and action.

Consensus decision-making was refined by the Canadian Round Tables, and many participatory planning settings now use it to accommodate diverse interests and conflict and to make sure that everyone is heard. It is inclusive, using stakeholder analysis to bring together everyone affected by an issue. Stakeholder groups may work separately at the beginning to define issues and choose a representative to represent them in the larger group. When the large group begins its work, a facilitator helps them learn techniques for working in groups. They decide jointly on a consensus process that suits their specific purpose. Not only must the values and interests of every stakeholder be heard, but everyone must have equal access to information. Parties should know at the beginning what aspects of their collective decisions can actually be carried out, for example, the limits created by existing legislation. At the end of the process there may be issues left unresolved, but the process is usually helpful in clarifying issues and building respect and understanding.

Asset mapping was popularized by John McKnight, a community practitioner and researcher whose ideas have influenced neighbourhood revitalization movements in North America and beyond. The general approach is to build on the assets, resources, networks, and informal helping systems in a community. By contrast, the traditional approach of human service agencies has been on the disadvantaged area's problems and needs, which has led to fragmented solutions, passive leadership, apathy, dependence, and the "individual client" strategy. Asset-based development uses the asset map to highlight community assets, skills and abilities. Inventories of individuals, voluntary associations and institutions form the basis of community building which is asset-based, internally focussed and relationship driven. Asset mapping has spread internationally and is used by institutions as well as popular movements such as the sustainable communities movement and healthy communities. There are guidebooks with questionnaires and information about how to carry out and use the inventories (see the *Bibliography*).

Current Practices

Introduction

This section describes twenty-two initiatives in community-centred planning and action. They are examples of many similar initiatives in this province and elsewhere involving community groups, agencies or coalitions of the two. It should be noted that the local examples are only a sampling, and we could have included many others.

First, there are *alternative programs* that focus on meeting basic needs and building capacity in people. A family literacy program, in which parents organize and control sessions, has user-friendly techniques and resources and is easily replicable in new settings. Family resource centres, in this province and elsewhere, have proven to be a good model for meeting the needs of young children and their families. They are flexible and inclusive, with parents involved in operations and decision-making. A regional community education network in this province has set up family resource centres, school projects and youth programs, with participatory planning, operations and evaluation. Health care co-operatives in Canada are a new vehicle for under-serviced groups to organize and control a variety of health services. A local peer counselling program is training professionals and community volunteers in "helping skills", which they can use with people in their communities who are experiencing stress and crisis. An employment support program, created by a provincial government-community group partnership, provides direct financial and job search support for single parents re-entering the labour force.

The second group, *collaboration and integration*, describes how governments and agencies are finding new ways to work with one another and with community groups. A coalition in Michigan co-ordinated the work of government and non-government service providers in one region, eliminating duplication and competition for scarce resources. Another American community-agency coalition created a multi-function, intergenerational centre, with space for social services agencies and community groups. In Newfoundland and Labrador, human service agencies have begun a process of integrating services and involving families directly in supporting children with special needs. Also in this province, a government-community anti-violence strategy has supported community groups and funded grassroots public education projects. It is also developing a training program for officials who deal first-hand with family violence.

The final examples come from *participatory research and planning*. A participatory evaluation project used storytelling as a technique for the groups involved in the Ontario Healthy Communities Network to describe their health promotion initiatives. Community conferences, forums and workshops are sponsored by some regional economic development boards in Newfoundland and Labrador as one way of involving more women and youth. The Ugandan government undertook participatory research into the needs of rural youth, culminating in a national planning conference with youth, parents, youth organizations and agencies that brought the issue to national attention. The process resulted in strategic plans and a stronger youth network.

Three local cases of participation in ecosystem planning are part of a national trend. The Canadian Round Table model received international attention as a good process for involving a wide range of stakeholders in consultations. Ecosystem planning and integrated resource management are based on the inclusion of all stakeholders, the incorporation of scientific and traditional ecological knowledge, and the use of consensus decision-making in planning and management. An Innu community consultation process concerning land claims negotiations was designed to be inclusive, to inform people and to obtain feedback. Community asset mapping projects involved local people in recording natural and cultural landscape features that are meaningful to them. The projects reinforced a

sense of place, and they have produced materials to help others do similar projects. Concluding this section are three examples of the use of media in participatory planning: the Fogo process pioneered techniques that have been used around the world; recent projects in Newfoundland and Jamaica helped people use media in community organization and sustainable agricultural development.

Alternative Programs

Parents' Roles Interacting with Teachers' Support

Parents' Roles Interacting with Teachers' Support (PRINTS) is a family literacy program in Newfoundland and Labrador that builds on the literacy strengths of families and gives parents the major organizing role. PRINTS considers parents to be the "key facilitators" of their children's literacy development. The program integrates literacy activities into everyday family life. Parents attend sessions over a four-month period at a community centre or school, learning techniques, practising with each other, and working with the children in groups and at home. Teachers and child care workers attend the sessions in a supporting role. Activities include oral language, play, books and book sharing, drawing, and writing. Parent groups choose the activities they want to concentrate on and how they want to organize the groups of children. Parents also learn to facilitate the program with new family groups.

PRINTS got its start in community centres in St. John's, where it has continued to thrive. In the past two years, it has spread to 19 settings around the province. Some of the early groups are still together, and the members are active in their community centres and schools. The program has its own resource materials, including a book produced locally, with culturally relevant content. A facilitator helps each new group get started, but there are now manuals and videos to help groups start up by themselves.

Family Resource Centres

The family resource centre model has become an effective means of improving the lives of young children and their families. In Newfoundland and Labrador, there are eight family resource projects funded by the province through the National Child Benefit provincial reinvestment plan and nine family resource programs sponsored by Health Canada's Community Action Program for Children (CAPC), each with numerous outreach sites. In addition, there are similar centres operated by union, military and community-based organizations. Family resource centres have a community development orientation, placing parents and communities (rather than staff and agencies) in the centre of decision-making and action. Activities for children include parent-child play sessions, singing, story times, and book lending, and there are courses for parents on topics such as parenting, child health and safety, managing as a single parent, and conflict resolution. Parents and community volunteers are encouraged to help in day-to-day operations, such as the community kitchens, toy lending libraries, drop-ins, and courses. Parents also sit on committees and boards of directors. Staff-parent interaction and collaboration are key factors. When a centre starts up, the staff usually begin with some basic programs, but as parents take a more active role,

decision-making about activities shifts to them. In a recent evaluation, parents noted that they immediately felt welcomed and respected, their opinions were heard and it was easy to become more active (Health Canada 1997).

The centres have programs for expectant mothers, such as the Healthy Baby Clubs, which give women access to nutritional supplements, information and support. The programs are usually run by staff "resource mothers" who work with a group of women for a specified time period. A different model is being tried in St. John's and Grand Falls in an effort to reach more women and keep the groups together longer. Women who have been through the program are trained to become resource mothers themselves and are paid a stipend to start up new groups. Organizers felt that women who had been in a club themselves could relate better to newcomers and that it was a good way to get participants into staff positions.

Community Education Network

In 1983, a development association and a school board in the Port au Port area of southwestern Newfoundland decided to do something about high dropout rates. Working with a federal employment centre and a provincial social services office, they set up pre-school programs and youth work orientation programs. By 1992, this had grown into the Port au Port Community Education Initiative with 20 partner agencies from education, social services, health, human resources, and economic development. For awhile, it received provincial support as a community education pilot project, allowing the local initiative to grow into a regional network of family resource centres, early education programs, school-based services, and adult/youth learning centres. Now called the Community Education Network (CEN), it works on the basis of the principles of localization, maximum use of resources, inclusiveness, responsiveness, leadership development, self-help, self-determination, lifelong learning, and integrated service delivery (CEN 1999). Organizers attribute their success to the fact that CEN was designed locally, growing out of existing efforts, and was committed to partnerships and integrated services. It also received quick response from agencies. Finally, it encouraged community consultation and participation through community television and radio forums, participatory evaluations and participant decision-making in programs.

Family Resource Centres. A concern about families needing support led CEN to partner with the Bay St. George Coalition to End Violence to create the Community Action Committee (CAC). This committee set up family resource centres in 14 communities under Health Canada's CAPC program. A training and leadership team was created to help volunteers take part in running the centres. Parents were represented on the CAC board, and parent committees were set up at each site, providing feedback about the programs and receiving leadership training. The parent committees began to visit each others' centres to compare notes on operations. This grew into regular, regional parent planning sessions, where parents have provided feedback for CAC strategic planning. The parent committees also organize participatory evaluations with all the parents, in sessions which only parents attend. Another participatory evaluation is carried out with

the Healthy Baby Clubs that are set up in the centres. This ongoing evaluation uses a handbook that was produced for the purpose by community facilitators at the local College of the North Atlantic campus (a CEN partner).

Communities in Schools. CEN established ties with the international Communities in Schools organization (CIS), which promotes partnerships of schools, service providers, families and community groups, to bring services into the schools where youth need them most. There is now a regional CIS Committee, and 19 schools have teams consisting of parents, service providers, staff and community volunteers. Each school hires young people to work as co-ordinators through Youth Services Canada (Human Resources Development Canada). They organize peer and intergenerational mentoring, literacy and homework tutoring, vocational guidance, health education, parental advisory/support, enterprise education, and information/counselling within each school. At the initial planning sessions, each school team looks at the needs and resources in their school and community, determining the activities they want based on this assessment. A facilitator asks each participant to identify their own skills, as well as those of friends on whom they can call for a favour. Youth workers keep this information for future reference. This saves time for the workers, while opening up new ideas for resources in the community.

CIS began a participatory evaluation project, supported by the McConnell Family Foundation and the national Communities in Schools organization. An evaluation team with a facilitator visits each site once a year, talking to parents, workers, children, school staff, and community people. They ask what is working, what is not and how to mobilize communities. The evaluation team uses video in this "stories collection". They bring the footage back to people for approval before it goes into reports and proposals. There are also videos of programs in operation to orient new workers and volunteers. CIS is developing learning guides for participants to use throughout Atlantic Canada to set up new programs. The guides have specific information on running activities, administration, public relations, fundraising, and other topics.

Onward Willow

"Better Beginnings, Better Futures" was a pilot program created by the Ontario government to help communities provide pre-school and school-age programs suited to local circumstances. Twelve project communities were selected to develop programs with the proviso there would be significant involvement of community residents in planning and operations. Onward Willow, a Guelph neighbourhood, was one of the sites (Narayan and Vanderwoerd 1997).

A group of human service workers had formed a committee to get one of the projects for this neighbourhood. Using a small grant they had received to develop their proposal, they hired a community development worker to get local people involved. The worker had shared many of the same experiences as the local residents, having lived in social housing and been a sole-support mother. She organized neighbourhood meetings, eventually pulling together a group of about twelve people who met weekly to talk about their lives, communities, children, and neighbourhoods. The worker asked them about their experiences as parents of small children, and what supports would have been helpful. Then she put

their ideas into a draft proposal and gave it back to them for comment. The group immediately got involved in revising and rewriting the ideas, and they organized a neighbourhood petition in support of the project.

When the project began, a board was set up consisting of residents and service providers. The project co-ordinator interviewed both groups, finding barriers and distrust on both sides. She worked on resolving these problems by getting the groups to focus on process goals (empathy, respect, genuineness, concreteness) and task goals. Program activities were pre-designed and divided into child, family and community streams. Neighbourhood people saw this as a somewhat artificial division but they went along with it. One supervisor with expertise in that field and one lay person from the community staffed each stream.

The program operated on community development principles, such as collective decision-making and action, leadership training and adult peer techniques in which people learn and teach from their own experiences. There were supports such as transportation and adequate food at home so no one was excluded. The focus was on community strengths, natural leaders and partnerships between formal and informal helping systems. People in leadership positions were encouraged to ask for help and feedback, to pay attention to emotions as well as information, and to process as well as goals. Committees were called "teams" to reinforce the sense of collaboration and belonging. Meetings used a model for conflict resolution that treated conflict as a normal occurrence which could be mediated with positive results. In evaluations, participants said they had benefited in their relationships with family, friends and neighbours, and in their knowledge of social processes.

Health Care Co-operatives

New models for delivering health care are being developed to deal with service shortages and demand for new kinds of care. One of these is the health care co-operative (Co-operatives Secretariat 1999). Health care co-ops actually began earlier in Saskatchewan and Quebec, answering the need for medical services in rural areas and low-income urban neighbourhoods. They are now appearing in Ontario, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island in home care, ambulance services and alternative medicine. Public agencies are looking at the co-op model as a way to partner with user groups to provide cost-effective, tailored services. Groups are forming co-ops to deal with inadequate services in rural areas, with minority language groups and special needs patients. The Co-operatives Secretariat recently joined with co-operative sector organizations to produce a start-up guide, which introduces the history and concept of health care co-operatives and outlines a step-by-step process for starting one.

Helping Skills

The Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA), Newfoundland and Labrador Division, developed the Helping Skills Training Program. Using a train-the-trainer model, CMHA trains facilitators (who are often counsellors, community nurses or volunteer leaders), who then deliver the program to volunteers in their own organizations or communities. The fourteen three-hour modules provide intensive exploration of core aspects of helping, including helpful versus versus

unhelpful behaviour, active listening, empathy, identifying boundaries, knowing when you are out of your depth, and taking care of yourself as a helper. The emphasis is on using your experiential knowledge as the basis of knowing what is most helpful to others. Participants learn by doing, drawing on their own experience in small group discussions and role plays. They can then use their skills to provide support and understanding to people who are going through stressful times.

The program was developed in 1996 with the goal of building capacity in rural areas where services are hard to access. CMHA partnered with the St. John's and Eastern Regional Health and Community Services Boards to pilot the program, and it is now being used in all health regions in the province. Volunteers have evaluated the training as extremely useful to them. Some have received referrals from professionals, while others use their skills with people who turn to them informally. They found these skills beneficial in everyday family and social situations as well. The program is now being adapted for use with young people.

Single Parent Employment Support Program

The Single Parents Association of Newfoundland (SPAN) approached the Department of Human Resources and Employment with an idea for a project to remove barriers faced by single parents on social assistance who want to get back into the labour force. The Department formed a partnership with SPAN to develop a pilot program to remove specific barriers and to help in the job search process. The Single Parent Employment Support Program (SESP) began in the fall of 1998. SESP involved about 100 single parents in its first year of operation.

Most of the participants have minimal skills and work experience, which means that they can only find low-wage work. The Department provides a wage subsidy which enables them to take low-wage jobs and still be better off than if they had stayed on social assistance. The subsidy goes directly to the participant rather than to the employer, and the amount of subsidy begins to decrease at a certain wage level. The hope is that participants will gain enough experience and skills to move on to better-paying jobs. SPAN organizes the other part of the program, placement support. There are sessions on job search skills, empowerment and financial management, with transportation and child care subsidies provided. Each participant then works with a placement officer to find a job, and those who are laid off can go back to the placement officer and try again. This provides a continuity that is often lacking in transition to work programs. Participants are enthusiastic about the subsidy and the help they have received. Some have improved their skills and found better paying jobs, but it is too early to tell if the measures in this pilot program can help enough people make a permanent transition. An evaluation is under way.

Independent Living Resource Centre

The Independent Living Resource Centre (ILRC) in St. John's, Newfoundland, is a community-based, consumer-controlled organization. ILRC puts into action the Independent Living principles of consumer control, individual choice and dignity of risk. The people who use the Centre determine their own needs, but they

also share their expertise, information and experiences. Programs are developed and run by people with and without disabilities working together. The Centre supports people in decision-making, overcoming barriers, problem-solving and achieving personal goals. Programs include individual advocacy, peer support, information, networking, and community development. The majority of board members, staff, volunteers, and general members are people with disabilities. Accommodation of disability-related needs is in place to ensure cross-disability representation throughout the organization. There is a commitment to open communication, and information is free-flowing and available in various formats. Staff and board meetings are open, and volunteer mentors support participation and leadership development. Individuals determine for themselves what they are looking for and how they want a service to be made available to them. They are encouraged to set their own goals and to develop skills to deal with barriers. Skills for individual decision-making become skills for organizational leadership, as people become involved in planning and running the Centre's activities. The Centre operates on the basic conviction that solutions can be found within the group and the community.

Collaboration and Integration

South Central Plus

The Region Nine Development Commission in south-central Minnesota found a way to co-ordinate the work of government and non-government agencies in a nine-county region (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture n.d.). These agencies were operating similar community services, competing for the same federal grant money, and this duplication weakened the region's ability to provide services to everyone given the funding cutbacks that were occurring. South Central Plus was created in 1989 to eliminate this duplication, reduce operating costs and present a unified voice to funders. The agencies now purchase supplies together, share staff and facilities, write joint grant proposals, and combine their advocacy efforts. They also undertake joint initiatives, including a drug prevention partnership and a child care referral program that links parents with appropriate child care and trains employers to help their workers find child care. A loosely-organized board of directors from 16 agencies runs South Central Plus. The board makes decisions by consensus and refers unresolved issues to a sub-group which studies the problem and reports back to the board. The board usually follows the sub-group recommendations, a reflection of board members' mutual trust. Administrative costs for South Central Plus are low because its role is primarily one of co-ordination and the member organizations pay project costs.

Twin Rivers Intergenerational Center

The town of Franklin, New Hampshire, renovated a closed-down factory and turned it into an inter-generational community centre (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture n.d.). The centre is the product of a collaborative effort by the local government, school board and hospital, as well as non-profit agencies, religious institutions, businesses, and individual volunteers. A group was formed to do something about fragmented and inaccessible services in this predominantly rural area. Problems included unemployment, poverty, alienation of the poor, isolation of

seniors, and high dropout rates and social problems among youth. In 1992, an inter-generational task force was formed to look at how to integrate services, promote education and empower low-income people. A needs assessment showed there was public support for a central service location, so the group began to work on establishing a centre. Money came from federal grants and fundraising, and people donated labour, materials and furnishings. The group got a lease for the factory, and volunteers did the renovations.

The centre contains murals painted by people of all ages in the community. It houses head start programs, high school upgrading, child care services and a seniors' centre, and meeting rooms for the community. Health and social service agencies share space in the centre to provide one-stop services and prevention programs. The centre is seen as a model of collaboration and co-location of services, and the New Hampshire government asked the partners to develop a manual for other communities to use.

ACCESS: Community-Based Mental Health Services

The Ontario Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association has devised a framework for an integrated, community-based system for people with serious mental health problems living in the community (CMHA Ontario 1998). The framework is called ACCESS (Accessible, Continuous, Comprehensive, Effective, Seamless System), and it expands on a similar national CMHA framework. The model emphasizes service integration, continuity of care, consumer and family decision-making, and facilitation of social networks and community resources. The concept of "community resource base" is used to convey the importance of family, friends, services and consumer groups in providing appropriate care and adequate housing, employment, education and income.

The framework was developed for Ontario's District Health Councils. It does not propose any specific service delivery model; rather, it outlines three "functions" necessary for a flexible, integrated service system. These functions are a blueprint for more specific models. The first is a resource centre, the central entry point for assessment, information, links to agencies and groups, advocacy, education, and short-term support. Secondly, a mobile outreach function does the same for geographically dispersed or socially isolated populations. The third function is a team consisting of a community support worker, family, friends, other providers, and community members. The team provides continuity of care and arranges for social supports. There is a manual describing the functions in detail, with information about cost savings to agencies and benefits to consumers.

Model for the Co-ordination of Services to Children and Youth

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has introduced a framework for delivering co-ordinated, collaborative services to children and youth at risk or with special needs. The model was recommended in a report on classroom issues and developed with input from four partner departments. There was strong public support as well. Teachers, caregivers and parents were tired of the overlap and contradictions caused by several agencies having several support plans for one child. Parents also wanted to become involved as decision-makers. Four

departments (Education, Health and Community Services, Human Resources and Employment, and Justice), along with regional Health and Community Services Boards and school boards are introducing the model at the provincial, regional and community levels.

The model is child-centred, so each child has one support team and a single collaborative plan. Each team consists of relevant service providers (teachers, social workers, etc.) and the child's parents. The child or youth may also be a member unless there are compelling reasons against this. The team creates an Individual Support Services Plan (ISSP) for that child, using a module developed from the best planning of each agency. The teams emphasize the child's strengths, the goals they can achieve for the year, and how the child's needs can be met through co-ordinated effort. Each team member takes on a specific responsibility in terms of these needs and goals. Team members share information but there are confidentiality procedures, and parents are informed of their rights.

A provincial team provides training and support to six "Regional Integrated Services Management Teams", made up of government, other agency representatives, parents and service providers. The Regional Teams are responsible for implementing the ISSP model and for integrating related programs and services. They also train each individual team in ISSP procedures and in skills such as problem-solving and consensus decision-making. Data is being compiled from each region to identify gaps and overlaps in services.

No new resources were obtained to implement this model. Rather, existing services and procedures were rearranged and streamlined to free up resources. Implementation is taking time because departments and agencies have to harmonize their policies and procedures and redirect their staff. Several regions are well into the process while others are just beginning. The model has been more easily adopted in rural settings where scarce resources have led many agencies into a habit of collaboration. On the provincial level, policies need to be reviewed and changed if the model is to be sustained. This child-centred, collaborative model is attracting attention across Canada.

Provincial Strategy Against Violence

The Provincial Strategy Against Violence, created in the late 1990s, was the culmination of decades of work by women's groups and community coalitions who brought attention to violence as an issue of concern to governments, institutions and citizens. The government of Newfoundland and Labrador, after a year of public consultations, supported the formation of working groups to deal with violence against women, children, seniors, and dependent adults. The Strategy includes legislation and policy change, interdepartmental co-ordination, staff training, new service delivery models, public awareness, peer education, and curriculum development. There is a provincial co-ordinating team and regional co-ordinating committees formed from existing anti-violence groups. The regional committees are being encouraged to network with each other about educational resources and strategies. The program is due to expire in 2000 before it has met all the objectives. The provincial team is holding focus groups around the province, asking participants what should be done to sustain anti-violence work.

The Strategy highlighted public awareness and community education with a peer education package and project grants in each region. The grants supported a wide variety of projects, including a plain language pamphlet for people with developmental disabilities, a facilitator's guide for sessions in stereotyping awareness, a workshop manual on oppression and marginalization, a networking project for urban aboriginal women, and a seniors' information series. One group produced a teaching module on social exclusion and discrimination for schools, with group discussions, word play and games. Another group designed a dating violence presentation, with resources for students on how to produce their own videos and skits. Some high school students designed and performed a series of skits for area schools. A group of family violence survivors produced and performed a play for men's groups, with a workshop/question-answer format. Another play on family violence was written by a playwright and performed for community audiences. Both plays were well received, and the groups found funds to continue their performances.

Training of government and agency staff is another Strategy measure. In small rural communities, victims of violence may not be able to confide in relatives or friends and may depend solely on a local official for help. These front-line people need training. Three levels of training are planned. The first level deals with the basic dynamics of violence and is designed for receptionists, police dispatchers and others who may be the first person contacted by a victim. These people often make a difference in whether a person continues with a complaint. The second level is intermediate training for people who make referrals, such as teachers, nurses and doctors. The third level is advanced training for child protection workers and shelter workers. The provincial team is designing the training to make it suitable for rural areas.

Participatory Research and Planning

Using Stories to Guide Action

The Ontario Healthy Communities Network wanted to help its member communities share their experiences and the tools they had developed in health promotion. Storytelling was seen as a way to describe the community organization processes that had been used so others could learn from what had worked. The federal and provincial governments funded the Using Stories to Guide Action Project and the Ontario Prevention Clearinghouse co-ordinated it. The initial plan was to hire regional researchers to visit communities, interviewing the groups and writing up their stories. However, the communities preferred to find local people to do the writing. Each story profiles the community, how it became part of the Healthy Communities Network, who was involved, and what issues were acted on. Each story emphasizes critical incidents, milestones, barriers, and successes. After the stories were completed, representatives from each community met and came up with some ideas about community processes, which they classified in terms of awareness, forming connections and taking action.

The Ontario Prevention Clearinghouse produced a guidebook, *Using Stories to Guide Action* (OPC/OHCC 1994), describing how stories were collected and offering a few samples. Longer versions of the stories are also available. The

guidebook outlines general principles and instructions for groups interested in undertaking a similar process. Participants said that stories were a good way to express what was important to them and to share feelings, a new way to look at the experience and gain new insight about how things happened. The stories serve as a public record that can be shared in the community, demonstrate their accomplishments, get new people involved, and inform them about what has gone on.

Social and Economic Development

Smaller development and community groups formed the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board in southwestern Newfoundland. Many had already worked on strategic development plans, and the Long Range Board's job was to bring these plans together and make more people aware of them. There was a feeling that traditional consultation methods, such as holding public meetings in each community, would not reach enough people. When the Communication for Survival (CFS) initiative got underway in 1995 (see below), the board became a key sponsor of their community conferencing projects. This helped them get feedback on strategic plans and to develop more partnerships in the region. They are working with these partners to strengthen community television in the region and to plan another community conferencing process.

The Long Range Board and the Stephenville Status of Women Council organized an October 1999 conference on women in community economic development. The goal was to get more women involved in the local organizations that make up the regional development board. Women are a minority in local government and development groups, even though they are active in the volunteer sector. The Status of Women Council thought that awareness and leadership training would be a step in breaking down these barriers by helping women to identify skills they already have and how they can train to get more. The groups plan follow-up meetings to create a regional action plan. They used models from British Columbia and Nova Scotia to design the conference and follow-up plans.

In October 1998, the Baccalieu Board of Economic Development in eastern Newfoundland organized a two-day round table forum on out-migration entitled, "Why Have All Our Families Gone?" Participants represented 35 organizations from government, education, business, and the voluntary sector. The follow-up committee produced an action plan, but after talking at length with youth in the region, revised the plan. Young people told them that a major problem was dealing with the negative attitudes people now have about living in a rural area. The new action plan includes organizing information sessions in schools to demonstrate the region's assets and restore young people's sense of pride in their communities. It will also introduce leadership training in the schools, beginning at the elementary level, to make young people aware of the importance of volunteer activity. The Board is setting up new Junior Achievement and 4-H programs. It also has a youth representative (as do most of the regional boards), and it supports the provincial youth in the development organization Futures in Newfoundland and Labrador Youth (FINALY).

National Action Programme for Rural Youth in Uganda

In 1994, the Ugandan Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF) brought together government departments, non-government organizations, youth and parents from around the country in a participatory strategic planning process for rural youth (Seiders 1996). The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) provided technical and financial support. The impetus for this planning project had actually come a few years earlier, when FAO sponsored a national workshop on rural youth which dealt with the impact of AIDS and high dropout rates among youth. FAO had done a study on youth and had tried unsuccessfully to revive the Young Farmers of Uganda Programme because of its "learn-by-doing" approach and strong volunteer support. A participatory planning process was needed to develop a new rural youth program.

The Ministry asked all departments and organizations linked to rural youth to participate in designing a national action program. The planning process used a "bottom-up, top-down approach." Organizations and agencies participated at the regional level in needs identification. At the village level, groups of youth, volunteers, community leaders, teachers, parents, and neighbours took part in the same kind of participatory needs identification. The process had three phases. First, an "environmental scanning" was done of all the organizations and agencies involved with youth and the nature of their activities. A National Rural Youth Advisory Committee was formed on the basis of the information collected. The second phase was information-gathering. Focus groups were held with college-level agricultural extension students on the issues facing rural youth and the actions needed to address them. Two of these students carried out field studies in four communities. They interviewed youth, parents, teachers, neighbours, and community leaders and wrote a report on problems and prospects for rural youth. The third phase was "structured decision-making" by the National Rural Youth Advisory Committee which identified needs and came up with six major issue areas for further discussion. The Committee held a national strategic planning conference, with about 70 participants from 17 districts, representing youth, volunteer leaders, agency officials, and non-government organization representatives. Participants worked in small groups, using the structured decision-making procedure, to develop core elements of a national action program.

The plan described the situation of rural youth and the interventions needed, serving as a basis for developing policy and programs. It provided a means for youth organizations do their own strategic planning. The conference brought rural youth issues to national attention and got many youth-serving agencies and organizations together for the first time. The process established a basis for future networking, collaboration and sharing of resources.

Natural Resource Management

In 1995, the *National and Newfoundland and Labrador Round Tables on the Environment and the Economy* formed a partnership with fishing industry representatives to examine the fishery crisis and the future sustainability of coastal communities and marine ecosystems (Partnership 1995). The partnership held meetings with stakeholders and the public in 13 communities around the province to capture the "voice of the communities" and to introduce people to the round table model

of consensus decision-making and planning. Community development facilitators organized the round tables in each community with stakeholders from within and outside the fishery. The facilitators asked people what made their communities sustainable and unsustainable, and what could be done in the future. The round table process allowed every stakeholder several chances to speak, and a public meeting was held afterwards to get feedback on the round table's conclusions. At the end of the project, the partners convened a final wrap-up session with participants from around the province to make sure that conclusions and recommendations represented a consensus of the people consulted.

In 1994, the Avalon Peninsula District adopted a *forest ecosystem planning model* based through a consensus process with public and private interests (Forest Management 1997). Public notices were posted and letters were sent to stakeholders, and over 120 people participated during an 18-month period. At the first meetings, the participants formed a planning team of about 30 people. For the next year or so, a facilitator guided the team through day-long and weekend meetings in which they applied ecosystem management models and worked through conflicting interests to achieve consensus, or at least temporary compromise. The team arranged for forestry staff to write up the material from each session and to bring it back for revisions. The team produced a strategy document and a five-year plan. The strategy is based on principles of adaptive ecosystem management, a co-operative, continual learning process that includes frequent monitoring of local and scientific data. The strategy incorporates market and non-market values such as sustainability, spirituality/culture and economic use of resources.

An Integrated Resource Management (IRM) framework was developed for the Central Avalon Coalition in 1995 (Extension CD Co-op and Hollett 1995). Integrated Resource Management has grown in Canada in response to pressure from the public to have a decision-making role in resource and ecosystem planning. IRM is a co-operative approach that tries to balance opposing values and reflect input from all resource users. It emphasizes participation, consensus decision-making, open communication, and equal access to information. According to this model, participation is essential in resource decision-making because local people have ideas and knowledge to contribute as well as a valid stake in the decisions that are made. IRM includes measures for continual monitoring of ecosystems and adaptation of plans to ecosystem change. The IRM framework has detailed guidelines for participation and consensus decision-making in meetings, so that all stakeholders have a voice and everyone learns one another's point of view. Participants learn conflict resolution and other group skills. Non-scientists begin to understand scientific data; scientists learn and respect traditional local knowledge. The IRM process takes time at the beginning but supporters say it prevents confusion and conflict later on.

Community Consultation on Land Rights

Since 1996, the Innu Nation in Labrador has been involved in land rights negotiations with the federal and provincial governments. Hydroelectric, military and mining activities have transformed parts of the traditional Innu territory, and there are plans for more development. The Innu are negotiating for land jurisdiction, self-government and protection of cultural and economic rights. Although

the leadership had a mandate from its people to negotiate, they felt there should be a process to inform people about the details of the negotiations and to obtain their feedback. A community consultation process began in 1998 (Innu Nation 1998). A team of Innu commissioners was selected, representing different social positions, age groups and clans, within the two Innu communities. The team underwent intensive training, learning the specific negotiating issues, the areas of land being negotiated and the traditional uses of these lands as well as how land claims had occurred in other parts of Canada. They also went through the exercise of examining their own biases about land claims to ensure that they would remain open to different opinions among those they consulted.

The team interviewed a cross-section of people in each community, asking them their views on what lands the Innu should control, what could be shared, what they thought about the negotiations, and what direction they thought negotiators should take. In addition to these in-depth interviews, the consultation used newsletters, phone-in radio shows, community meetings, and questionnaires to inform people and obtain their opinions. The team met with elders and other groups, and travelled to bush camps to reach as many people as possible. The consultation was actually held in two stages. The first stage consisted of providing information and asking preliminary questions. Another round of interviews occurred later, after people had a chance to consider the information provided. After the first phase, the team evaluated their work, making changes in their procedures and in the questions they planned to ask, based on the feedback they had received. The voices of the people consulted dominate their final report. The report describes their feelings about the land and the negotiation process. It is intended as an educational tool for the Innu as well as for negotiators and others interested in the issues involved.

Community Asset Mapping

In 1995, the Humber Environmental Action Group organized *Community Values Mapping projects* in Deer Lake and Outer Bay of Islands in western Newfoundland. In community asset mapping, communities identify environmental features that reflect the values (cultural, economic and spiritual) that are important to one's sense of place and identity. The Action Group saw asset mapping as a way of contributing to community health by helping people to rediscover the good aspects of their communities in contrast to the despair caused by the fishery crisis. A sustainable planning exercise such as the Integrated Resource Management process could also use the data collected. The project partners included environmental, forestry and economic development groups. Health Canada provided resources to train volunteers in community development and community mapping techniques. The project team developed a training workbook and video. The core group came up with a list of ten value categories: cultural, historical, spiritual/sacred, wilderness, habitat, archaeological, recreational, social, attractive, and other. Interviewers went around the communities with maps, asking residents to identify and talk about places of value, recording information about each feature or place mentioned. They compiled the information on one map, supplemented with reports, photos, and other materials. After a public verification process, the map and materials became an accessible community resource. For example, the Outer Bay of Islands Round Table used the mapping

project as the basis for creating more detailed community profiles in a series of meetings with representatives from councils, schools, development groups, recreation committees, and others.

Newfoundland and Labrador's regional economic development boards are implementing the *Marine Coastal Resources Inventory* for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. The Baccalieu Board of Economic Development in eastern Newfoundland decided to include cultural features in their inventory, and to extend it to land-based as well as marine-based resources. They added items from their strategic plan related to agriculture, cultural and natural tourism, and underutilized marine resources. The Board partnered with a community development corporation which hired local people to interview residents about natural and cultural features. The inventory includes trap berths, fishing rocks, capelin beaches, sea urchin beds, unusual rock formations, arable land, heritage buildings, transatlantic cable sites, cemeteries, rock walls, and similar features. The inventory will be made available for opportunity identification.

The Fogo Process

The Fogo process is one of several media-based models designed for use in remote rural areas, frequently known as "development communications". It began in the late 1960s, when a National Film Board filmmaker teamed up with the Memorial University (MUN) Extension Service to produce a series of films about life on Fogo Island (Williamson 1991). The Extension field workers used a community education process to introduce participatory development into rural communities. However, the original purpose of the films was to document rural life rather than to serve as an animating technique. Twenty-eight vignettes were produced in which Fogo Islanders talked about the fishery, co-operatives, the role of women, the merchants, government, resettlement, and other issues. There were scenes of work, children playing, dances, house parties, storytelling, and singing. When the films were shown in the communities, people were excited and their confidence was boosted, as they saw their strengths, skills, knowledge, and lifestyle portrayed on the screen. They began to see their problems with government, merchants and internal rivalries things that they could change. Field workers built on this new confidence and animation, helping people come up with strategies to keep the island viable and to oppose resettlement. The films were shown to provincial politicians, whose reactions of support were filmed and later shown to the people. The government began looking at alternatives to resettlement and worked with residents to put these into effect.

The Extension Service established a film crew to help field workers in other outports. In Port au Choix, a crew made films on the fishery, economic development, resettlement, and youth that were designed to educate people about the new area development association. This introduced "peer teaching", a process whereby films were screened as a basis for discussion. The practice of "approval screenings" was also developed to give people who had been filmed a chance to request that things be deleted or other things be added. This practice did not remove all controversial elements; in fact, people were willing to be filmed saying critical things that they would never say in person because it would be too confrontational. Often, there would be a constructive dialogue afterwards between the opposing parties. Organizers found the distancing effect of film to be helpful

in conflict resolution. The switch from film to video in 1970 demonstrated some differences in how the two media could be used in community development. Video could be edited quickly and used almost immediately in community sessions, which meant that it had far less of the distancing effect of film. It was easier and cheaper to use, and the field workers had their own portable equipment which they could teach local people to use as well.

The Fogo process was used in the Arctic to help resolve differences between Inuit hunters and government managers. MUN Extension staff designed and implemented the project with local Inuit and non-Inuit co-coordinators and interviewers. The two sides agreed that both parties would have access to the technology and that each would choose the people they wanted to interview. Only those who were interviewed would have editing rights. When the interview tapes were completed, a co-ordinator worked with both sides to come up with a fair sampling of the views expressed. Videos were produced, and screenings and discussions took place in homes, schools, community centres, offices and at social events. As a result, both Inuit and managers came to understand each other's knowledge of caribou and their mutual interest in preserving the resource. The process reduced animosity, and Inuit leaders and government officials eventually formed a joint advisory board. Video had been a useful tool in the hands of the organizers, allowing both sides to listen to the other's point of view without danger of confrontation or losing face. The videos were also a rich source of traditional and scientific information, and they have been broadcast in the north through the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation.

Memorial University's Snowden Centre for Development Support Communications took the process abroad in the 1980s. In a project in Nepal, the Centre trained and supported community workers to teach video production to women for use in their work with a women's rural development and community education program. Although the women could not read or write, they had no trouble learning the technology. They planned and produced videos on issues they considered important, such as legal rights of women, traditional medicine, and handling of drinking water. The women carried battery-powered equipment around the countryside, showing their home-grown educational films to groups of women.

Communication for Survival

For two years, HRDC funded Communication for Survival (CFS), a development communications initiative in western Newfoundland. It continues to the present day in various forms (Rural Newfoundland 1997). The Newfoundland Cultural Survival Project facilitated the initiative, and organized it as a partnership among the towns of Burgeo and Ramea, communities in the Port au Port area, the Community Education Initiative, the Ramea Economic Development Corporation and the association regionale de la cote ouest. Informal partners included economic development groups, school boards, the community college, and local broadcast companies. CFS builds on a 30-year tradition of using film and video in rural community development which began with the Fogo process. The partners believed that people needed more tools to communicate with each other and the outside world, to analyze their situation and to find solutions for rural economic

decline. The goal was to build on the work that groups were doing in communities by providing them with more tools and skills. There was also a community television and radio infrastructure which could be used.

The partners formed steering committees in each community. Each committee decided what to work on and how to share information with other communities. An overall steering committee held regular meetings in rotation among the four areas. These meetings were always open, and the steering committee made a special effort to get young people and musicians to attend. The facilitators stayed in each community for set periods, training groups to use communications technology and community organizing methods, helping them find ways to inform people, and bring them together to work on issues.

The activities included computer networking, newsletters, photography, weekly community television shows, radio and television forums, and phone-ins. People who got involved in community television production learned all the roles, both behind and in front of the cameras. Communities then taught the skills to other communities. There were also groups producing videos and plays on youth issues, local industries, family resource centres, employment, literacy, Francophone issues, and festivals, among other topics. Volunteer organizations took part in participatory workshops on group communication. Community forums and round tables were held, including some small, selective round tables organized by informal contacts that proved useful in reaching people who were not usually active in the community.

After two years, many people had developed technical and organizing skills, and groups working for community improvements had created new partnerships. Some of the stations have continued with the community programming initiatives, and development organizations are using the stations more frequently. The partners are working on ways to strengthen regional broadcasting, and they are planning a communications conference.

Participatory Media with Rural Jamaican Women

Women play a crucial role in Jamaican domestic food production, but they have had little access to agricultural extension services that traditionally focus on male commercial farming. This situation became worse when extension services were reduced in the 1990s. However, officials began to recognize the role of women in agriculture and the need to support local agricultural practices so that rural areas can feed themselves. A five-year joint project between the governments of Jamaica and Canada organized a pilot project to improve the use of soil nutrients in three rural communities using a gender approach and participatory media (Protz 1998). The project worked on the principle that communication approaches must be empowering, culturally relevant and supportive of indigenous knowledge. The goals were: to increase domestic food production, income and nutrition; to raise the profile of women in agriculture; to document their knowledge of soil fertility and environmental issues; and to link their knowledge with scientific knowledge.

In the first phase of the project, extension workers spent several months contributing labour to women's farms, which provided the women with an immediate benefit and put the workers in the position of learner and listener. The workers also showed videos of other Jamaican agricultural projects. The women had been unaware of the innovations in other communities and were enthusiastic about what they saw. They interviewed women on tape, and showed the results to them before compiling and analyzing the data. Although the taped interviews were more time-consuming, they created a good record of the women's knowledge, and the women appreciated being able to speak for themselves. They felt they were being listened to and had something to say. The findings revealed that although the flow of information about agricultural techniques was affected by women's relationships with their husbands, most of them knew about and used chemical fertilizers and did not need to be introduced to them, even though they had little direct access to extension services. What they really needed was support to improve their use of chemical fertilizers and to find cost-effective, organic alternatives.

The project included other media activities. Newsletters profiled the project, rural life and people, and included technical and other information that the extension service wanted to disseminate. One community hired a women's cultural group to produce a play about gender relationships and soil fertility issues. It told the stories of three women in different situations: one who was alone on the farm because her husband had left and never returned; another with an abusive husband who gave her no information or decision-making power; and a third who shared decisions with her husband. The play was videotaped and played in each community as the basis for discussions. The video was a way to examine sensitive gender issues, but it also taught the workers more about the women farmers. For example, they discovered that women had their own informal networks for spreading information about farming techniques. In another media project, each community chose a young man and a young woman to learn photography and to document farming issues, community problems and personal problems, and the resources their communities had to address these issues. The project also collected oral histories in the communities and published them in the newsletter.

The project produced a rough cut instructional video on techniques of soil conservation and fertility that was screened and analyzed in each community. The project invited women to sign up to test combinations of the techniques and about a hundred took advantage of the opportunity. Finally, the project held a participatory video training course in each community. The groups produced several humorous, but informative, vignettes on indigenous fertilizer techniques and how to improve them. One video featured a farm "rap"song incorporating interviews with rural youth. The information from the video projects went into a final video package with a printed manual for distribution to other communities.

Key Processes

This section draws on the examples above, as well as recent research[4] and discussions with community facilitators. It describes some key processes and principles for ensuring that community-level initiatives are community-defined and owned, and that excluded groups are brought into planning and carrying out initiatives.

Alternative Programs

A review of alternative services across the country (St-Amand 1994) reveals many similarities with some of the examples described in the previous section. Such programs typically try to involve the community, and the participants, in determining issues and developing programs. This ensures ownership from the beginning, as well as appropriate design. In many cases, participants sit on boards and committees, and sometimes staff are from the same background as participants. Relationships with staff are non-hierarchical and there are no boundaries between participant and staff space. Consensus decision-making is used in meetings and to get feedback. There are regular participant evaluations, and there is flexibility to act on the feedback received.

Service providers focus on building links and networks among families rather than on identifying deficits. Services are in accessible community sites, and community members are often trained to do outreach work. There are multiple services in one centre. Supports such as transportation, food and child care are provided to ensure that people are not excluded. Services are directed at the specific needs of particular groups, such as single parents, so they can participate in the labour force and in their communities.

Community development is a primary goal, building the capacity and skills of participants and the community in general. There are formal and informal partnerships in the community. Leadership development and other training use adult/peer education techniques, and volunteers and staff mentor new participants. Staff and volunteers may be trained in organizational and leadership skills. Self-management is a possible goal, but there are innovative coalitions of community groups, human service agencies, schools, local governments, and businesses.

Collaboration and Integration

Canadian health analyst Ronald Labonté (1997) has outlined some principles for collaboration between agencies and communities and for fostering participation. For Labonté, community development is "a particular health practice in which both practitioner and agency are committed to broad changes in the structure of power relations in society through the support they give community groups" (p. 89). An agency's goal should be to nurture more equitable relationships, but also to openly acknowledge the power differences that exist. However, the agency should support the community to identify its own issues, rather than consulting the community about pre-defined ones. This process requires more time and resources from the outset. Stakeholders have to be identified and less powerful ones supported to participate. The agency can arrange for community facilitators to work with smaller stakeholder groups at the beginning, finding common goals which the larger group can work on. This facilitation process should continue with a larger planning group, allowing all partners to identify their goals and expectations. Eventually, the agency negotiates with the group to define the goals in such a way that it can support them with resources. The partners commit themselves to joint management, and the agency helps the community groups develop the capacity to organize their own initiatives in the future. Labonté distinguishes this kind of community development from the more limited community-based service typical of human service agencies (Figure 2).

David Smith (1995) proposed another collaborative, participatory approach for health promotion in Ontario in the early 1990s. In this model, the agency supports community initiatives as they grow into regional networks by establishing a joint agency-community consultation group. This group sets up a network of organizations, institutions, informal groups, and individuals to help communities trade information with each other and to communicate issues to officials. It trains communities in such things as data collection, problem identification and organizing meetings. It brings local initiatives into agency planning and facilitates joint planning. The agency hires community facilitators and trains its regular staff in community development methods.

In our examples of collaboration and integration, agencies work within the limits of existing power relations and bureaucratic structures, trying to change them from within. In some cases, they developed innovative projects and multi-service centres in collaboration with community organizations. In others, they have reduced service duplication through a clear focus on the individuals who are at the centre of the program or service.

Figure 2: Community-based versus Community Development[5]

Community-based vs. Community Development	Problem Definition	Problem Articulation	Problem Ownership	Action	Impacts
Community-based	• agency/ professionals name and define • definers not directly affected • those who experience the most stress not involved	• agency promotional campaign • community may agree with definition	• agency develops strategy to remedy • partial buy-in of other community groups to strategy • not necessarily a common perception of situation	• agency retains decision-making power • major responsibility for on-going program transferred to locals; defined time lines • agency involves local groups and individuals in implementation • the most stressed may or may not have a role	• possible benefits and capacity growth for most stressed • local leadership development • commuity capacity-building • "results" outcomes, defined time line
Community Development	• agency with community • includes those most experiencing stress from beginning • primacy of perception of issue by those most affected	• agency with community • to a wider, growing number of people • people perceive linkages to other aspects of community life • developing a common perception of the situation	• strategy developed jointly by community and agency • linkages • community support; high level of commitment • readiness for action	• agency and community share decision-making • responsibility of implementation largely with community • the most stressed have a role	• benefits and capacity growth for most stressed • local leadership development • community capacity-building • "process" outcomes, defined time lines

Participatory Research and Planning

According to community facilitators, a procedure for getting a community involved in planning should be decided in consultation with that community, with respect for local expertise. Local people will know how to structure a process that will work in their area. Facilitators go to them with a problem, ask how things work there and how they would get people to work on issues. Share your objectives, ask people theirs and ask them to help design.

Leaders and other active community members have much valuable information about their community to share with outsiders. However, they do not represent everyone's perspective and experiences. Staying mainly within the orbit of the leaders will create a barrier to excluded people. Stakeholder analysis is a place to start for reaching all segments of a community, as well as going to where people are and meeting them on their own ground.

When introducing a new issue in an area, it is a good idea to attend meetings of other groups in the area first and make presentations at this meeting. This is preferable to holding a big public forum on the issue at the beginning, with politicians, bureaucrats and other VIPs in attendance. That would be the conventional way of doing things and people would want to discuss their own agendas making it difficult to focus on the issue at hand. Moreover, holding one public meeting will not give people time to analyze the information and it will not get a sufficient range of people involved. A series of community conferences or round tables is the method preferred by community facilitators. Meetings should be held in a location that is perceived as open to everyone (sometimes, the building is important). Small round tables can be a way to include people who do not go to community events, perhaps by inviting groups of friends and making the meetings accessible. If there are not enough people, the round table can be supplemented with people already involved. Participants require time and resources at the beginning to attend other groups' meetings, to make follow-up contacts, to identify stakeholders, and to train people in facilitation.

If there is to be a series of meetings with all stakeholders represented, some of them may need ongoing support to participate, which might mean financial support or adjustments in meeting times and places. Often, facilitators will meet with stakeholders first in smaller groups to reach consensus among themselves and to appoint delegates to the planning group.

At the beginning of the planning meetings, people need the opportunity to express their views and goals. This initial process should not be inhibited by insisting on a structured discussion of pre-determined content. There should also be clear objectives that everyone agrees on at the beginning. In order to ensure that everyone has a chance to contribute, facilitators usually introduce groups to some co-operative planning and decision-making techniques (group learning and teaching, consensus decision-making, conflict resolution, etc.). However, the participatory planning process is often confusing because individuals do not share the same frame of reference. People have different social status, power, areas of expertise, agendas, and levels of understanding. There may be an initial period of mistrust, and later periods of struggle and conflict, from which progress can emerge if the conflict is handled through a consensus decision-making proce-

dure. Moreover, without these initial processes, it is too easy to get people to say only what they think is expected of them. A strategic planner may consult a community and come up with a good plan, and people may agree with the plan, but they may not be prepared to support it if they did not really participate in its creation.

Participatory planning requires open communication and equal access to information. Professionals must respect local knowledge and expertise and find ways to integrate it with their own knowledge systems. Scientific and professional knowledge has to be made accessible in plain language. Resources are needed to conduct participatory research, to make scientific or professional data accessible, and to keep the general public informed about what the group is doing.

Our examples from the previous section, as well as the participatory methods outlined earlier, demonstrate some ways of involving the community in research, planning and evaluation. They suggest ways of bringing stakeholders into a planning process and ensuring that their voices are heard in community meetings, round tables and national-level forums. The key is to ensure that local knowledge is respected and used, that ordinary people have access to data, that consensus decision-making is used and, most importantly, that those with a stake in decisions have a genuine role in making the decision.

Conclusion

The resounding lesson of this project is that social exclusion is a real issue. At a time when the tradition of belonging and social cohesion that is a hallmark of this province is threatened by the forces of rapid change, many people find themselves on the margins of society. Whether because of poverty, unemployment, lack of education, gender, age, disability, or combinations of factors, it is harder for them be involved in mainstream social activities and easier for them to feel alienated and powerless. Many are at the receiving end of social policy without having any say in its planning. The traditional approaches to public participation, such as large public forums and consultation hearings, are not "user-friendly" for people experiencing social exclusion.

The Strategic Social Plan has recognized the value of participation as a component of individual and community well-being. People's sense of "belonging" to the larger group or community is the lynchpin of the exclusion/inclusion issue. The premise of this paper is that real social development needs to include all parts of the community—not just the leadership and already active participants—but those who are usually outside the circle of participation, who experience apathy and the sense that there's no point because the odds are stacked against them. If excluded people are genuinely to be included, the opportunity has to reach them on their own ground, in the context of their own lives.

The same premise underlies projects undertaken throughout the world. The examples cited describe specific, targeted efforts to engage people in defining their own issues and developing their own plans of action. The good news is that excellent social inclusion work is being done in our own country and our own province. The bad news is that these efforts have been piecemeal, often short-

term, inadequately resourced, and variable in outcome. The unique opportunity presented by the SSP is that it provides an overall policy framework for the specific purpose of engaging communities in planning their own futures. Sound working examples, along with the hands-on experience of those involved, are available to guide communities in this process.

Initial outreach has found an atmosphere of readiness and eagerness to take part, along with considerable scepticism about whether such a process can work. It is only realistic to note the obstacles that exist. The Strategic Social Plan has started in a "top down" way, engaging existing community boards to carry out implementation. Social and political divisions can also be significant barriers to participation. Moreover, many people in communities have become cynical about consultations which have little influence on decisions, and they may be unwilling to get involved. It has to be made clear that participatory planning is a different kind of process. The benefits of participation moreover take time—more time than a four year political mandate allows. The planning and policy-making have to be consistently sustained to yield long-term results.

With regard to agencies, although they widely support models of co-ordination and collaboration, most human services remain fragmented in practice. Attempts to make agencies more responsive and flexible come up against individual turf protection, hierarchical structures and reluctance to direct scarce resources to community facilitation. Community boards and organizations need support, both internal and financial, to increase the participation of excluded groups.

This said, can formal systems and communities work together to implement the Strategic Social Plan? From the wealth of experience described above, what key elements emerge that can guide an inclusionary process?

Key Elements

1. **Political will:** There needs to be a strong commitment to the concept of inclusion and inclusive policy-making at each level of the system.

2. **Communication:** Excellent communication is needed to let people know, both in the system and the community, why and how an inclusive process is being embraced.

3. **Pro-active outreach:** For inclusion to be genuine, active outreach efforts are needed to engage marginalized citizens, particularly those directly affected by social policies.

4. **Facilitation:** A vital ingredient in successful grassroots processes is invariably the presence of a skilled facilitator, ideally someone who knows the local community, whose role is to serve as a catalyst, engage motivation, support community organizing, help navigate obstacles and resolve tensions, and help identify the skills and resources the community needs.

5. **Collaboration across boundaries:** Organizations and agencies need to communicate on social development issues to foster good collaboration and to prevent efforts from being jeopardized by traditional turf issues.

6. **Organizational readiness:** Although beyond the scope of this paper, organizational transformation has emerged as a critical theme. Service-providing bureaucracies need to be attuned to the processes and benefits of inclusion and to be ready to respond to the community's input. A parallel internal development process is required to generate a sense of new possibilities, to create the excitement and hope that can bring about this shift in perspective.

A way for the "top-down" and "grassroots-up" processes to connect is through the Community Accounts, the bank of statistical information assembled by the Social Audit Unit. This quantitative data describes the issues in a standardized way and provides a frame of reference on the provincial, regional and community levels. By looking at the demographic, income, employment, health, and education data on individual communities, regional steering committes can get an overview of the comparative status of different areas and identify where to start.

Community accounts can also be a resource for the facilitated grassroots process. People can be encouraged and invited to come together, in familiar settings and groups, to discuss this information. Is the statistical picture of their community accurate? Does it reflect their reality? What is missing? What information is needed to put flesh on the bones? How do people assess their own well-being? What do they perceive to be the strengths and assets of their community, as well as the needs? How have these changed over time? Can they build on their strengths? What skills and resources do they need to do so? What community development models would be useful to them? The goal would be, over a period of months, to build a vision and a plan for the community in which everyone has participated. Out of this process would also come the qualitative information that puts flesh on the bones of the quantitative data. In this way the Strategic Social Plan would be shaped to the social and cultural environment of individual communities. The higher the degree of community ownership, the higher the possibility of success.

It has to be emphasized, however, that community participation is not a panacea. Communities by their very nature are diverse, varying in their histories, resources and the makeup of their population. Each has its own sense of identity along with its own problems; each is full of differences in assets, needs and opinions. There is no guarantee of consensus and plenty of potential for conflict. But to be fair to everyone, the process must be inclusive.

While there are key elements in the development process, there is no single recipe for success. The dynamics are complex and different in each situation. The same model can work well in one community and poorly in another. Whether a process works or not depends ultimately on factors that cannot be described by a model—the personal readiness of individuals to participate, the motivation to work together, a belief in human potential, a commitment to shared goals, and the capacity to build trust. When these come together within a well-facilitated process, the growth in energy and morale, both individual and collective, can be extraordinary and the social benefits of participation will outweigh the difficulties.

The concept of inclusion requires us to extend the accepted concept of democracy, which is inclusionary but passive; it's left to the citizen's initiative to vote. Pro-active social inclusion is a necessary ingredient to the formation of progressive social policy and to social growth and development. If we continue to make social policy as we currently do, we will continue in the reactive problem-solving mode.

Recommendations to Support Inclusion

1. That the Strategic Social Plan establish a Resource Group on Social Inclusion to support communities and regional boards, to provide seminars, look at successes and failures, and to help to generate momentum.

2. That regional boards explore the issues of exclusion and inclusion and the implications for their way of doing business with communities.

3. That the boards examine the readiness of their organizations to engage in participatory action.

4. That priority be given to ensuring skilled facilitation of the process.

5. That communities use the continuum models developed by Arnstein and Labonté (Figures 1 and 2) to assess where they are on the ladder of participation and how they might want to move. Communities can also use the examples in this paper to see what approaches might apply to their situation and be useful to them in moving ahead. They can get more information about these projects from the people involved—what worked, what didn't work, and what "intangibles" made a difference.

6. That a concerted effort be made at the provincial level to secure federal funds for community capacity-building. Unless resources are available for proper facilitation and to support the plans developed by communities, the SSP process may self-destruct.

7. Existing projects that are successful and are already building community capacity should be sustained. Past experience shows that valuable work is often cut off because on-going funding is not available.

8. Inclusiveness should be a key indicator in the social audit. The facilitated process through which excluded people define their own needs and priorities will provide baseline data for this component of the social audit.

In the implementation of any plan, there will be people who are dissatisfied. Social development is a continuing process; there are no complete solutions. The Strategic Social Plan has espoused the community participation process as intrinsically healthy in the belief that people thrive, individually and collectively, when they contribute to development or problem-solving. This paper has aimed to assist in this process.

References

1. Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, *People, Partners and Prosperity: A Strategic Social Plan for Newfoundland and Labrador, 1998*. St. John's: Office of the Queen's Printer, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1998.
2. Modified from Arnstein (1969) and Extension CDC and Hollett (1995).
3. See Community Tool Box; Extension CD Co-op and Hollett (1995); Institute for Cultural Affairs; Kretzmann and Knight (1993); UNDP (1998a); and World Bank Learning Group (1998).
4. See Community Tool Box; Extension CD Co-op and Hollett (1995); Rural Newfoundland (1997); Poole and Van Hook (1997); St-Amand (1994); Schorr (1997); UNDP (1998a); personal communication with community facilitators.
5. Modified from Labonté (1997).

Bibliography

Guidebooks and Manuals

Aberley, Doug (ed.). 1993. *Boundaries of Home: Mapping for Local Empowerment*. Gabriola Island, BC; Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers.

Centre for Community Enterprise (CCE). 1998. *Local Action to Fight Poverty: A Strategic Guide for Community Organizations*. Published by the Centre for Community Enterprise in collaboration with the Lutherwood Community Opportunities Development Association. Vernon, BC: CCE.

Clague, Michael. 1993. *A Citizen's Guide to Community Social Planning*. Vancouver: Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia and available: http://www.vcn.bc.ca/sparc/.

Dobson, Charles. 1997. *The Citizen's Handbook: A Guide to Building Community in Vancouver*. Available: http://www.vcn.bc.ca/citizens-handbook.

Harmony Foundation of Canada. 1994. *Discovering Your Community: A Co-operative Process for Planning Sustainability*. Victoria, BC: Harmony Foundation of Canada.

Health Canada, Office of Alcohol, Drugs and Dependency Issues. 1998. *Community Action Resources for Inuit, Metis and First Nations*. Ottawa: Health Canada.

Kretzmann, John P. and John L. McKnight. 1993. *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.

Ontario Prevention Clearinghouse (OPC). 1994. *Community Action Handbook*. Toronto: OPC and available: http://www.opc.on.ca/pubs/.

——— and Ontario Healthy Communities Coalition (OHCC). 1994. *Using Stories to Guide Action: A Guidebook of Stories of Ontario's Healthy Communities*. Toronto: OPC/OHCC and available: http://www.opc.on.ca/pubs/.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 1998a. *Empowering People: A Guide to Participation*. New York: UNDP and available: http://www.undp.org/csopp/paguide1.htm.

World Bank Learning Group on Participatory Development. 1998. *World Bank Participation Sourcebook*. Available: http://www.worldbank.org/html/extpb/PartiSource.html.

Other Publications

Andrews, Geoff. 1997. The inclusive society. *New Times, ONLINE* 6 (Issue 127) (July), available: http://www.democratic-left.org.uk/newtimes/.

Arnstein, Sherry. 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of American Institute of Planners* (July): 216–24.

Best Start Resource Centre. 1999. Progress III. *Newsletter of Best Start Project*. Toronto: Ontario Prevention Clearinghouse, available: http://www.opc.on.ca/beststart/.

Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA), Newfoundland and Labrador. 1999. "Building Helping Skills, concluding reflections: What we learned." Unpublished paper. St. John's: CMHA

————, Ontario Division. 1998. *ACCESS: A Framework for a Community Based Mental Health Service System*. Toronto: CMHA.

Community Education Network (CEN). 1999. Articles on CEN website: "Learning from ourselves: The beginning, Port au Port: Community education in action" (Beverley Kirby, *Learning* magazine); "Rural Newfoundland: A struggle for survival" (*Small Schools Newsletter* 12 (1) (October 1998); "The Newfoundland experience" (Fred Campbell, *LACMF Literacy Across the Curriculumedia Focus* 13(4)), available: http://www3.nf.sympatico.ca/ryakuga/.

Connor, Desmond M. 1993. "Ten lessons learned in 22 years of public participation." Paper presented at the Second Annual Meeting of the International Association for Public Participation Practitioners, Kananaskis, Alberta, 29 August - 1 September, available: http://www.islandnet.com/connor/lessons.html.

Co-operatives Secretariat, Conseil canadian de la cooperation, Canadian Co-operative Association and Conseil de la cooperation de l'Ontario. 1999. *Health Care Co-operatives Startup Guide*. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Extension Community Development Co-operative and Hollett and Associates. 1995. *People, Resources and Issues: Integrated Resource Management for the Central Avalon Region*. Prepared for the Central Avalon Coalition. St. John's: Extension Community Development Co-operative and Hollett and Associates.

Forest Management District 01. 1997. *Forest Ecosystem Strategy Document for Forest Management District 01 (The Avalon Peninsula)*. St. John's: Department of Forest Resources and Agrifoods, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. 1998. *People, Partners and Prosperity: A Strategic Social Plan for Newfoundland and Labrador, 1998*. St. John's: Office of the Queen's Printer, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

————. 1995. *Towards the Year 2000: The Provincial Strategy Against Violence, An Action Plan. Executive Summary*. St. John's: Queen's Printer and available: http://www.gov.nf.ca/exec/wpo/provstra.htm.

Health Canada. 1997. *Moving Along, Growing Strong: The Final Report of the Atlantic Community Action Program for Children (CAPC)Regional Evaluation*. Prepared for the Health Promotion and Programs Branch, Atlantic Region, by Extension Community Development Co-operative and Landal Incorporated. Halifax: Health Canada.

Higgins, Joan Wharf. 1997. "Who participates? Citizen participation in health reform in B.C.," in Brian Wharf and Michael Clague (eds.), *Community Organizing: Canadian Experiences*, pp. 273–301. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Innu Nation. 1998. *Money Doesn't Last, The Land is Forever: Innu Nation Community Consultation on Land Rights Negotiations, Final Report*. Sheshatshiu, Labrador: Innu Nation Office.

Kalisch, David W., Tetsuya Aman and Libbie A. Buchele. 1998. S*ocial and Health Policies in OECD Countries: A Survey of Current Programmes and Recent Developments*. Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Paper No. 33. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Kretzmann, John P. and John L. McKnight. 1993. *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.

Labonté, Ronald. 1997. "Community, community development, and the forming of authentic partnerships: Some critical reflections," in Meredith Minkler (ed.), *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health*, pp. 88–102. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Lane, Jacqueline. 1995. "Non-governmental organizations and participatory development: The concept in theory versus the concept in practice," pp. 181–225 in Nici Nelson and Susan Wright (eds.), P*ower and Participatory Development: Theory and Practice*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

MacNeil, Teresa. 1997. "Assessing the gap between community development practice and regional development policy," in Brian Wharf and Michael Clague (eds.), *Community Organizing: Canadian Experiences*, pp. 149–163. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

McKnight, John. 1995. *The Careless Society: Community and its Counterfeits*. Perseus Books.

Minkler, Meredith and Cheri Pies. 1997. "Ethical issues in community organization and community participation," in Meredith Minkler (ed.), *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health*, pp. 120–36. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Narayan, Jassy and Jim Vanderwoerd. 1997. "Case study: Onward Willow, Guelph," in Hubert Campfens (eds.), *Community Development Around the World: Practice, Theory, Research, Training*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Nelson, Nici and Susan Wright. 1995. "Participation and power," in Nici Nelson and Susan Wright (eds.), *Power and Participatory Development: Theory and Practice*, pp. 1–18. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Our Healthier Nation. 1998. Green paper presented to Parliament, United Kingdom.

Partnership on Sustainable Coastal Communities and Marine Ecosystems in Newfoundland and Labrador. 1995. *The Report of the Partnership on Sustainable Coastal Communities and Marine Ecosystems in Newfoundland and Labrador*. St. John's and Ottawa: Newfoundland and Labrador Round Table on the Environment and the Economy and National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy.

Poole, Dennis L. and Mary Van Hook. 1997. Retooling for community health partnerships in primary care and prevention. *Health and Social Work* 22(1) (2–4 February).

Protz, Maria. 1998. *Developing sustainable agricultural technologies with rural women in Jamaica: A participatory media approach*. Paris: United Nations, Food and Agriculture Organization, Sustainable Development Dimensions, Development Communications and available: http://www.fao.org/sd/cddirect/cdan0020.htm.

Raphael, Dennis. 1999. Economic inequality and health: Policy implications. Keynote presentation to the Pathways to Health Conference, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, 15 May. Toronto: Department of Public Health Sciences, University of Toronto.

Rothman, J. 1974. "Three models of community organization practice," in F. Cox et al. (eds.), S*trategies of Community Organization,* pp. 22–39. Itasca, IL: Peacock Press.

Rural Newfoundland Cultural Survival Project. 1997. *Final Report, Communication for Survival Initiative*. Submitted to Human Resources Development Canada, Ramea Economic Development Corporation, Port au Port Community Education Initiative, association regionale de la cote ouest, Burgeo CFS Community Steering Committee, Lourdes and Area CFS Community Steering Committee.

St-Amand, Neree. 1994. *This is our place: Alternative resources for low-income families*. Ottawa: School of Social Work, University of Ottawa and available: http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~nstaman/.

Saskatchewan Provincial Health Council. 1996. *Healthy Public Policy Development: Science, Art or Chance?* Conference Proceedings, April 29 and 30. Saskatoon: Prairie Region Health Promotion Research Centre, University of Saskatchewan and Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre.

Schorr, Lisbeth B. 1997. *Common Purpose: Strengthening Families and Neighborhoods to Rebuild America*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.

Schuftan, Claudio. 1996. The community development dilemma: What is really empowering? *Community Development Journal* 31(3):260–64.

Scottish Office. 1999. *Social Inclusion: Opening the Door to a Better Scotland*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Office and available: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library/documents-w7/sisu-00.htm.

Seiders, R. William. 1996. *Uganda: A participatory approach to developing a national action programme for rural youth*. Paris: UN, FAO, SD Dimensions, Extension and Education and available: http://www.fao.org/WAICENT/FAOINFO/SUSTDEV/Exdirect.

Smith, B. C. 1998. "Participation without power: Subterfuge or development?" *Community Development Journal* 33(3):197-204.

Smith, David. 1995. "A community development approach to health planning: Participatory planning," in Ted Jackson (ed.), *First Person Plural: A Community Development Approach to Social Change*, pp. 89–113. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Social Policy Advisory Committee. 1997. *Report of the Social Policy Advisory Committee. Volume I: What the People Said. Report of the Strategic Social Planning Public Dialogue, Newfoundland and Labrador. Volume II: Investing in People and Communities, A Framework for Social Development*. St. John's: Office of the Queen's Printer, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Task Force on Community Economic Development. 1995. *Community Matters: The New Regional Economic Development.* Report of the Task Force on Community Economic Development. St. John's: Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Economic Recovery Commission.

United Nations Development Programme. 1998b. *Human Development Report*. New York: UNDP.

U. S., Department of Agriculture, Economic Development. No date. *Ideas That Work*. Available: http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/wi/cdpage.htm.

Wharf, Brian. 1997. "Community organizing: Canadian experiences," in Brian Wharf and Michael Clague (eds.), *Community Organizing: Canadian Experiences*, pp. 1–14. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Williamson, H. Anthony. 1991. "The Fogo process: Development support communications in Canada and the developing world," in Fred L. Casmir (ed.), *Communication in Development*, pp. 270–87. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Web Sites

Aspen Institute Rural Economic Policy Program, http://www.aspenroundtable.org/

Canadian Council on Social Development, http://www.ccsd.ca/

Centre for Community Enterprise (B.C.), http://www.cedworks.com

Coalition for Healthier Cities and Communities, http://www.healthycommunities.org/

Community mobilization sites, http://www.dirigoprevention.org/commobil.htm

Community Tool Box (U.S.A.), http://ctb/lsi.ukans.edu/

Community Education Network (Newfoundland), http://www3.nf.sympatico.ca/ryakuga/CEN.html

Communities in Schools (Newfoundland), http://www.glinx.com/users/ryakuga/chat/chat.html

Community Development Foundation (UK), http://www.cdf.org.uk/

Community development/local partnerships (UK), http://www.lrdp.co.uk/locdev.html

Community Health Resource Centre, Washington Health Foundation (WA), http://www.whf.org

FINALY (Futures in Newfoundland and Labrador Youth), http://www.entnet.nf.ca/finaly

Institute for Cultural Affairs (ICA) (USA), http://www.ica-usa.org

International Development Research Centre (Toronto), http://www.idrc.ca/

Maritime Centre of Excellence for Women's Health, http://www.medicine.dal.ca/mcewh/inclusion.htm

McKnight and Kretzmann Northwestern University, http://www.sesp.nwu.edu/grad/hdsp-mcknight.html and http://www.nwu.edu/IPR/people/kretzmann.html

Newfoundland and Labrador Strategic Social Plan, http://www.gov.nf.ca/ssp/

Ontario Prevention Clearinghouse, http://www.opc.on.ca/

Scottish Social Inclusion Network, http://www.scotland.gov.uk/inclusion

Sustainable Communities Network, http://www.sustainable.org/

Tri-Cities Freenet (WA), http://www.ccfn.org/mapping/

United Nations Centre for Human Settlements, Best Practices Database, Civic Engagement/Participation, http://www.bestpractices.org/

United Nations Development Programme, Civil Society Organizations and Participation Programme (*UNDP Guidebook on Participation*), http://www.undp.org/csopp/paguide1.htm

United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), *SD Dimensions*, http://www.fao.org/sd/

United States, Department of Agriculture, *Ideas That Work*, http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/ideas/idea_menu.html

United States, Department of Agriculture, Rural, community and economic development, http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/other/comm.htm

Virginia Organizing Project, http://www.virginia.organizing.org/

World Bank Learning Group on Participatory Development, *World Bank Participation Sourcebook*, http://www.worldbank.org/html/extpb/PartiSource.html

MCEWH is supported by Dalhousie University and the IWK Grace Health Centre. MCEWH is also financially supported by the Women's Health Bureau of Health Canada and through generous anonymous contributions.

Maritime Centre of Excellence for Women's Health

Le Centre D'Excellence pour la Santé des Femmes-Region des Maritimes

5940 South Street
PO Box / CP 3070 -
Halifax
Nova Scotia/
Nouvelle Écosse
Canada B3J 3G9

Tel/Tél
(902) 420-6725

Toll Free/
Linge sans Frais
1-888-658-1112

Fax/Télécopieur
(902) 420-6752

E-Mail/
Courrier Électr.
MCEWH@dal.ca

Website
www.medicine.dal.ca/mcewh