

What We Heard from our committees about RECOVER recommendations

We invited our three governance committees and prototype teams to come together on June 27th, to review and comment on the RECOVER draft recommendations. Recover engaged stakeholders on 3 draft recommendations described in the table below. A total of 26 people participated in this discussion. Furthermore, we shared the three draft recommendations electronically on June 28th with those who could not attend in person or who wanted to add more comments. We received 9 additional responses via the online form. In total, we received feedback from 33 people who participated in various stages of RECOVER.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

That Council approve social innovation continuing in the neighbourhoods of Boyle Street, McCauley, Central McDougall, Queen Mary Park and Downtown for up to 5 years giving time to measure changes of the indicators measuring urban wellness, and RECOVER begin work in Strathcona.

What we heard: feedback themes	Consideration	What we changed and what we didn't
<i>Advancing this work</i>	<p>City should lead this process. City staff should continue to play a very central role. Sustaining and integrating practices will be challenging, but there are opportunities to improve efficiency in program planning, administration, governance, and for better outcomes through collective impact.</p> <p>Development of a social innovation network needs to leverage existing groups/networks.</p> <p>More focus, alignment and involvement are needed with the Province.</p>	<p>Recommendation 1 has been amended into two separate statements to ensure that work can advance without a dependency on expansion into additional neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Feedback from the participants have been reflected in the rationale for each component of the recommendation.</p>

	Lessons from the RECOVER process can be applied to other municipalities.	
<i>Timeline/Process for Evaluation</i>	<p>It will be important to measure real results. This includes both measurement of the social innovation process and the indicators of urban wellness.</p> <p>Baseline data needs to be reported by the end of 2018.</p> <p>Evaluation needs to consider that some metrics are only collected every 5 years (e.g., Census).</p> <p>Measurement of urban wellness is not just limited to prototyping but also needs to include reporting from aligned strategies and programs and services.</p>	

<p><i>Expanding into Strathcona Neighbourhood</i></p>	<p>There needs to be a more explicit rationale for the expansion.</p> <p>Tension exists between desire to expand before positive outcomes have been achieved in the 5 core neighbourhoods and the desire to make RECOVER a city-wide initiative immediately.</p> <p>Staying focused on just the 5 core neighbourhoods can cause some confusion about the scope of RECOVER and its relationship to existing city-wide initiatives. Expanding to city-wide focus would be more consistent with Recommendation 3 that services need to be distributed and not concentrated. This does not mean the focus still couldn't be on those neighbourhoods, it just gives permission and obligation to think more broadly from the beginning as we move forward.</p>	
---	---	--

RECOMMENDATION 2:

That Council approve development and testing of a RECOVER governance structure, to replace the three committees, with Administration reporting back to Council in Q1, 2019.

What we heard: feedback themes	Consideration	What we changed and what we didn't
<p><i>Merging of the committees (Community Advisory Committee, External Partners Committee, and Integrated Corporate Committee)</i></p>	<p>It is essential that diverse stakeholders talk directly with each other. This will help with relationship building.</p> <p>There were some concern and confusion about where decisions were being made. Some felt that there was an imbalance of power and merging the committees could address this.</p> <p>The internal City meetings with the Integrated Corporate Committee provided value in discussing internally focused issues.</p>	<p>No change to the recommendation, but we plan to merge the committees.</p> <p>We could host additional City meetings on an ad-hoc basis when the need arises to address internally focused issues.</p>
<p><i>Membership</i></p>	<p>Some people were missing from the conversation. We should consider including: schools, health, Indigenous communities, people with lived experience, a community planning voice, and political leaders.</p> <p>Members should be allowed to self-select, but those participating need to show commitment.</p> <p>We will need to find the balance between letting certain participants fall away while also keeping a critical mass of stakeholders</p>	<p>No change to the recommendation.</p> <p>We will invite more people to participate on the merged committee in the future.</p> <p>Those not wishing to continue can self-select out of the project.</p>

	at the table.	
<i>City should continue to lead RECOVER</i>	<p>City staff have played a very central role.</p> <p>If the City downloads the coordination work onto the community partners, agencies and other stakeholders, it would likely stagnate - not because the stakeholders are not engaged or lack buy-in, rather, because they are focused on their daily business operations.</p> <p>The City should facilitate collaboration and engagement, and ensure transparency, but remain the lead on RECOVER.</p> <p>Initiatives like this need dedicated resources such as FTEs, and in particular, champions at a senior level within the City that prioritize this work.</p>	<p>No change to the recommendation.</p> <p>The City will continue to lead in a collaborative space with shared decision-making. We will strive for continuous improvement.</p> <p>We will continue to have a Deputy City Manager sponsor this work.</p>
<i>Operations</i>	<p>If new people join the leadership group, then they should honour the work-to-date and agree to the shared principles.</p> <p>We will need to make an effort to ensure that all voices are heard.</p>	<p>No change to the recommendation.</p> <p>We plan to address these considerations moving forward.</p>
<i>Collaboration</i>	<p>We need to provide more resources for organizations to support collaboration, making the best use of existing collaboration tables and informal opportunities to advance the conversation.</p>	
<i>Advice for the Future</i>	<p>We need a sustainability strategy that takes political change into account if this is a 5-year timeline. Perhaps the goal should be to build the social innovation culture of</p>	

	<p>doing things into the City itself.</p> <p>We should tie the work of RECOVER into the City's new strategic plan.</p> <p>We shouldn't consult endlessly - we will lose momentum and then we will lose RECOVER.</p> <p>Prototyping must be partnered with good systems coordination.</p>	
--	--	--

RECOMMENDATION 3:

That the City advance a distributed model for serving marginalized people to ensure facilities and services are available in other areas of the city where need is evident, and that the City explore tools and incentives - regulatory, policy and funding levers - that can support public realm improvements in the core neighbourhoods.

What we heard: feedback themes	Consideration	What we changed and what we didn't
<i>Future investment in the core</i>	This recommendation is silent/ ambiguous regarding continued investments in the core neighborhoods	We have modified Recommendation 3 to indicate that facilities and services are available both in the core as well as in other areas of the city, where there is evident need.
<i>Considerations for broader vulnerable populations</i>	"Marginalized people" are not only the visibly homeless. Would this model of distributed services and facilities consider this broader population?	In this phase, the distributed model is focusing on services for the very vulnerable. However, the overall focus of RECOVER is community wellness and our prototypes have, and will continue, to address all segments of the vulnerability spectrum.
<i>Uncertainty regarding use and alignment of regulatory instruments</i>	Tools and incentives may result in regulatory barriers to prevent services from being created where there is a great need. In fact, there are already "tools and incentives" that are designed to support public realm improvements and the recommendation may overlook existing work in "redevelopment" projects in the neighbourhood.	This part of the recommendation is exploratory in nature.

	This discussion has impact and dependencies that will need to be fully understood and agreed on across multiple branches and departments within the corporation.	
<i>Cost implications for agencies</i>	<p>The City needs to provide clear guidelines and resources for agencies to conduct community engagement should this be a requirement for service expansion.</p> <p>Ethnographic research for exploring service expansion is great but costly. City should provide guidance and resources on what this looks like to meet the expectations for an approval.</p>	<p>This recommendation is based on ensuring the principle of collective impact, which is a key aspect of the RECOVER process. Traditionally, public consultation has been embedded in the planning budget of capital development. In our recommendation, we are providing more specific guidelines.</p>
<i>Divide the recommendation in two</i>	Divide this recommendation into 2 parts so it has more clarity and lose the bureaucratic language (i.e., "public realm improvements").	<p>We have revised the wording to this recommendation to increase clarity but kept the recommendation intact as one.</p> <p>We recognise that the 2 aspects of this recommendation are related to the types of capital investments; however we think it is important to consider and plan investments both for the marginalised population and other upstream preventative investments.</p>