



## **Maximizing Partnerships: What's in it for my group? Leona Heilig, Montreal Assault Prevention Centre**

The Montreal Assault Prevention Centre has been taking part in various partnerships since 1986. Because we do not fit into an obvious sector, we can pick and choose alliances and partnerships according to our needs.

### Current trends and changes in partnerships:

- Proliferation of committees
- Governments getting us to do the work (using us in the guise of consulting)
- More openness to diversity issues

### Partnerships and "concertation": pros and cons

#### Pros:

- exposure
- credibility
- contacts
- information sharing
- better understanding of systems (legal, government, grants, health care, police etc.)
- getting your message out (your unique point of view)
- furthering your mandate (accomplishing things your group couldn't do alone)
- improving the situation of your population/clientele
- \$

#### Cons:

- time and money
- slow process
- members have different priorities and agendas from yours
- frustration
- prejudices (many committees are majority white francophone and new to diversity issues, also institutional/community organizations often have mutual distrust and lack of understanding)
- loss of autonomy and corruption (less rocking the boat because you know the people, for example)

### Strategies for Success:

- Choose your committees (what's in it for us, what can we accomplish)
- Alliance building within committees, for support and pressure (caucuses, sub-groups, taking someone to lunch)
- Look at the long-term picture
- Regular re-evaluations: is it still worth it?
- Choose the right person to represent your group, and encourage others to do so: the people make a huge difference
- Share committee work between organizations and share information
- Keep badgering, hammering your points home. Personal stories help (diversity issues especially)
- Debrief with supportive people, share info with your group
- Breathe!

## Changing Times - Trends in Federal Funding

- **14% of funding to Nonprofits comes from the Federal Government**  
In the sectors they fund however they are a key source of revenue e.g. employment and retraining supports.
- **The Harper Conservatives believe in decentralized government and have been particularly solicitous of Quebec** – this means continued devolution of services to the Provincial Government.
- **Every time there is a tax cut there is a permanent reduction in government capacity to support services for its citizens**. All governments have been cutting taxes. The overall capacity of all levels of government to address collective needs is shrinking.
- **The New Conservative Urban Agenda – Not...** each level of government to stick to their knitting – so federal role is – *federal investment* (major physical infrastructure projects) *federal regulation* in federal jurisdiction (– safe cities through sentencing reform) *Fiscal transfers* – to provinces for local responsibilities. Implications- no improved capacity to tackle the “wicked” problems facing communities
- **Harper Conservatives don’t much like the nonprofit sector** – view them as leftist leaning and in opposition to conservative government agenda. At best they need to be docile deliverers of services if receiving government funding.
- **Stifling of debate through intimidation** - They are determined to silence critics – 1 billion cuts to services covered up the assault on knowledge and discussion brokers - especially to policy think tanks and advisory bodies – CPRN, Law Reform Commission, CRA Charities Advisory committee, Status of Women etc.
- **Investment Partnerships** – The conservative government has invested in arms length funding initiatives such as the Canadians against Cancer Partnership and the Homelessness Partnership providing funding to existing or new organizations who will be the granting organization for specific agendas e.g. cancer research. There is considerable debate across the sector on whether this kind of initiative will help or hinder meeting the needs of communities.
- **Stimulate Private Giving** – the next federal budget is likely to improve tax treatment of donation to private foundations and the last budget provided capital gains exemptions for donations of stock to charities.
- **Blue Ribbon Panel** – called for *full cost recovery, tendering, streamlining of grants and contribution administration, benchmarking administration*. What will be left of Federal funding to nonprofits may see some improvement eg. Settlement services in Ontario. This will be offset by tendering practices that will favour large agencies. Funding will continue to focus on service delivery objectives with no recognition of or support for the “social good” missions of community agencies. The Blue Ribbon implementation group is located in Treasury Board so they have the authority but a major retooling job of Federal granting culture is required.

### Conclusion

Focus your energy on the province, the city and private foundations.

## **les tendances relatives au financement des organismes communautaires au Québec - Présentation de Stephan Reichhold de la Table de concertation des organismes au service des personnes réfugiées et immigrantes (TCRI)**

La Table de concertation des organismes au service des personnes réfugiées et immigrantes (TCRI) regroupe 130 organismes oeuvrant auprès des personnes réfugiées et immigrantes au Québec.

Au Québec, les organismes communautaires se sont donnés un cadre politique et opérationnel régissant leur rapport à l'État qui s'est traduit en 2001 par l'adoption par le gouvernement une politique de l'action communautaire. Il s'agit d'un important pas en avant pour le mouvement communautaire québécois. La politique gouvernementale de l'action communautaire met de l'avant un certain nombre de principes et d'orientations au niveau de la reconnaissance et vise à assurer un financement stable et récurrent pour les organismes communautaires, notamment les organismes communautaires autonomes. Loin d'être parfaite cette politique gouvernementale engage le gouvernement à :

- reconnaître l'autonomie des organismes en définissant clairement les critères permettant de faire la distinction entre un organisme communautaire autonome et non-autonome;
- reconnaître la légitimité et l'importance de la défense collective des droits en soutenant les organismes à cet effet;
- financer de manière prépondérante les quelques 4000 organismes communautaires autonomes au niveau de leur mission.

En ce qui concerne le secteur communautaire immigration/intégration, représenté par la TCRI, on peut affirmer que la politique a permis au secteur de se structurer et de se consolider au bénéfice des personnes réfugiées et immigrantes que nous défendons. Même si la majeure partie des organismes de notre secteur est encore confrontée à des problèmes de sous-financement, surtout au niveau du soutien à la mission, la situation s'est quand même passablement stabilisée et améliorée pour la majorité des organismes.

La politique et son potentiel en terme de revendication face à l'État restent cependant encore peu connus et pas assez exploitée par le milieu, alors qu'il s'agit d'un outil essentiel pour la reconnaissance et le financement de l'action communautaire au Québec.

Il faut également souligner que cette politique à engendrer deux classes d'organismes communautaires, ceux qui sont reconnus « dans le système » et ceux qui n'ont pas de ministère d'attache et qui se retrouvent « à l'extérieur du système ». Ayant décidé de mettre un moratoire sur toute nouvelle demande, le gouvernement ne prend pas en compte les nouveaux besoins et les nouveaux organismes qui ont émergé ces dernières années. Ceci est particulièrement problématique pour les organismes communautaires ethno-culturels. Par ailleurs on constate que le réseau des organismes communautaires anglophones est largement également sous-représenté dans champ d'application de la politique de l'action communautaire.

### **Pour plus d'information :**

Site du Secrétariat à l'action communautaire autonome (SACA) : <http://www.mess.gouv.qc.ca/saca/>

Site du Comité aviseur de l'action communautaire autonome : <http://www.comavis-aca.org/>

## **The Changing Face of Volunteering**

*Alison Stevens, Volunteer Bureau of Montreal*

### **Changes 1937-2007**

**1937:** volunteering seen as charity or “good works”, practiced primarily by women of comfortable class, seen as benefiting the other person (poor, sick, handicapped, elderly, homeless, orphaned) individually or as a group, any and all volunteers welcome

**2007:** volunteering is an exchange between the volunteer and the organization, benefits go both ways (volunteer allows organization to serve its clients or to pursue its mission, and also gets something out of the experience), practiced by males and females from diverse backgrounds, classes, professions, cultures, ages, not all volunteers welcome – an appropriate match is made between a volunteer and a task, client/group, or project

**... we’ve come a long way, baby!**

### **Trends**

- increase in employer-supported volunteering, other forms of group volunteering
- increase in mandated community service
- family volunteering
- short-term, events, projects
- virtual volunteering
- aging, slowing down of “super volunteers” (65+) resulting in difficulty of finding long-term, regular volunteers
- more youth (15-24) volunteering
- risk management, security issues more prevalent
- most organizations trying to do more with less: decrease in core funding, cuts to funding to the voluntary sector (a trend?), yet increased immigration, aging population etc. increasing needs for support services, advocacy etc.

### **Challenges for organizations in responding to these trends**

- ensuring that volunteers needs are met, but also ensuring that the needs of the organization are being met – danger of mission drift
- ensuring solid structure and support for volunteers without becoming tied up in rules, policies and bureaucracy
- being flexible and open to change and diversity – in the way volunteers are recruited, in the way work is organized, in the way communication takes place, in the way volunteers are supported and recognized
- finding ways to continue to attract and keep long-term, regular volunteers
- recognizing that there are fewer of these and developing ways to involve people in other ways
- continuing to think creatively!

### **Sources and Resources**

- *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2004 Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating* ([www.givingandvolunteering.ca](http://www.givingandvolunteering.ca))
- *Cornerstones of Community: Highlights of the National Survey of Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations* (2004, [www.imaginecanada.ca](http://www.imaginecanada.ca))
- *Reinventing Aging: Baby boomers are civic engagement*, Centre for Health Communication, Harvard School of Public Health (2004, <http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/chc/reinventingaging>)
- *BOOMNET: Capturing the Baby Boomer Volunteers*, Judy Esmond (2001, [www.mtd4u.com](http://www.mtd4u.com))
- *From ‘BOOMNET’ to ‘BOOMNOT’*, Judy Esmond (2001, [www.mtd4u.com](http://www.mtd4u.com))
- *Citizen RE-Generation: Understanding Active Citizen Engagement Among Canada’s Information Age Generations*, D-CODE (2003, <http://www.d-code.com/pdfs/CitizenReGen2003.pdf>)

**Understanding the effects of a changing population:  
Using Quebec City's English-speaking population as an example  
Richard Walling, Holland Centre**

Using the English-speaking population of the Quebec City region as an example, this workshop will explore how population's change and how those changes impact on the various organizations which service those populations.

The types of population changes that will be explored include:

- Change in the total numbers of the population.
  - In the Quebec City region, the English-speaking population has declined by close to 50 % in the past 40 years. This has had a tremendous impact on the organizations which rely on this population.
- Change in the relative weight of the population.
  - At the turn of last century the English-speaking population represented over 40% of the total Quebec City population. Today it represents 1.9%. How does this impact on the population's ability to influence government decisions on a local and provincial level?
- Change in the geographic distribution of the population.
  - Up until the 1960's there were geographic areas in the city that were known as English. Today this is no longer the case. The English-speaking population is spread out over the whole metropolitan area with no real concentration in any one area. How does this impact on the way services are provided?
- Changes in the origins of the population.
  - In the mid 1900's the majority of the English-speaking population in the Quebec City region were born in the region. At present every 5 years, 25% of the population changes with people leaving and new people coming in. In 2001, 22% were born outside Canada. 47% have no family other than household members within a one hour drive.
- Changes in the age structure of a population.
  - The English-speaking population of the Quebec City region is aging at a higher rate than the general population. The middle age population is declining (The missing middle). This has important implications of services to seniors as traditionally it is the middle age population that provides informal care to them.
- Emergence of needs in the population.
  - Needs continually change in a population. For the English-speaking population in the Quebec City region, the numbers of people requesting adult mental health services is on the rise. The number of children identified with special needs is also increasing. What does this all mean?
- Changes in the socio-demographic profile (education level, income level) of the population.
  - Population education levels and income levels are changing. What impact does this have on services, and how they are provided?

'Other Overall Changes' Workshop  
Facilitated by Frances Ravensbergen  
**Notes and questions to reflect on further**

Do we define ourselves or do we let ourselves be defined by others?

- Blurring of the sector with government
- Thinking about the language we use - is it ours?
- Professionalization / training from the corporate sector

Consumerist society - we are part of the problem!

- We work from a 'consumer' mentality with our 'products', selling and branding.
- We work so that people 'buy' from us - not to eliminate our sector because the needs are met by the state.

Media is increasingly important

- Are we visible in media?
- How do we (or not) work with mainstream media?
- What is the role of alternative media - does it reach 'new' people?

Controversy is what our sector is about

- Have we lost the ability/interest in challenging?
- Conflict can be good - we need to learn how to work with it

What's the mission of our sector?

- Provide services for the government at cheaper rates?
- Provide alternatives - show the way to a more just society?
- How can we stay mission-focused? Perhaps being 'free of funding' (no \$!) is better/freer than being tied to funders... ..

**We make the path by walking it (Friere)**

**Be the change you want to see.**