

Presented To:	City Council
Presented:	Tuesday, Aug 12, 2014
Report Date	Tuesday, Aug 05, 2014
Type:	Managers' Reports

## Request for Decision

### Community Engagement Review

#### Recommendation

WHEREAS the City of Greater Sudbury has supported various methods of community engagement to provide citizens with opportunities to become involved in municipal decision-making processes;

AND WHEREAS Council accepted a report dated December 2, 2013, requesting staff to conduct a community engagement review;

AND WHEREAS the existing Advisory Panels, Boards, and miscellaneous entities sunset with this term of Council on November 30, 2014.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Greater Sudbury accept the report dated August 6, 2014 from the Chief Administrative Officer entitled "Community Engagement Review";

AND THAT staff be directed to explore options as outlined in the report to promote more strategic and fulsome community engagement;

AND THAT staff be directed to bring forward a report in December 2014 with suggestions and implementation plan for a proposed engagement structure for formal civic engagement that aligns itself within the Public Participation Policy;

AND THAT the existing model of Advisory Panels be reviewed for consolidation into a strategically aligned civic engagement model to be ready for implementation by February 2015.

## Acknowledgements

The City wishes to thank all residents who took the opportunity to participate in the review of the community engagement strategies and processes. The City is committed to implementing a community engagement strategy that better reflects the needs as expressed through the review.

This report is the result of a cross-departmental collaboration. Co-authored by the Manager of Corporate Communications, Eliza Bennett, and Community Development Co-ordinator, Cindi Briscoe, it was reviewed by senior levels of management including Catherine Matheson, General Manager of Community Development, Caroline Hallsworth, Executive Director of Administrative Services/City Clerk, and Doug

#### Signed By

**Report Prepared By**

Eliza Bennett  
Manager of Communications & French  
Languages Services  
*Digitally Signed Aug 6, 14*

**Recommended by the C.A.O.**

Doug Nadorozny  
Chief Administrative Officer  
*Digitally Signed Aug 6, 14*

Nadorozny, Chief Administrative Officer.

## Background

Community engagement is an integral part of every accountability framework. It is a process which involves and empowers the community and stakeholders through the exchange of information and opinions on decisions, policies, plans, and strategies; and to partner and consult with the community and stakeholders in the decision making process. Community engagement speaks to how a community comes together through various venues to build a collective vision and identity, and to contribute to the decision-making process of City Council.

Since amalgamation, several reports have been prepared for Council regarding community engagement:

- Mayor's Task Force on Community Involvement & Volunteerism, June 2001
- Supporting the Community Action Network (CAN) Infrastructure, September 2002
- Healthy Community Strategy, June 2005
- CGS Human Services Strategy 2015, June 2005
- Constellation City, January 2007
- Civic Participation Experience Report, May 2007
- Public Participation Policy, May 2008
- Community Action Networks – Terms of Engagement, June 2008
- Community Engagement Review – December 2, 2013

A variety of community engagement approaches utilizing various techniques are used for different issues. The key is that the community engagement process be applied consistently and that citizens are aware of the opportunities to engage. Examples of community engagement include: public consultation, community fairs, advisory bodies, task forces, focus groups, open houses, community action networks (CANs), neighbourhood associations, and participatory budget processes.

The City of Greater Sudbury currently has 26 Advisory Panels which sunset with the term of City Council in 2014. In addition, staff in a number of departments liaise with 16 CANs and many other ad hoc panels and task forces.

Across the City, departments conduct engagement practices in very different ways – some with more success than others. Departments are looking for new and innovative ways to connect more broadly with the public given the desire and interest from residents to help shape the programs, services, and policies/processes that impact them. Departments are also looking for ways to reach out and interact with residents who normally do not participate in formal engagement structures.

Consultation is a way of doing business for City staff and all stakeholders involved in consultation understand and appreciate the value of citizen engagement into projects. Best practice indicates that the importance of meaningful engagement cannot be overstated, and that engagement systems are continually moving as a community shifts and grows. It is therefore timely to ensure that the City's consultations and engagement strategies are meeting the needs both of residents, municipal staff, and Council, while achieving desired outcomes.

As outlined to Council in a report to the Community Services Committee dated December 2, 2013, staff have undertaken a review of the City's community engagement processes with the aim of understanding better what residents want to see from the City in terms of engagement, how residents engage – or do not engage – with their local government, and what opportunities exist for the City in terms of engagement strategies.

This report explains the methodology of the review process, provides a summary of best practices research, details the findings of the review, analyzes the broad themes and challenges to community engagement, outlines next steps and actions to be taken to take advantage of opportunities identified, and finally, provides several recommendations for more high-level next steps.

## **Methodology**

At the beginning of the community engagement review, all City stakeholder departments involved in some way in community engagement or consultation had an opportunity to provide input regarding the City's current engagement processes. Those stakeholders have been an integral part of the process of this review and report.

In order to determine how residents want to engage with their municipal government, and on what issues, a bilingual survey was conducted. The survey was available both electronically and in hard copy, and was also made available in large format at Citizen Services Centres. A diverse distribution was used to engage as many people as possible:

- Front page of the City website;
- Regular prompts via the City's social media networks;
- Advertisements placed in the Sudbury Star, the Northern Life, and Le Voyageur;
- Distribution via Community Action Network and Advisory Panel staff liaisons;
- Distribution in hard copy to Citizen Service Centres;
- Distribution in hard copy to Greater Sudbury Housing Corporation residents;
- Availability at fairs and City events over the survey period;
- Distribution to various networks and stakeholder groups;
- Distribution to all City staff with email template provided in both official languages for them to distribute to others as needed.

Survey data was gathered and analyzed by a third party in addition to City staff. The survey is attached (Appendix A). It is worth noting that the City has been contacted by others interested in using the format and content of the survey tool.

In addition to the survey, four public input sessions were held, which were facilitated by the Social Planning Council to ensure unbiased reporting. Two sessions were held for audiences deemed to already be engaged in some form – members of CANs or Advisory Panels, for instance – and two were held for the general public. Stakeholder sessions were promoted primarily through staff liaisons with those stakeholder groups. The public sessions were promoted in traditional (newspaper, website) and non-traditional (social media) ways.

Finally, research was conducted into best practices in terms of community engagement. Staff spoke with municipalities who had already conducted a similar review of engagement processes, as well as municipalities with recognized, different, or established strategies around engagement. A literature review was also conducted.

## **Best Practices with Regards to Engagement**

In accordance with the report made to Community Services in December 2013, the Public Participation Policy (Appendix B) was also reviewed as part of this process so that it can continue to reflect the evolution of community engagement in the City of Greater Sudbury. Research conducted with other municipalities showed that the Public Participation Spectrum continues to be widely used and is a solid basis for engagement strategies going forward.

In addition to a literature review, staff spoke with a number of municipalities that have worked on a

community engagement strategy over the last several years. While each municipality had different demographics, in all cases, the broad themes reflected those of the City: a generalized need for more, better, and different types of engagement combined with a need for education of staff around consultation and engagement. There is also a need for education of residents about how to engage, when to engage, and what to expect when they engage with municipal government. Those themes are explored further below.

## Findings

The community engagement survey resulted in the highest number of respondents since the City started conducting regular surveys, with nearly 1,000 people providing a response, either electronically or in hard copy. This high survey response rate indicates that engagement matters, and the results show that there are high expectations with regards to engagement from municipal government. The public input sessions were not similarly well attended. This could be due to a number of factors, including time, location, and the fact that the sessions were held after the survey was conducted, so some people who may have participated chose not to as they may already have completed the survey. However, the discrepancy between participation in the survey and attendance at the meetings suggests that it is important for residents to have the ability to engage at their convenience rather than at a specific date and time. This trend is reflected in many other organizations and municipalities, and is at the forefront of revising the engagement process.

The survey results suggest that there is a need to rethink and revitalize the City's engagement processes. It is often said that municipal government is the level of government that is closest to residents, and touches their lives most intimately. This was reflected in much of the feedback that was received. Many respondents took the time to thank the City for seeking their input into this subject, which speaks to the desire of citizens to be heard by their local government.

This section provides a summary of the findings (data only), while the next provides an analysis of and response to the data.

- Approximately 70% of respondents do not feel engaged in their municipal government, but 89% wish to be engaged.
- 54% of those who feel engaged are led to be engaged because of a specific issue. The remaining respondents are engaged either through their work or educational institution (17%), or family and friends (6%) or other mechanisms.
- The majority of respondents prefer to engage with municipal government through their elected official – i.e., Mayor or Councillor (28%) – followed by engaging with City staff (25%). Significantly fewer respondents stated their preferred method of engagement as attendance at a structured meeting.
- Most people feel that more information about ways to get engaged would help them become more engaged (61%). Respondents also wanted: information meetings at times/locations that better suited them (18%), alternative ways to participate such as electronic surveys, charettes, etc. (28%), and different ways of presenting information (14% each).
- Of the reasons cited for not feeling engaged, more than 30% cited a lack of trust that their contributions would make a difference, while approximately 20% cited a lack of knowledge about how to get involved.
- The primary mechanism that respondents reported using to provide feedback to the municipal government was through the City's website (64%), followed by communication with elected officials or City staff (48% and 47% respectively), Facebook (45%), and others, including serving on a board/advisory panel or CAN (approximately 30%).
- Residents who responded to the survey receive their information about municipal affairs or decisions primarily through the media (an average of 54% through all media vehicles); however, of the methods

- of information that are managed by the City, respondents identified the City website (57%) and municipal employees (33%) as their primary sources of information, followed by social media (30%).
- 55% of respondents would like to receive information about municipal affairs or decisions by email, followed by radio or television (45%), and Facebook (43%).
  - Of those who responded to the survey, 75% indicated that they would be willing to participate in a web-based, issues-focused platform with other citizens to find ways of enhancing the community. They further identified their definition of a strategic approach to community engagement as “issues-based.”

The demographics of the survey revealed a balanced spread of respondents. Thirty percent of respondents have lived in Greater Sudbury for 31-50 years, compared to 24% for 21-30 years, followed by 18% for those who have lived here for 10 years or less. Females represented 61% of respondents.

The age range of respondents was equally diverse: 35% were aged between 36 and 50, compared to 33% between 21 and 35, and 24% between the ages of 51 and 65.

Finally, of those who responded, a large number had attended either one Council/Committee meeting or a meeting with City staff in the last 12 months, but a similarly large number had not attended any type of engagement opportunity (including Council meetings, CANs, advisory panels meetings, neighbourhood associations, local business or other organization meetings, etc.). The primary reason cited for not attending any of the engagement opportunities that were identified in the survey was the need for more information about when or where meetings take place, followed by lack of interest in attending those meetings.

## **Analysis**

The City uses many forms of public engagement, including: media relations, surveys, website, social media, CANs, Advisory Panels, stakeholder meetings, telephone, 311, flyers/direct mail, public meetings, etc. Still, given the results of the review process, as well as the research conducted into different municipal engagement strategies and reviews, there is a clear mandate to enhance the ways in which we engage residents.

From the survey results and the public engagement sessions, staff have identified a number of broad themes and challenges that were noted for CGS to become a truly engaged community. The next section outlines some of the next steps to act on the opportunities identified as part of this review.

### **1. Responsiveness**

While residents expressed an interest in engaging with elected officials and municipal staff, they also expressed concerns around responsiveness. The overall feeling was one of not being heard – and a clear desire to see that input was received, and how it was used. At the public input sessions, attendees were asked how they would know their voices were heard, to explore the idea of “being heard” further. There were two primary responses: one was that there would be an acknowledgment of some form that the input had been received; the second was that the result of the consultation would reflect the input received.

Feedback received on the City’s social media activities was positive. Since the City’s social media accounts were first started in late 2010, a large number of positive comments have been received, and this trend has continued.

These points suggest a need for education – both for municipal officials on the importance of informal communication with residents, and for residents on municipal processes. For example, public consultation might reveal a desire for something that goes against the recommendations of an

environmental assessment, or a piece of legislation. It is necessary to provide appropriate information to ensure that input can be as strategically aligned as possible to the requirements of the project.

One additional element associated with responsiveness is ensuring that City employees have access to relevant information in a timely way to allow them to speak to the City's processes and projects appropriately. It is worth noting that the last employee survey (2012) suggested there have been improvements in organizational communication; however, there is still work to be done.

## **2. Transparency**

Many comments received reflected a general sense that engagement opportunities could be sought at an earlier stage of a project's life so that input could more effectively impact the project's direction and outcomes. The survey indicates that input is sought too late to really engage, and that direction has already been set by the time engagement occurs. This again points to the need for several enhancements to the current process, including a streamlined approach to criteria and timelines associated with engagement opportunities, as well as education around a project's scope, timelines, budget, benefits, and impacts.

Comments received also reflected the need for both residents and staff or elected officials to go into consultation meetings with open minds and constructive purpose. Based on survey results, there have been public consultation sessions in the past where the general feeling was one of antagonism, and feedback shows that all parties – staff and residents alike – want to work more constructively together.

## **3. Availability of Information**

As indicated in the "Findings" section above, a significant number of respondents use, and wish to use, the City website for information pertaining to municipal affairs or decisions. As Council is aware, the City website was restructured and redesigned in 2012, and feedback has been largely positive. However, the community engagement review did indicate that respondents feel that more work is required on the City website. A number of enhancements are already underway – such as a new and greatly improved search engine tool, to allow for much better search functionality, and a content review to ensure that information is up to date and relevant – but it may be appropriate to do a two-year review of the website to ensure that the City is meeting expected goals and make changes where necessary.

A related opportunity is one related to accessibility of language. The City's Strategic Communication Plan (presented to Council in 2013) has as one of its goals "accessible communications." This refers not only to the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act but also accessibility of language – what is generally called "plain language." There is a tendency for governments to use specific, technically accurate language when providing information to the public. While accuracy is of course essential, it is equally important to ensure that communications are understandable.

The significant representation of media coverage – including television, radio, and newspapers – as a source of information speaks heavily to a need for strong media relations and reputation management strategies, as well as a well informed and engaged media community.

## **4. Need for Further Education around Municipal Processes**

A high proportion of responses indicated a lack of knowledge about engagement opportunities – i.e., residents did not know when, where, or how they could participate in municipal decision-making. While any number of strategies are used, education, as well as the development of new tools – including a web page dedicated to engagement opportunities – will be key in addressing this core concern.

A key area that has been identified as part of this review as needing additional support from an educational perspective is that of municipal processes. While some groups are well informed about where change can be effected, some may feel frustrated by a sense of not being heard. Staff are committed to engaging the community, and it is important to hear and reflect the voices of the community; however, any number of logistical, budgetary, health and safety, or legislated responsibilities must also be taken into consideration before a final direction can be taken. There is therefore a need to ensure that those who wish to participate in a project can do so with all the relevant information at hand.

A number of comments were received around the 3-1-1 system, pointing to a need for further communication and link-backs with this front-line citizen service and communication vehicle. Currently, 3-1-1 staff receive all information released to the media, so that they are able to answer questions as appropriate; they are also provided with information on projects on an ad hoc basis. There is a need to ensure a more consistent and streamlined approach to including these staff members in outreach and providing them with the right information to be shared.

It was clear upon analyzing the results of the feedback that there was a need for further education both about municipal processes as a whole (e.g., agenda availability for Council and Committee meetings) and about the availability of engagement opportunities. The City's Notice By-law provides guidelines for consultation based on a number of criteria, including significance of the issue or project. Timelines associated with consultation are included in that by-law, as are suggested vehicles for communication regarding the engagement opportunities. As significant items are brought forward to Council, it is worth reinforcing engagement opportunities be made available early in the process, so that citizens do not feel left out of the process when the item does come before Council.

Overall, there is a clear need to provide more information in different formats – which may include website enhancement, different mechanisms for inclusion of certain staff groups, and more. The “Next Steps/Outcomes” section of this report will go into more detail.

## **5. Structured Engagement Models**

The City of Greater Sudbury currently has 26 advisory panels, 9 Boards and 5 miscellaneous entities, many of which sunset with the term of City Council on November 30, 2014. In addition, there are 16 Community Action Networks (CANs), and 50+ Neighbourhood Associations established in Greater Sudbury. As well, the City partners with over 700 community groups - both formal and informal - on different projects and programs. Feedback received through the survey indicates that the Advisory Panel structure could be more strategically aligned for effective and collaborative engagement purposes.

The broad consultative processes including Advisory Panels, Boards, CANs, and community consultations have seen a maturity in the nature of information brought forward to Council. In the interest of continual improvement and as part of the community engagement review process, a thorough review of all the City's citizen engagement practices has been undertaken to ensure that the City is using all the engagement tools at its disposal to most effectively involve residents in the decision-making process. The review included a community survey, public consultations, lessons learned from other municipalities, and alternative strategies for strengthening public participation in municipal government.

From the nearly 1,000 responses to the survey, approximately 100 of those individuals have attended an Advisory Panel meeting. The statistics below are based only on the responses of those individuals.

- 44% of the respondents feel engaged in the municipal government

- 95% want to be engaged  
In addition, there seems to be a disconnect between wanting to be engaged and actually feeling like the respondents who attend meetings are engaged.
- 25% feel that they have attempted to influence change in the past and feel dissatisfied with the outcomes or don't believe their contributions have made a difference.
- 65% of the respondents became engaged because of specific issues that they felt strongly about.
- 53% would like more information about ways to get more engaged
- 32% would like alternative ways to participate
- 24% would like meetings scheduled at times that better fit their schedules, and the same percentage would like information presented in a different manner.
- 75% understand how decisions are made at City Hall, but 72% feel that they are not currently able to influence decisions made by City Hall.
- 94% of the respondents feel that it is important to be involved in municipal issues, yet 73% strongly disagree that anyone who wants to participate in municipal decision-making is currently able to do so.
- Respondents use the following modes of media to receive information and decisions about municipal affairs (able to select more than one): Newspaper – 60%, City website – 45%, City employees – 44%, Radio – 43%, Attend meetings – 41%, Television – 36%, City social media – 33%, CANs – 30%, 311 – 18%, City newsletters & mail outs via Canada Post – 17%
- 67% of the respondents would like to receive information and decisions regarding municipal affairs via email.
- 70% of the respondents would regularly participate on a web-based, issue-focused platform with other citizens to find ways to enhance the community.
- Of the 100 responses from individuals who are already engaged through advisory panels, the split between what term best describes their definition of a strategic approach to community engagement – holistic (22%), issues-based (21%), inclusive (24%), human focused (11%), and diverse (8%).
- The age demographics of the respondents was equally distributed – ages 21-35 = 24%, ages 36-50 = 30%, ages 51-65 = 29%, and ages 66+ = 17%.

Advisory Panels are working groups of Council with an overall mandate to provide advice to Committee and Council on matters within their jurisdiction. They also provide a forum for the public to identify emerging issues. Some panels are mandated by Provincial legislation while others are developed based on the current Council's wishes. Historically, the basis for creating Advisory Panels has been established where Council wishes broad policy advice and/or information on future trends with regards to major issues. Regardless of how the shape of citizen engagement evolves for the City of Greater Sudbury, legislated or mandated advisory bodies will of course be maintained in their legislated form – including the Library Board, the Solid Waste Advisory Panel, the Accessibility Advisory Panel, and more.

Approaches to citizen engagement have evolved, due to advances in technology as well as changes in governance. Advisory Panels were established before electronic and social media tools were either available or in general use. They were a direct way for City Council to receive advice from informed citizens about the relative merits of staff proposals or emerging issues in their areas of interest and expertise.

Advisory Panels have contributed significantly to the City of Greater Sudbury initiatives over the years. However, records indicate that a small percentage of the population of Greater Sudbury apply to sit on citizen appointed panels and boards. As a result, one can infer that there is a lack of true representativeness on panels, and one citizen may sit on several panels, therefore limiting their involvement on each panel. The lack of widespread participation on panels is reflected in the results of the survey, which speak to a community that wishes to be engaged in different and diverse ways, as opposed to through purely structured means.

This report is recommending that the City review the current structured civic engagement model, and work to consolidate that structure within a broader strategic framework for the new term of Council. Within this new strategic framework, it is important that mechanisms be included that allow for cross-pollination of engagement bodies, which is a theme that has emerged as vital in the research conducted. The structure would aim to make more efficient use of the limited resources set aside for Council's priorities of good governance, citizen engagement, accountability, and transparency.

The community engagement review supports an exploration of this way forward, as the very large majority of participants responded favourably to the idea of "issues-based" as a definition for strategic community engagement.

Finally, it is worth noting that processes targeting areas that cannot be influenced within a specific scope of work can lead to frustration. The civic engagement model that the City pursues should align itself within a municipal-centric scope of work – that is, terms of reference and engagement should be strategically aligned to influencing areas that are properly municipal in nature.

## **Best Practices with Regards to Structured Community Engagement**

Following are examples from a few municipalities that have worked to more strategically align their engagement model to allow for more fulsome engagement and reflect changing society and engagement trends.

### **1. City of Ottawa**

**Advisory Committees were reduced from 15 to 7 to align broader mandates through fewer groups. City of Ottawa staff cited in a report that Council advisory bodies and working committees are established to assist Council in achieving its term objectives and should be purposeful and appropriate to the term. The City of Ottawa is focused on linking the work of the Advisory Committees to the Term of Council priorities.**

### **2. City of Toronto**

**Has reduced the number of advisory bodies from over 70 to 3 in May of 2011. Toronto's reduction of the number of advisory bodies occurred to achieve objectives similar to those which led to the review of the governance structure in the City of Ottawa. The two main motivations articulated for reviewing, reinstating or disbanding an advisory body in Toronto are a commitment to improved, broader civic engagement, and an effort to focus the use of these bodies to matters that are relevant to the current Council's priorities.**

### **3. Other**

**A number of other municipalities – including Guelph, Mississauga, and Kitchener, to name but a few within Ontario – have completed extensive community engagement reviews, with varying outcomes. Some outcomes have included a cross-departmental community engagement team, creation of a community engagement office within the organization, and development of tools and mechanisms to strategically align and streamline community engagement processes.**

## **Outcomes and Next Steps**

As in most municipalities who have conducted a review of their community engagement strategies, there are a number of changes to the City of Greater Sudbury's current processes that can be made to more fully engage residents in municipal decision-making.

The attached table (Appendix C) outlines some of the planned next steps, along with a high-level timeline and identification of the type of action (for instance, a new tool, or a new process). A number of opportunities exist that have not been outlined in this report and there are others that may be identified as the City engages citizens in appropriate ways forward.

## Conclusion

In writing this report, care has been taken to accurately reflect what was discovered in the review of the City's community engagement strategies. There is a clear mandate to review those strategies and processes to create a community truly engaged with its municipal government. Care has also been taken in balancing the needs of the community with the needs of the City, which must change what it can, and explain what it cannot and in that way, create a more ongoing and two-way communication with residents.

The City's community engagement review revealed a mandate to make changes to how the City encourages and responds to public participation. The primary findings were:

- A need for further education around municipal processes;
- A need to assist municipal officials in developing consultation skills;
- A need to continue to enhance already existing forms of information and explore new forms;
- A need to revisit the governance structure of how Council receives advice through resident-led panels;
- A need to develop mechanisms to ensure that residents' voices are reflected back to them.

A number of actions have already been taken as part of the City's growth as a municipal government to engage with residents and to keep engagement top of mind. For example, a new Health Impact Assessment tool is being included as part of the Agendas Online system, which will encourage a growing awareness of civic engagement as part of "doing business."

The outcomes of this review are in line with many strategies already in place for the City, including the Healthy Community Strategy, the Vision, Mission and Values, and the Strategic Communication Plan.

As well, it should be noted that this report will be as widely circulated to ensure that those who took the time to respond to the request for feedback receive follow-up that their voices were heard.

Staff are continuing to work on a governance structure for civic engagement, and a report will be brought forward for Council's consideration in December 2014.

Community engagement is a moving target, and one strategy will never fit all circumstances. As feedback is received and dialogues are conducted over the coming months and years, some directions may need changing; however, it is important that the process be reviewed as part of CGS' continuous improvement.



# Voices Engaged.

## Ideas. Directions. Decisions.

This is about you and your relationship with your municipal government.

We care what you think. We care what you think about our roads. We care what you think about our budget. We care what you think about the Official Plan and the cultural plan. We care what you think about libraries, community parks, elections, and recreation programs.

There are many ways that you tell us what you want in your community and from your City Hall. You tell us by email and letter, in public hearings and meetings, at open houses, through surveys, social media, drop-in visits, through participation in panels /committees and phone calls.

Ultimately, a healthy community is one where residents and public servants work together to create a city which is a reflection of all our voices.

We know we can do better at listening to what you say, but we want to do it right.

We want to know how you want to engage with your City Hall. What matters to you? How do you want to share your views? What encourages you to engage? Are there barriers to engaging with us, and if so, what are they and how can we remove them?

This review of how we engage you as citizens, as individuals, and as groups, is part of the City's work to make sure that we communicate in ways that are accurate, consistent, inclusive, timely, creative, accessible, and measured.

***It's your city. Engage.***

**This survey can be dropped off at any Citizen Service Centre location, or mailed to:**

Manager, Corporate Communications  
City of Greater Sudbury  
4th Floor – 200 Brady Street, Sudbury  
P3A 5P3

*The end of the survey period is Monday, June 16, 2014.*

### **Notice of Collection**

Collection of personal information provided on this form is collected under the authority of the section 9 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25 for the purpose of gathering input into the City's community engagement processes. The information gathered will be used to formulate recommendations and strategies related to engagement processes by the City. Questions relating to the collection, use and disclosure of this personal information may be addressed to the Manager of Corporate Communications at 200 Brady St. Sudbury, ON, P3A 5P3 by emailing [eliza.bennett@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:eliza.bennett@greatersudbury.ca) or by calling 705-674-4455 ext 4507.



The following questions seek to understand your level of interest in municipal decision-making.

- 1. I understand how decisions are made at City Hall.
2. I understand the Council and Standing Committee structure of Greater Sudbury municipal government.
3. It is important to me that I be involved in municipal decision-making.
4. I feel that I am currently able to influence decisions made by City Hall.
5. I feel that anyone who wants to participate in municipal decision-making is currently able to do so.
6. It is important that I receive information on the final decision on an issue when I have offered input into the process.

The following questions seek to understand how you currently participate in or wish to participate in municipal decision-making.

- 1. What method(s) do you use to participate in or give your opinion to City Hall decision-makers? Using a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means you do not like or use this method at all, and 10 means you like or use this method this a lot, please rate each of the following:
2. You prefer to participate in municipal decision-making by engaging with:

- Attend public meetings dealing with specific issues
Go to the City website
Attend a Community Action Network (CAN) or Advisory Panel meeting
Attend a City Council or Standing Committee meeting
Use Facebook
Use Twitter
Attend community meetings
Communicate with elected officials (Mayor or Councillor(s))
Communicate with City staff
Serve on a municipal board, Community Action Network or Advisory Panel
Contact media
Join a group – please specify

- Organize or participate in protests
Other – please specify

Horizontal lines for rating and additional input for question 1.

- Mayor and/or Councillors
City staff
Community Action Network(s) (CAN) or Neighbourhood Association
My local business association/organization
My issue-based advocacy group
Advisory Panels
Local Boards
Other

Horizontal lines for selecting and providing details for question 2.

3. What methods do you currently use to receive information about municipal affairs and/or decisions?

Television - Please specify

---

---

---

Radio - Please specify:

---

---

---

Newspaper - Please specify:

---

---

---

Community Action Network (CAN)

City employees

Neighbourhood newsletters

Ethnic, faith-based, or cultural organizations

Attend Board, Committee, or Council meetings

Elected officials

City website

Canada Post mail outs from City Hall

Employer groups - Please specify:

---

---

---

311

City social media accounts

Other – please explain

---

---

---

4. How would you like to receive information about municipal affairs or decisions?

Direct mail

Email

Facebook

Twitter

Radio, Television

Flyers in mail

Other – please explain

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

5. Would you regularly participate on a web-based, issues-focused platform with other citizens to find ways to enhance our community?

Yes  No

6. Which of the following terms best describes your definition of a strategic approach to community engagement? Please pick only one.

Holistic

Issues-based

Human-focused

Inclusive

Diverse

Other - please specify

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**Voices Engaged.**  
Ideas. Directions. Decisions.



## **Public Participation Policy**

---

### **Background**

The City of Greater Sudbury recognizes that political decision-making is most effective when it includes public input from an active, engaged and educated public. The City of Greater Sudbury has been proactive in involving citizens in community decision-making: participatory budget processes, various planning and development initiatives, the Healthy Community Cabinet, numerous Advisory Committees and Panels as well as neighbourhood level involvement through the Community Action Networks (CANs). A policy will formalize and guide future citizen engagement activities across the corporation toward standardized, consistent and sustainable civic engagement for all citizens.

### **Purpose**

The Public Participation Policy is intended to provide a framework for the City of Greater Sudbury to engage its citizens in local decision-making. One of the main goals of this policy is to ensure that civic engagement activities are given consideration throughout the corporation as well as ensure that citizens can initiate civic engagement activities through a number of available entry points. This policy recognizes, unless otherwise stated by law or regulations, that it is the responsibility of the City of Greater Sudbury (Council and Administration) to assess opportunities for public engagement.

### **Policy Statement**

The City of Greater Sudbury (Council and Administration) recognizes that decisions are improved by engaging citizens and diverse stakeholder groups where appropriate and are committed to upholding engagement processes that are inclusive, transparent and standardized within the Corporation's ability to finance and resource them.

The City of Greater Sudbury assigns high priority to the factors impacting the challenge of civic engagement, specifically the diverse needs and backgrounds of citizens and the large geographic spread of citizens across communities.

The City of Greater Sudbury will work to build capacity within the Corporation, equipping staff and Council with the tools necessary to play a vital role in fostering a greater sense of belonging among all citizens within the community.

Recognizing the value of ongoing input from citizens and diverse stakeholder groups throughout the community, the City of Greater Sudbury commits to work closely with these groups through various venues to ensure the policy remains relevant and successful.

## **Guiding Principles**

A growing consensus concerning what Greater Sudburians value has evolved over time and is reflected in the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan, the Healthy Community By-Law implemented by City Council in 2001 and more recently the healthy Community Charter in 2007. In keeping with this, the Charter embraces civic engagement and social capital as one of its four main priority areas forming an integral part of the overall Healthy Community strategy.

### *Principles of Healthy Communities:*

- Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well being
- Social, environmental and economic factors are important determinants of human health and are inter-related
- People cannot achieve their fullest potential unless they are able to take control of those things which determine their well-being
- All sectors of the community are inter-related and share their knowledge, expertise and perspectives, working together to create a healthy community.

\*Ontario Healthy Communities Coalition, 2004

## **Core Values**

The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) offers the following core values of public participation to help guide the application of this policy.

1. The public should have a say in decisions about actions that affect their lives.
2. Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decisions.
3. The public participation process communicates the interests and meets the process needs of participants.
4. The public participation process actively seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected.
5. The public participation process involves participants in defining how they participate.
6. The public participation process provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.

\*International Association for Public Participation (IAP2)

## Public Participation Spectrum

Different issues require different levels of public engagement. The following Public Participation Spectrum can be used as a guideline for action. The Public Participation Spectrum is a tool to assist with the planning of specific civic engagement activities. The pillars of this spectrum are; **inform**, **consult**, **involve**, **collaborate**, and **empower**, providing a mechanism to clarify complex issues, and to ensure that decision-making processes are transparent.

### IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum

Developed by the International Association for Public Participation

#### INCREASING LEVEL OF PUBLIC IMPACT

INFORM	CONSULT	INVOLVE	COLLABORATE	EMPOWER
<b>Public Participation Goal:</b>	<b>Public Participation Goal:</b>	<b>Public Participation Goal:</b>	<b>Public Participation Goal:</b>	<b>Public Participation Goal:</b>
To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problems, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.
<b>Promise to The Public:</b>	<b>Promise to The Public:</b>	<b>Promise to The Public:</b>	<b>Promise to The Public:</b>	<b>Promise to The Public:</b>
We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.
<b>Example Techniques to Consider:</b>	<b>Example Techniques to Consider:</b>	<b>Example Techniques to Consider:</b>	<b>Example Techniques to Consider:</b>	<b>Example Techniques to Consider:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fact sheets</li> <li>• Web sites</li> <li>• Open houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public comment</li> <li>• Focus groups</li> <li>• Surveys</li> <li>• Public meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshops</li> <li>• Deliberate polling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizen Advisory Committees</li> <li>• Consensus-building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizen juries</li> <li>• Ballots</li> <li>• Delegated decisions</li> </ul>

## Appendix C: Action Items and Next Steps

Action Item	Opportunity Addressed	Timeline	Process / Tool / Other
Report back to Council with proposed civic engagement structure	Transparency	Fall 2014	Report
Replace website search engine	Availability of information	Immediate	Tool – enhancement
Create a website page on “getting involved” and engagement opportunities	Availability of information, education	Winter 2014	Tool – enhancement
Create a “community engagement toolkit” for staff outlining methods, processes, timelines, etc.	Education, accountability, transparency	2015	Tool – new
Create a checklist for community engagement for staff for a streamlined approach to consultation	Education, accountability, transparency	2015	Process and tool – new
Create a “community engagement toolkit” for residents outlining municipal processes, meeting schedules, different ways to get involved	Education, Availability of information, accountability, transparency	2015	Tool – new
Implement a plain language policy	Availability of information, transparency	2015	Process – new
Explore new ways of connecting with 311 – i.e., email	Availability of information	Immediate	Process and tool – new
Training for staff on consultation and facilitation skills	Education	Long-term	Process – new
Conduct regular (at least bi-annual) citizen satisfaction surveys	Accountability, transparency	2015	Tool – enhanced
Review terms of engagement for CANs to ensure projects can move forward effectively	Accountability, transparency	2015	Tool – enhanced
Create a cross-departmental “community engagement” team to explore opportunities related to community engagement	Accountability, transparency, education	2015	Process – new
Explore an online platform for broad engagement on a project- or issues-based level (supported by survey – 75%) as embarked on by the Healthy Community Cabinet	Availability of information, transparency	2015	Process and tool – new