

---

**Community Plan Update on Homelessness Initiatives in  
Peterborough City and County and Evaluation of the  
Government of Canada's National Homelessness Initiative  
Supportive Communities Partnerships Projects**

---

**Prepared for  
Community Advisory Board and Affordable Housing  
Action Committee**

**FINAL  
Part 2: Evaluation of SCPI Process**

**March 2007**

**Prepared by:**



56 Wright Street  
Richmond Hill, Ontario  
L4C 4A1



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
1.0 Introduction .....	1
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Purpose .....	2
1.3 Process for the Evaluation of the SCPI Funding Allocation .....	2
2.0 Evaluation of SCPI Process .....	3
2.1 Key Question #1: Did we do what we said we would do?.....	3
2.2 Key Question #2: What did we learn about what worked and what didn't?.....	12
2.3 Key Question #3: What difference did it make that we did this work? .....	13
2.4 Key Question #4: What could we do differently? .....	15
2.5 Key Question #5: How do we plan to use the evaluation findings? .....	17
3.0 Evaluation Framework .....	17
4.0 Summary and Recommendations .....	20

Appendix A: CAB/AHAC SCPI Funding Allocation Process Survey

Appendix B: SCPI Funding Recipient Survey

Appendix C: NHI SCPI Funding Criteria

## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

Following the announcement of the National Homelessness Initiative (NHI) in December 1999, Peterborough County and City communities developed a Community Plan to guide efforts to alleviate and prevent homelessness.

The Government of Canada approved \$541,785<sup>1</sup> (through two allocations) in funding for the City and County of Peterborough through the Supportive Community Partnerships Initiative (SCPI), the Government of Canada's National Homelessness Initiative (NHI).

A citizen advisory group, the Community Advisory Board (CAB), was formed under the auspices of the Affordable Housing Action Committee (AHAC) with a dual role:

- 1) to update the Community Plan to Address Homelessness and Housing Insecurity in Peterborough City and County
- 2) to implement the updated plan, largely by making funding recommendations to Services Canada (formerly HRSDC).

The role of CAB with respect to making funding recommendations was to:

- i) develop and deliver a transparent and equitable RFP process
- ii) determine (a) the number of RFP's needed to distribute the money, (b) the timing and order of the RFP's and (c) the priority of each RFP process, as guided by the Community Plan Update and NHI objectives
- iii) review applications for each RFP and, as guided by NHI objectives, the priorities of Community Plan Update and the criteria of the RFP in question, recommend to Services Canada the proposal(s) that should receive money, recommend how much money (e.g., up to the amount of money available under the RFP) and make any additional comments or observations in relation to the funding and evaluation of the project(s)
- iv) recommend to Services Canada projects to be funded from the SCPI funds designated for the City and County of Peterborough under the second round SCPI, to be spent by March 31, 2007.

---

<sup>1</sup> A total of \$526,163 was assigned to project funding; the balance was allotted to the completion of the Community Plan Update and the SCPI Phase II Evaluation.

## 1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to evaluate Phase II SCPI funding allocation process, particularly in relation to the following two objectives from the Phase II Community Plan Update (2003) objectives:

- *To ensure that the process for identifying gaps, determining priorities and funding programs and services within the system that serves the needs of the homeless and housing insecure is inclusive, transparent and built upon solid accountability measures: and*
- *To ensure that the broader community is aware of, and sensitive to, homelessness and housing insecurity issues in order to gain its support (monetary and non-monetary) for programs and services.*

## 1.3 Process for the Evaluation of the SCPI Funding Allocation

This report is based on the development of an evaluation framework rooted in the following five key questions:

1. Did we do what we said we would do?
2. What did we learn about what worked and what didn't?
3. What difference did it make that we did this work?
4. What could we do differently?
5. How do we plan to use the evaluation findings?

In order to develop a framework and respond to the above questions, two surveys were conducted; one was distributed to both CAB and AHAC members and the second one was distributed to all Peterborough City and County Phase II SCPI funding recipients. A total of eight surveys were completed by CAB and AHAC members (four out of five CAB surveys were completed and four out of seventeen AHAC surveys were completed) and a total of 6 out of seven surveys were completed by SCPI recipients. It should be noted that one survey was completed by telephone.

A copy of each survey is provided in Appendix A and Appendix B.

A meeting was also held with all Community Advisory Board members to review the SCPI Phase II funding allocation process and to obtain feedback on what areas were successful and what areas required improvement.

In addition to the surveys and focus group session with CAB, a review of background material was conducted, materials reviewed include the following:

- The Community Plan to Address Homelessness and Housing Insecurity in Peterborough City and County, September 2001 (prepared by AHAC Community Plan Steering Committee)
- Community Plan Update 2003 (prepared by CAB)
- Community Advisory Board, Conflict of Interest Guidelines 2004
- Community Advisory Board, Term of Reference 2004
- Community Advisory Board, Application Guideline
- Community Advisory Board, Request for Proposal Funding Policies and Procedures 2004
- Community Advisory Board, Request for Proposal Process 2003
- Community Advisory Board, Selected Requests for Proposals

Results from these sources, as identified above, as well as feedback obtained through consultation are summarized and presented in the following section. This information provides the foundation to respond to the five key questions and ultimately determine recommendations.

## **2.0 Evaluation of SCPI Process**

### **2.1 Key Question #1: Did we do what we said we would do?**

There are two areas that are explored in order to provide an evaluation of this first key question: the first was did CAB achieve its goals in creating an effective RFP process and secondly did CAB achieve its goals identified in its implementation plan.

#### a) RFP Process

In order to meet CAB's role of making funding recommendations to Services Canada, a Request for Proposal (RFP) process was established which identified

nine goals. These nine goals are described below along with a summary as to whether or not these goals were achieved throughout the RFP process.

1. *Confirmation received from Services Canada (formerly HRSDC) regarding the approval of Community Plan Update.*

Services Canada received the Community Plan Update on November 1<sup>st</sup> 2003. The Plan was subsequently approved by Services Canada (or HRSDC at the time).

2. *Advertise to community the approval of the Community Plan and the percentage allocation targets to community and stakeholders.*

Notification of the percentage allocation targets was included in the RFP, which were advertised; however no additional advertisement or promotion of the Community Plan Update was done through CAB.

3. *Development of RFPs for each objective of the CPU.*

Request for Proposals were developed by CAB for each of the nine objectives within the CPU.

4. *Advertisement and promotion of a workshop for community agencies and stakeholders to review the RFP process, timelines and submission process.*

Promotion of the information workshop was completed including announcements sent out to interested groups. Advertisements for the RFPs were paid by City of Peterborough.

5. *Community workshop on RFP process and timelines. This included the distribution of RFPs and responding to questions related to the RFP.*

A community workshop was held to review the RFP process and timelines as well as CAB was available to respond to questions related to the overall process.

6. *CAB review of proposals within framework of CPU, percentage targets and priorities. Additional research was conducted to fill gaps within information provided.*

CAB conducted a review of all proposals based on the framework and objectives within the CPU. Additional research was completed by CAB and in at least three cases agencies were asked to provide additional information and/or respond to questions.

7. *CAB recommendation on allocating funding to Services Canada.*

CAB completed its recommendations to Services Canada on the allocation of SCPI funding.

8. *Notification of funding to applicants once Services Canada approved.*

CAB was requested to notify only applicants that were unsuccessful in obtaining SCPI funding. Services Canada notified the agencies that were approved for SCPI funding. In addition, CAB members were not notified directly by Services Canada of the successful applicants.

CAB noted that, given that they administered the entire RFP process, including making recommendations, it would have been more rewarding for CAB to have been able to notify the successful recipients or at least be included in the notification to the successful applicants. Once the funding allocations were announced by Service Canada, CAB ceased to have any involvement with the successful SCPI projects because agreements were signed directly with Service Canada and the successful agency. This caused a 'disconnect' in the community as there was no reporting back to the community on the progress, completion or results of the SCPI funded projects.

9. *Communication to community via media on allocation.*

There was no communication to the community via the media on the SCPI allocations. CAB did not have a budget for this and no press releases or announcements were made by Services Canada.

b) Implementation Plan

In addition to the goals identified for the RFP process, CAB also established an implementation plan process. The following identifies eleven goals of this process:

1. *CAB will identify projects that clearly address the objectives, priorities and eligibility criteria of the NHI*

CAB developed RFPs to address each of the nine objectives and priority areas of the CPU. CAB also followed the eligibility criteria of the NHI. Funding criteria established by CAB and included in their Funding Policies and Procedures report states that for an application to be considered, it must meet the following criteria:

- A complete application is submitted by the deadline for submission;
- The proposed project meets HRSDC's (Services Canada's) NHI funding criteria (provided in Appendix C);
- The proposed project meets the objectives of the RFP.

Through its review of proposals CAB continued to refer to the eligibility criteria with respect to eligible activities. The projects that did receive funding were listed under eligible activities including prevention, emergency transitional and supportive housing, capacity building, and activities that meet the immediate needs of people living on the streets such as provision of food.

Eligibility criteria with respect to which agencies are eligible for funding were clearly stated in each RFP under Section D. This section read as follows:

The following are eligible for applications for proposals:

Not-for-profit organizations, individuals, municipal governments, Band/tribal councils and other Aboriginal organizations are eligible to receive funding and act as coordinators for activities. Public health and educational institutions may be eligible for funding, with the agreement of the provincial government.

For-profit enterprises are eligible for funding provided that the nature and intent of the activity is non-commercial and fits within the community plan. For-profit enterprises, research organizations and research institutes may also receive funding to carry out research that will help communities understand and address homelessness issues.

2. *CAB will facilitate the development of specific proposals with candidates for funding*

Consistent with the above, CAB did develop a set of RFPs to address the objectives and priorities of the CPU and which fell within the scope of eligible SCPI activities.

3. *CAB will finalize its RFP policy and procedure for fund distribution and establish funding selection criteria to the objectives identified in the Community Plan*

CAB did develop a Funding Policies and Procedures report in February 2004. This report included several aspects including outlining the process for announcing RFPs, the opportunity for an information session, funding

application requirements, and funding evaluation criteria. CAB members reviewed proposals based on the following evaluation guidelines:

- The degree to which the program meets the objective (s) of the particular RFP and the Community Plan Update
- An assessment of the program objectives and outcomes
- An assessment of the workplan and staffing model
- The viability of the proposal program budget
- The sustainability of the project beyond SCPI funding
- The degree to which the proposal is considered an effective use of grant dollars
- The degree to which the proposal shows evidence of inter-agency co-operation.

The guidelines also noted that service providers may be contacted by CAB to clarify or explain aspects of their application. This was done on at least three occasions.

CAB further provided applicants with an allocation of points based on each evaluation criteria. An example is provided below.

<b>SAMPLE EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>		<b>Points</b>
A	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the environment, resources and homelessness risk factors. Understanding is clearly linked with the work plan activities.	20
B	Innovative use of partnerships to deliver the service, to secure resources, to expand or transform existing services to support a new model, including identification of key community leaders and partners	15
C	Includes a plan and tools or methods for how you will assess how many people were diverted from emergency shelter, or were able to secure permanent housing.	5
D	Includes a plan and quality measurement tools that will allow you to measure and reflect on the impact of the service on the person receiving service	5
E	Provides a coherent plan, including realistic goals and objectives, to mobilize the community and implement a strategy that will connect people to services and information that will help people to avoid shelter use and to work toward obtaining permanent housing.	10
F	Demonstration of a viable sustainability plan and/or lasting impact beyond continuation of the project beyond receipt of SCPI funding.	15
G	Provides specific strategies for service and agency coordination, including co-location of services at sites readily accessible to people in need of service.	10
H	Provides a budget clearly outlining the planned expenditures of contribution funds and additional resources, including a budget narrative justifying these expenditures.	5
I	Provides a sound plan for collecting data for measuring objectives and activities.	5
J	Demonstrated capacity to manage the key elements of the project (i.e. supervision, physical space, financial management, other specific expertise).	5
K	Demonstrated service benefit to people from the youth and aboriginal communities	5
<b>TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS</b>		<b>100</b>
<b>Evaluation of SCI Process</b>		<b>8</b>

Each proposal was evaluated by each CAB member based on the above allocation of points. Of particular note, the evaluation criteria tables varied slightly by each RFP and not all RFPs included the point allocation.

4. *AHAC Funding Committee will work with the City of Peterborough Department of Social Services to review other major sources of funds for homelessness projects*

The AHAC Funding Committee was altered to develop the Community Advisory Board (CAB). It was widely agreed, through feedback from the CAB focus group and through several surveys that there was a disconnect amongst CAB members and the City of Peterborough. A review of other major sources of funding was not completed. CAB members agree that this was one of the most significant challenges of the process.

5. *City staff and CAB will identify which other priorities may be best addressed and funding through various programs administered by the municipality*

Similar to the above, City staff and CAB did not identify together which other CPU priorities may be addressed and funded through programs already in place by the City. In one case a proposal was rejected as CAB had the understanding that such a project was going to be funded through the City, however, this never materialized and subsequently the project was never developed. Improved communication between CAB and the City of Peterborough would have allowed CAB to have made their funding recommendations with a broader understanding of how priorities may be addressed through current initiatives, ultimately achieving a greater potential of the CPU to address homelessness and housing insecurity in Peterborough City and County.

6. *AHAC will support the implementation of the community plan by working with agencies and groups delivering services focusing primarily on resource development, planning and evaluation*

There was not a mechanism in place to achieve the above goal. The CPU was not adopted by Council and therefore had no 'owner' once the SCPI recommendations were made. There was no process to ensure that the priorities of the CPU were being met or that proposed activities were achieved. Many organizations and agencies were independently working towards the goals of the CPU, but there was no collective or overseeing entity to take possession of the CPU or its objectives.

7. *CAB will hold an information session for community organizations interested in submitting a proposal to clarify and support proposal process*

CAB did hold an information session for community organizations. The information session provided community service providers an opportunity to ask questions of CAB members. Information provided at the session included an overview of NHI program objectives and how these objectives fit into the Peterborough Community Plan Update objectives, how proposals will be evaluated and what information is required with each application.

8. *Call for proposals will be advertised in local media, posted on City website and sent directly to known local organizations*

Requests for Proposals were advertised through a number of ways, including:

- Letters were sent to community service providers
- Advertisements were placed in local newspapers and newsletters
- Announcements were placed on the City's website

Of note, CAB did not have a budget for advertising or administrative costs such as photocopying and printing. The City of Peterborough paid for the advertisements in local newspapers.

9. *Proposals will be reviewed by CAB according to priorities and the process criteria with emphasis on clear outcome measurements.*

As described in #3, CAB developed a set of evaluation criteria for which to review each RFP. Included in the evaluation criteria was the requirement that proposals include a plan and tools (or methods) for assessing the outcome of the project and a plan for collecting data for measuring and assessing objectives and activities.

10. *AHAC will monitor the implementation overall and will take responsibility for priorities related to advocacy, policy analysis and change, public education and accountability.*

Similar to #6 there was no monitoring or implementation plan in place. Once the recommendations were made to Services Canada there was not central mechanism in place to ensure that the priorities and proposed activities within the CPU were being achieved.

Survey results confirm a lack of advertisement and overall communication to the public regarding the final allocation of SCPI funding.

11. *AHAC will continue to review semi-annual and annual reports on successful projects and will ensure that Aboriginals, youth and other designated groups*

*have opportunities to assess how well the Community Plan addresses their needs*

CAB members did not feel that this goal was achieved. The Community Plan Update was not adopted by Council and there was no reporting mechanism built in on the part of Services Canada.

c) Other CAB Goals

In addition to establishing an RFP process and implementation plan, CAB set out to meet the following two objectives:

- i. To ensure that the process for identifying gaps, determining priorities and funding programs and services within the system that serves the needs of the homeless and housing insecure is inclusive, transparent and built upon solid accountability measures: and*
- ii. To ensure that the broader community is aware of, and sensitive to, homelessness and housing insecurity issues in order to gain its support (monetary and non-monetary) for programs and services.*

Overall, survey respondents seemed to indicate that the process was successful in achieving objective i). Several respondents (3) noted that the process wasn't inclusive as it did not respond to the needs of the County or "rural parts" of the County. One respondents noted disappointment that no proposals were received that would address the needs of the County. In addition, it was noted (1) that there was little to no accountability for CAB; essentially there was no appeal process for CAB recommendations.

With respect to the second objective there were several concerns that this objective was not met. Overall, respondents indicated that the broader community did not receive sufficient information on SCPI funding or the SCPI funding allocation process. While the SCPI process was on the City's website, there was concern that once allocations were made, little information was distributed or shared (by CAB or by Services Canada) making the process appear less transparent and unaccountable.

## 2.2 Key Question #2: What did we learn about what worked and what didn't?

### a) RFP Process

Aspects that seemed to be most effective include a solid dedicated team and an effective RFP process. Five survey respondents noted that the CAB team was dedicated, credible and committed to the SCPI funding process. Several (4) respondents noted that a significant amount of time and effort went into the RFP process. Community consultations were held in the community which were successful, CAB held a seminar on proposal writing and a session for RFP respondents to have the opportunity to meet and discuss the intentions of the application process. Further, it was noted (3 respondents) that the review process was positive, well organized and impartial.

### b) Funding Allocation Process

With respect to the funding allocation process, most SCPI recipients responded positively to the overall process. Four respondents noted that the process was not too difficult and overall fairly straightforward. One noted that the process moved at a good pace and that it was helpful to have specific questions in time to pull together desired information. One respondent did note some duplication of data was required. One respondent noted that the process was not clear and many efforts to gather needed information were made.

Four respondents stated they received their funding in a timely manner. One respondent noted that funds were received based on the previous month's report and this therefore put them one month behind. It was further noted that the completion of monthly reports were a challenge.

### c) Communication and Information Sharing

Survey results also, however, seem to indicate a lack of communication and sharing of information across several levels. A lack of communication was noted between the federal government and CAB (3); between CAB and the general public (after allocations were made) (1); between the City and CAB (3); and between AHAC and CAB (1). Respondents (2) noted that CAB was not kept informed of other initiatives by the City, other than the assistance of one City volunteer; members felt "in the dark" on what else was going on at the City with respect to homelessness. In general processes intended to inform the public were noted as ineffective.

It is clear, that there was disengagement between the City and CAB. CAB members were not clear on what programs were already funded by the City in order to minimize duplication of services. As described previously, in one

example a project was not approved based on the understanding that it was to be funded through the City, this project was never realized. Members of CAB experienced a great sense of disconnect from Services Canada in particular with respect to the time between making the recommendations and the announcement of recipients. It was agreed by members, that there should have been some sort of announcement, press release or promotion of funded projects. Further, it was difficult for CAB members to follow what was recommended and how much funding was actually received by groups. There was nothing built into the process to get information back; no review, or feedback mechanism. This therefore, resulted in little closure for volunteers and created lack of transparency.

*“Communication with Services Canada really broke down once recommendations were made”. (CAB member)*

d) Timeframes

Three respondents also noted frustration with timeframes; both in that planned timelines had to be shortened and projects were rushed to meet funding guidelines and that the timeframe to release the funds was lengthy as a result of the approval process.

e) Aboriginal and Youth Representation on CAB

It was also noted (1) that CAB was not effective in obtaining Aboriginal and youth representation on the CAB committee. One member of CAB although not Aboriginal, worked with Aboriginal persons and made an effort to represent the viewpoints of her clients.

### 2.3 Key Question #3: What difference did it make that we did this work?

As noted by one survey respondent, the SCPI process was successful in bring over \$500,000 in funding to the community. Overall, seven projects were funded through SCPI and one project was funded through Regional Homelessness Fund (RHF). The following summarizes very briefly the projects that were funded in order to illustrate the difference the SCPI funding made to Peterborough.

- Housing Resource Centre (HRC) – funding used to cover the costs of hiring a Fund Developer to assist in developing sustainable sources of funding for the Emergency Assistance Fund (EAF). This fund provides one-time financial assistance in the form of a grant to low income

residents of Peterborough City and County. HRC was successful in obtaining “Big Online” software and conducted research on funding approaches. They have also developed documentation to assist them with fundraising grant applications and public education related to the EAF program. Part of their public education included meetings with municipal staff, local housing committees and possible donors and partners. Year to date (February 2007), grants and donations to the EAF are up 22% from the previous year; committed grants and donations were at \$53,000 YTD.

- St. Leonard’s Society of Peterborough – Oversaw research on Aboriginal homeless in Peterborough who are currently living on the street and unable to access existing shelter services.
- Brock Mission – Funding was used to purchase specialized cooking units to be used by their Food Services program. These units assisted in re-implementing a community meal program. Currently the program serves over 100 meals a day.
- Kawartha Food Share – SCPI funding was used to purchase an industrial walk-in fridge and industrial walk-in freezer. The purchase of these items allowed Kawartha Food Share to take in and distribute perishable foods both fresh and frozen. SCPI funding has improved their capacity to serve their clients.
- Peterborough Community Chaplaincy – Funding was used to start up the New Beginnings Transition House for people coming out of prisons that are homeless. The funding has helped them open this house and provide a safe affordable accommodation. The funding has also ensured that marginalized individuals have a chance to make a new start after a period of incarceration.
- Whitepath – Used funding for capacity building. Urban Aboriginal Strategy Circles were held which resulted in one proposal for mentoring Aboriginal youth who were homeless or at risk.
- Youth Emergency Shelter – Funding was used for capital upgrades to the Abbott House. Upgrades include a new boiler system, air conditioning, solar hot water, security system and new doors. These upgrades have made a significant difference; the Abbott House is a much more liveable space and is more cost efficient to operate.

Overall, several survey respondents (4) further noted that the funding had a positive impact; one noted that it was very effective in the area of transitional housing; another noted funding meant some projects could continue operation.

One respondent noted, however, that while funding has made a difference it has only “scratched the surface”. One responded noted that the funding made no difference in their community and rather the work only reinforced the need.

Respondents (3) again noted that very little if any impact was made on the County. It was further noted that there were challenges in generating sufficient interest in the need to improve county wide information services for homelessness issues.

Other impacts noted include a renewed working relationship between CAB and AHAC and the creation of a Community Plan to be used as a useful benchmark for future projects.

#### **2.4 Key Question #4: What could we do differently?**

In response to this key question, survey respondents noted several ideas. These results have been grouped by topic and are presented below.

##### ***Need for More Funding***

- Longer term project (operating) funding is needed in addition to capital funding (2).
- Funding levels need to be increased and, and funds must be available for emergency services to help people retain housing.

##### ***Improvements Needed at Federal Level***

- “Ensure that projects can be funded quickly after local approval simply to preserve the planning and partnership arrangements that are an integral part of the projects”.
- Needs to be a source of administrative funding to provide the support to deliver the program in an effective and accountable way (4).
- Recognition of volunteers.
- A smoother quicker federal government process (2)
- Ensure all potential applicants are well informed on SCPI process.
- Have a local contact at Services Canada.

##### ***Better Communication Required***

- Regular communication with the broader community about the successful proposals is critical as well as improved communication among City/County/AHAC/CAB (4).
- Ensure understanding that applicants are not members of AHAC to avoid conflict of interest.
- More brainstorming among community organizations in order to come up with innovative programs.
- There should be ongoing consultation throughout the entire term of the Community Plan. This would ensure on going dialogue and promote continued community support.

### ***Recognition of Priority Issues***

- The focus on the Community Plan should be for broader community processes and not just for funding.
- A recognition that homelessness remains a priority issue, and a recognition that mental disabilities/addictions are often at the root of homelessness
- There is a strong need for supportive housing, transitional housing and “truly” affordable housing for our extreme low income earners.
- The process should be split between rural and urban streams and divide the resources available based on the same formula that applies to housing under the Joint Services Agreement between the City and the County.

### ***Enhanced Accountability***

- Money would be better given to an agency which then could disperse the funds directly (with a monitoring and accountability piece built into the agreements).
- Funds should be distributed through the City where there would be greater accountability.

With respect to the last two suggestions surrounding enhanced accountability. It is widely agreed by CAB members that a Community Entity Model of funding would be the preferred model. One of the main reasons for this decision being that the process would remain within Peterborough therefore creating greater transparency and accountability. Under the Community Entity Model the Community Advisory Board would make their recommendations to the community entity (an incorporated organization) which is the decision making body responsible for approving project proposals and determining the eligibility of

projects. There would also likely be some administrative funding which could assist in printing, advertising, promotion etc.

## 2.5 Key Question #5: How do we plan to use the evaluation findings?

The findings presented above will be used to for the evaluation framework presented in the following section.

Importantly, while there was a requirement in the RFP process to outline how recipients would measure the achievements of their program, these outcome measurements were never collected or tabulated in order to fully evaluate the success of the funding allocations.

It is important to mention that recently (first announced in December 2006) a new program is being launched through the Housing and Homelessness Branch (formerly the National Secretariat on Homelessness) called the Homelessness Partnering Strategy. This program will likely include a funding allocation to the Peterborough community. In the initial stages of this new program Services Canada is requiring that communities complete a Community Plan Assessment by the end of May 2007. This Assessment is not aimed at evaluating the performance of CAB or the SCPI process but rather focuses on “housing transitions and introduces an approach that was not part of the Phase II Community Plan Update requirements”. The overall purpose of this Assessment will be to demonstrate progress and highlight continued priorities, assets and gaps.

## 3.0 Evaluation Framework

The following table summarizes the findings presented in Section 2 in order to identify achievements as well as areas for improvement in the SCPI allocation funding process.

Evaluation Question	Achievements	Need for Improvement	Recommendations
#1 Did we do what we said we would do?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of RFP evaluation criteria.</li> <li>• Development of RFPs for each of the nine CPU objectives.</li> <li>• Held a proposal writing seminar.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPU was not approved by Council and no promotion, monitoring or implementation plan achieved.</li> <li>• Lack of feedback from Services</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the City of Peterborough adopt the Community Plan Update once finalized by CAB and take the steps necessary to ensure its coordination with other City/County initiatives.</li> <li>2. That Services Canada</li> </ol>

Evaluation Question	Achievements	Need for Improvement	Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Held an information session to allow interested organizations to ask questions</li> <li>• Advertised for proposal call.</li> <li>• CAB followed edibility criteria of NHI.</li> <li>• Funding recommendations made to Services Canada in a timely fashion.</li> </ul>	<p>Canada to CAB or community on approved allocations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of review mechanism established.</li> <li>• Lack of Aboriginal or Youth persons on CAB.</li> <li>• Funding did not address needs of County residents.</li> <li>• Little accountability for CAB.</li> </ul>	<p>includes a reporting and/or feedback mechanism into its next funding program or phase.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. That the Community Advisory Board takes the necessary steps to move from a Shared Entity Model to a Community Entity Model for the delivery of future NHI funding programs.</li> <li>4. That CAB strives to include new members from the community in particular from the Aboriginal and Youth communities.</li> </ol>
#2 What did we learn about what worked and what didn't?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicated team (CAB).</li> <li>• RFP process established and followed.</li> <li>• Community consultation held.</li> <li>• SCPI recipients in general agreed that process was easy to follow and allocations received in a timely manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some duplication of material in application process.</li> <li>• Nothing built into system to get information back from Services Canada.</li> <li>• Disengagement between CAB and City and between CAB and Services Canada (once recommendations were made).</li> <li>• Disconnect with community once recommendations made to Services Canada.</li> <li>• Lack of closure for volunteers.</li> <li>• Frustration experienced with Services Canada timelines.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. That steps be taken to ensure open communication between the City and County of Peterborough, CAB (or Community Entity) and Services Canada.</li> <li>6. That Services Canada create an HPS website to provide program details, timelines, forms as well as including a feedback mechanism.</li> </ol>
#3 What difference did it make that we	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$541,785 brought into the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two agencies who received</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. That community service providers and agencies</li> </ol>

Evaluation Question	Achievements	Need for Improvement	Recommendations
did this work?	<p>community through SCPI funding to address homelessness and housing insecurity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fund Development Office hired.</li> <li>• New equipment for Kawartha Food Share</li> <li>• Capital upgrades for Youth Emergency Shelter.</li> <li>• New Beginnings Program opened by Community Chaplaincy.</li> <li>• Equipment purchased to re-establish Brock Mission meal program.</li> </ul>	<p>funding felt that money did not impact their community/client group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little, if any, impact on the County.</li> <li>• Funding only “scratches the surface” of need.</li> </ul>	<p>continue their involvement in the NHI funding processes and their efforts to achieve the objectives of the Community Plan Update.</p>
#4 What could we do differently?	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for increased funding and longer term funding.</li> <li>• Need administrative funding for CAB.</li> <li>• Need for greater awareness of SCPI process throughout.</li> <li>• Improved communication overall.</li> <li>• Increased consultation with public throughout CPU and SCPI process.</li> <li>• CPU should be for broader community processes not just funding.</li> <li>• Need for</li> </ul>	<p>8. That through proceeding with a Community Entity Model, Services Canada provides administrative funding.</p> <p>9. That a portion of the administrative funding be dedicated to communication on the HPS, funding opportunities and successful HPS funded projects.</p>

Evaluation Question	Achievements	Need for Improvement	Recommendations
		enhanced accountability and transparency.	
#5 What do we plan to do with the evaluation findings?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of SCPI Phase II Evaluation.</li> <li>• Commitment to participate in new Homelessness Partnering Strategy and the Community Plan Update.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for follow through of outcome measurements in next funding process.</li> </ul>	10. That the Community Plan Update include measurable outcomes within the evaluation strategy and that follow-up on these outcomes be initiated to effectively evaluate funding initiatives.

## 4.0 Summary and Recommendations

Based on the evaluation presented in the previous sections, we have developed nine recommendations to CAB and Services Canada on the SCPI Phase II Funding Allocation Process. Importantly, this evaluation is on the *process* and not necessarily the overall outcome. Therefore, recommendations related to the funding itself (i.e. the need for increased funding) are not addressed here. Rather, these nine recommendations are aimed at improving the process of future funding allocations to meet the following two objectives:

- i. To ensure that the process for identifying gaps, determining priorities and funding programs and services within the system that serves the needs of the homeless and housing insecure is inclusive, transparent and built upon solid accountability measures: and*
- ii. To ensure that the broader community is aware of, and sensitive to, homelessness and housing insecurity issues in order to gain its support (monetary and non-monetary) for programs and services.*

Overall the process for allocating funds, evaluated through the RFP process, was inclusive and transparent. CAB made strong efforts to notify and include local service providers in the RFP process including holding a proposal writing and information session which were not required by Services Canada. CAB members, as volunteers, made themselves available for questions and in several cases met with interested groups. Once recommendations were made to Services Canada, however, the process became less transparent. CAB was not aware of Services Canada's conclusions for funding and subsequently neither was the broader community. As a result, the process lost momentum and much

of the support (monetary and non-monetary) of the Community Plan Update objectives was lost.

Recommendations to better meet the above objectives are as follows:

1. That the City of Peterborough adopts the Community Plan Update once finalized by CAB and takes the steps necessary to ensure its coordination with other City/County initiatives.
2. That Services Canada includes a reporting and/or feedback mechanism into its next funding program or phase.
3. That the Community Advisory Board takes the necessary steps to move from a Shared Entity Model to a Community Entity Model for the delivery of future NHI funding programs.
4. That CAB strives to add new members in particular from the Aboriginal and Youth communities.
5. That steps be taken to ensure open communication between the City and County of Peterborough, CAB (or Community Entity) and Services Canada.
6. That Services Canada create an HPS website to provide program details, timelines, forms as well as a feedback mechanism.
7. That community service providers and agencies continue their involvement in the NHI funding processes and their efforts to achieve the objectives of the Community Plan Update.
8. That by proceeding with a Community Entity Model, Services Canada provides administrative funding.
9. That a portion of the administrative funding be dedicated to communication on the HPS, funding opportunities and successful HPS funded projects.
10. That the Community Plan Update include measurable outcomes within the evaluation strategy and that follow-up on these outcomes be initiated to effectively evaluate funding initiatives.

## Appendix A: CAB/AHAC SCPI Funding Allocation Process Survey

### PETERBOROUGH CITY AND COUNTY EVALUATION OF SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE (SCPI)

#### SURVEY CAB AND AHAC MEMBERS

Organization Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 1. Overview of Process

- a. Can you please briefly describe your role in the SCPI funding allocation process?

#### 2. Evaluation of the SCPI Process

- a. Did the outcome of the SCPI Process meet the intended goals? Please explain.

- b. More specifically did the process meet the following objectives:

- i. To ensure that the process for identifying gaps, determining priorities and funding programs and services within the system that serves the needs of the homeless and housing insecure is inclusive, transparent and built upon solid accountability measures: and*
- ii. To ensure that the broader community is aware of, and sensitive to, homelessness and housing insecurity issues in order to gain its support (monetary and non-monetary) for programs and services.*

- c. What aspects of the process were most effective? Why?

- d. Which aspects were not as effective? Why?
  
- e. In your opinion, what impact has the SCPI funding has on the City and County of Peterborough?

**3. Next Steps**

- a. What would you like to see changed or done differently for the next SCPI process?

Please return your survey to Jodi Ball with SHS Inc. at [jball@shs-inc.ca](mailto:jball@shs-inc.ca) or fax to (905) 737-2385

## Appendix B: SCPI Funding Recipient Survey

### PETERBOROUGH CITY AND COUNTY EVALUATION OF SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE (SCPI)

#### SURVEY

Organization Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **1. Your Project**

- a. Can you briefly describe your organization?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- b. How was the SCPI funding used?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- c. What impact has the SCPI funding had on your organization?

#### **2. The SCPI Process**

- a. Did your organization receive the allocated funding in a timely manner?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- b. Was the process for applying for the funding easy to follow?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- c. Could you comment on how the process could be improved?

Please return your survey to Jodi Ball with SHS Inc. at [jball@shs-inc.ca](mailto:jball@shs-inc.ca) or fax to (905) 737-2385.

## Appendix C: SCPI Funding Criteria

### ELIGIBILITY FOR SCPI FUNDING

#### Allocation of Funds

Eighty percent of SCPI funding has been allocated to 10 urban centres (see page 7 for explanation). The balance goes to other communities that have significant homelessness problems.

#### Eligible Organizations

Individuals, not-for-profit organizations and municipal governments are eligible to receiving funding. Public health and educational institutions *may* be eligible for funding, with the agreement of the province/territory government.

For-profit enterprises are eligible, provided that the nature and intent of the activity is non-commercial and conforms to the plan to address homelessness that has been developed by the community (the Community Plan). In addition, businesses may receive funding to assist them in providing work experience for the homeless.

#### Eligible Activities

Project activities eligible for a federal contribution under the SCPI must not only fit within the Community Plan, but must also fall within the scope of eligible SCPI activities. These include:

- ongoing planning related to building within the community, the capacity to address a wide spectrum of homelessness issues such as prevention, the need for transitional and supportive housing, and socio-economic inclusion of homeless people;
- activities that strengthen the capacity of community organizations to address the needs of the homeless, including proposal development, organizational assistance (strategic planning, board training, conflict resolution, decision making, etc.) access to workshops and other educational opportunities, encouragement of collaboration, and community development initiatives;
- activities that meet the immediate needs of people living on the streets or in shelters, including providing outreach workers to link homeless people with resources, multi-service centres (drop-in centres that provide food, clothing, laundry, showers, foot care, sleeping bags, dental hygiene, service referrals, etc.) building, buying or renovating facilities for shelter space, and transitional and supportive housing; and
- other initiatives that are based on a seamless program of support services aimed at reducing homelessness.

#### *Individual Projects*

All activities eligible for SCPI federal funding must fit within the program's objectives, terms and conditions, and be identified in the Community Plan. Priority will be established by the community and generally be given to projects that address the needs of those currently without permanent shelter. Some key areas that may be funded through the SCPI include:

- emergency shelters;
- transitional and supportive housing;
- health and employment services;
- prevention strategies;

- outreach services;
- multi-service centres;
- initiatives that help community organizations conduct strategic planning and board training, access educational opportunities and encourage partnerships; and
- other activities that form part of a seamless program of support services aimed at reducing homelessness.

## **Eligible Costs**

### ***Planning***

In each eligible community, contributions may be made to cover the full reasonable and direct costs of preparing a plan to reduce homelessness, and disseminating information about it. Such costs may include renting meeting space for community consultations, hiring a consultant to facilitate the planning process and draft a Plan, and the publishing and distribution of it.

### ***Implementation***

SCPI contributions may cover any or all portions of the reasonable and direct costs of developing, administering, delivering and evaluating projects that fall within the Community Plan. Contributions may be provided for capital projects. If a proposal is approved for funding, the eligible costs will be specified in detail in a contribution agreement.

### ***Administration***

In both the Community Entity and Shared Delivery models of implementation (see Decision Making, page 21) financial assistance may be provided to cover administrative costs such as wages and employment-related costs for staff, licences, permits, fees for professional services, disbursements for research or technical studies, disability needs, bank interest, utilities, materials, supplies, travel, insurance, rental of premises, leasing or purchasing equipment and the costs of audits, evaluations and assessments.

## **Urgent Needs Projects**

While a community is in the process of developing its Plan, an urgent need may arise for a project to address the case of people currently without shelter. Funding for such a project will be considered, provided that communities demonstrate that:

- the proposed intervention must be implemented within a specific time frame to address immediate needs;
- the project has been identified as a community priority, through a process of public consultation;
- the project is formally endorsed by all members of the Community Planning group and, once complete, will reflect the priorities of the Community Plan;
- the federal or, where appropriate, provincial Homelessness Coordinator has certified that the project meets the objectives of the SCPI.

In addition to meeting these requirements, an Urgent Need Project proposal must contain the same elements as a regular project proposal.

(Source: Government of Canada National Homelessness Initiative  
[www.homelessness.gc/publications/commguide](http://www.homelessness.gc/publications/commguide))