



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.



Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Well-being
Coalition pour la sécurité, la santé et le bien-être des communautés



Community Safety Round Table II

Coalition-Building on Community Safety, Health and Well-being

“As-it-was-recorded” Report

Delta Ottawa Hotel and Suites
30 October 2006

I. Context

In February 2006, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACCP) hosted a Community Safety Round Table of 51 representatives of non-governmental organizations, federal and provincial governments and police services to:

- build synergies between national non-governmental associations in order to reinforce the vision of a community-based approach to crime prevention through sustainable social development; and
- articulate messages to garner support for community-owned strategies for sustainable social development.

The February 2006 meeting ended with a clearly expressed desire on the part of the NGOs to pursue the formalizing of a Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Well-being. The CACP agreed to provide the leadership to help make this happen.

Consequently, on October 30, 2006, the CACP held a follow-up consultation. Some 50 participants from 26 national NGOs involved in social development, 11 police services and federal and provincial governments met at the second Round Table with a view to formalizing a coalition to promote community safety, health and well-being.

II. Purpose

The purpose of the October 30 meeting was to agree on:

- what a coalition would look like and how it would function; and
- what the coalition’s top priority (or key area of focus) should be and what key strategy(ies)/action(s) would be used to deliver on this priority.

The purpose of this “as-it-was-recorded” report is to present the key messages emerging from the second Round Table. It is not a polished synthesis or “think piece”, but rather a presentation of the most salient points arising from the meeting.

III. Agenda

I. Opening

- Welcome and purpose (Dorothy Franklin, Co-chair, CACP Crime Prevention Committee)
- Context (Gail Dugas, Canadian Council on Social Development; Chief Edgar MacLeod, Cape Breton Regional Police Service; Peter Dudding, Child Welfare League of Canada)
- Review of process and agenda (L. Pigeon, Facilitator)
- Participant introductions in small groups

II. Taking Stock of Crime Prevention through Social Development

- Presentation by Dr. Ross Hastings, Institute for the Prevention of Crime, University of Ottawa
- Facilitated conversation

III. Defining the Coalition We Want to Build

- *Purpose*: Why do we want this coalition to exist?
- *Form*: Given why we want it to exist, what form would best suit our purpose?

IV. Agreeing on Key Area(s) for Action (i.e., What will be our focus?)

V. Clarifying the Objective to be Achieved on the Chosen Area of Focus and Choosing the Strategy(ies) to Get There

VI. Wrap-up and Review of Key Decisions

VII. Closing Remarks (Chief Edgar MacLeod)

IV. In Attendance

Fifty representatives from 26 national non-governmental organizations (NGOs), 11 police services, the Province of Manitoba and the National Crime Prevention Centre of Public Safety Canada attended the meeting. Lack of funds/staff or scheduling conflicts prevented 14 organizations from attending. The list of invited participants is attached at Annex A.

V. Proceedings

I. Opening

a) Dorothy Ahlgren Franklin, Co-chair, CACP Crime Prevention Committee

Dorothy Ahlgren Franklin welcomed participants and indicated that this Round Table was convened to take further the work done at the February meeting, where national organizations came together to identify some of the risk factors that contribute to crime and victimization, determine the key ingredients for safe, healthy communities, and start developing key messages on sustainable social development.

Ms. Ahlgren Franklin noted that the Advisory Committee had suggested that the Coalition needed a practical tool for communicating key messages on crime prevention through sustainable social development. Ray J. MacLellan of Crew Productions would be filming throughout the day to produce a DVD that all coalition members could use within their organizations, for their constituents and stakeholders and for federal, provincial/territorial and municipal decision-makers.

b) Gail Dugas, Canadian Council on Social Development

Ms. Dugas reminded attendees that the CACP had invited all participants to join the Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Well-being in order to move forward on the shared objective that sustainable social development be recognized as the basis of sustainable crime prevention. She indicated that there is an impressive body of knowledge about the factors that contribute to pro-social development and an understanding of the factors that place people at risk of involvement in crime, as either victims or perpetrators. Although internationally Canada leads in developing knowledge and sharing it, nevertheless it sometimes feels like an uphill struggle, because crime prevention is still not being integrated into the way we do our normal business. This could change if one missing ingredient were present: the sustained commitment of politicians and community leaders.

Ms. Dugas stressed that the Coalition represents an opportunity to provide strong, articulate input into government priorities, to shape the agenda and to make that agenda “sustainable crime prevention through sustainable social development”. She added that Canadians consistently support prevention, including crime prevention through social development, and that many recognize attention must be paid to the root causes of criminal behaviour: poverty; lack of educational, recreational and employment opportunities; social exclusion and marginalization; poor parenting; and lack of positive role models. Crime prevention works and should be considered first on the police, courts and corrections continuum.

In closing, Ms. Dugas indicated that the Coalition needs:

- the public and decision-makers from all orders of government to understand the link between social development and prevention of crime and victimization;
- a commitment from communities and governments for a long-term view; and
- investments in those things that promote the pro-social development of individuals, families and communities.

c) Edgar MacLeod, CACP

Chief MacLeod explained that the CACP had not intended to have a second Community Safety Round Table and that in fact, the February consultation had achieved the objectives that had been set, in particular the crafting of key messages about crime prevention through social development. He noted that in addition to that communications content, other clear messages emerged from the February meeting:

- Participants expressed gratitude that Canada's police leaders had reached out to national associations, federations and organizations.
- All agreed that crime prevention belongs to everyone, but that this shared responsibility should not result in an abdication of responsibility by decision-makers.
- All agreed that united voices were more effective in communicating with government decision-makers than many individual voices.
- There was overwhelming interest in getting together again, to plan how to sustain the momentum that had been created and build upon it.
- There was strong interest in using the National Showcase on Community Safety, Health and Well-being next March in Winnipeg as a starting point for building a national framework – a non-prescriptive, comprehensive, multi-sectoral, evidence-based approach to planning for safe and healthy communities.
- The CACP was asked to continue its leadership role in the Coalition in order to explore its sustainability beyond the end of the current funding in March 2007.

At its Annual Conference in St. John's in August, the CACP membership was provided with an update on the Coalition's work. Chief MacLeod noted that the Coalition received overwhelming support and a clear mandate to carry on. In addition, the CACP adopted a resolution, aimed at federal, provincial and municipal governments, which:

- expresses support for the government funding from and leadership exhibited through the National Crime Prevention Strategy;
- draws attention to the need for crime prevention as the primary element of community safety and as an investment that is proven to yield savings in police, the courts, corrections and other social service areas; and
- seeks the commitment of governments at all levels, to work together and, with the non-governmental sector, support the creation of a comprehensive, national community safety action plan to guide the work of local communities in addressing their crime prevention needs.

Chief MacLeod emphasized that Round Table II, an addition to the CACP's original work plan, was convened to determine whether there was interest among participants in sustaining the Coalition, how that might be achieved, and what should be accomplished within the coming two years.

d) Peter Dudding, Child Welfare League of Canada

Mr. Dudding started by saying that the areas in which he works, child protection, youth justice and mental health, are ones that we wish did not have to exist. But they do. Like many others, these areas experience the pressures of heavy workloads and insufficient resources. There are many success stories, but also some tragic failures. While we are fortunate in Canada to have child welfare within our sightline and constant efforts to improve how the parts of the system work together, children in many countries have no advocates and no protection from the state. Mr. Dudding stressed, however, that Canada cannot be complacent; to illustrate his point, he cited a 2002 Canadian study showing that children made up 23% of the population, but accounted for 61% of the victims of sexual assault and the Canadian Incidence Study on Reported Child Abuse and Neglect which estimates that in 2003, over 29,000 substantiated investigations of children witnessing domestic violence occurred.

Mr. Dudding underlined that knowledge about the requirements for healthy child development is at our fingertips: adequate income, cohesive families, maternal mental health, effective parenting, and supportive schools and community. But, too often we don't act upon what we know: child poverty rates remain at 16% and in a recent study of child poverty in wealthy countries, by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Canada ranked a dismal 19 out of 28 countries. Yet, despite the evidence of the victimization of children and seniors, governments are not paying enough attention to the social determinants of safety, health and well-being. The federal government's commitment to accountability and supporting families and communities makes this a good time for a Coalition to work on increasing interest in social development as a priority. The CACP has stepped up to the plate and agreed to lead the Coalition initiative for the near future, but no one national association can do it alone. We need to continue to work together at the national level to support practical collaboration at the community level.

II. Taking Stock of Crime Prevention through Social Development – Presentation by Dr. Ross Hastings, Institute for the Prevention of Crime, University of Ottawa

Dr. Ross Hastings examined what is going well with regard to crime prevention through social development: CPSD is an accepted part of criminal justice policy, a funded part of criminal justice practice and a popular option to both the public and, more and more, politicians. He then asked if CPSD was a permanent part of the social landscape, if things would get better or worse and if we were organized for success or failure. He noted that the battle for CPSD was not won yet and explored in some depth three key ingredients that could lead to failure:

- lack of consensus around the meaning of crime prevention through social development which makes it difficult to create political momentum;

- misreading of the climate for change which might mean that crime prevention through social development is out of step with current society; and
- failure to address resistance to change, in particular the need for organizations, workers and clients to accept that things be done differently.

The three streams on CPSD were described:

- *developmental* where the focus is on persistent deviance;
- *social* where the focus is on reducing stress and deprivation; and
- *community* where the focus is on engaging communities in problem solving to address risk factors, inequalities and the redistribution of resources.

Dr. Hastings concluded that CPSD is a popular but ambiguous notion. It is unclear who leads or who speaks for the CPSD constituency. People are cynical about crime experts and their expertise and too often focus on individual cases rather than the broader social dimensions of crime. Too often communities choose to pursue programs addressing specific risk factors, not the inequalities of society.

The full text of this presentation is found at Annex B.

III. Defining the Coalition We Want to Build

As a catalyst for discussion of the Coalition's vision and mandate, the Advisory Committee had prepared a "straw man" of sorts: draft Terms of Reference. Participants used this document, attached at Annex C, to discuss the purpose and governance model for a formalized Coalition.

Participants agreed that the members of the Coalition, themselves, form the audience for the Terms of Reference (i.e., it is an internal document and not an external communication tool) and that other tools will be needed to communicate with the public at large, governments and other stakeholders.

A. Purpose of the Coalition

i) Background:

Participants agreed that the Background section of the draft Terms of Reference should be amended as follows (changes in italics):

The Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Well-being brings together at the national level police associations and *community service organizations* whose individual mandates support the vision of community-based, sustainable social development leading to safe and healthy communities across Canada.

ii) Vision:

It was agreed that a vision statement should describe a destination or high level goal that is not necessarily measurable and a mission statement what the organization does. The following vision statement was proposed in the draft Terms of Reference:

Community-based, sustainable social development leading to safe, healthy communities across Canada.

The group suggested several alternate visions for the Coalition; participants' observations on the various choices are captured below:

a) Governments and communities working in partnership for the sustainability of safe and healthy communities across Canada.

Comments:

- Compared to the proposed statement, this version identifies who is working towards sustainable communities. Some participants were uncomfortable with the notion of “governments” because “it is not the government which will get out and do the work” and because “governments are the main target of the coalition’s advocacy work”; however, others felt that acknowledgement of the support of governments was important.
- This version removes the “how” (i.e., the notion of social development) which was present in the original version. A number of participants felt it was important to retain the notion of social development.
- Some participants felt that this version describes more the mission of the coalition than its vision.
- Although it does not describe a destination or a desired result, a few participants preferred this version because it reflects more accurately what emerged from the February meeting.

b) Sustainable social development for safe, healthy communities across Canada.

or: *Sustainable social development focused on safe, healthy communities across Canada.*

Comments:

- This version drops the words “*community-based* sustainable social development” because some participants felt that that description was too restrictive.
- Many participants preferred this broad, high level statement.

c) Reducing rates of crime through social development so as to have safer, healthier communities.

Comments:

- None recorded.

d) *Reducing crime, victimization and insecurity (or fear of crime) in order to contribute to greater individual and community well being.*

Comments:

- Many participants were attracted to this vision statement, especially if presented in tandem with the following mission statement: *Linking criminal justice and crime prevention through social development in order to address the causes and risk factors leading to crime and victimization.*
- Others thought it was too restrictive and favoured alternative 2 which they felt spoke to all sectors in the community.
- Other participants indicated it is important that the notion of social development be in the vision statement, not just the mission statement.
- There was no consensus on whether the notion of *crime prevention* had to be included in the vision statement, although some participants pointed out that since it is explicit in the mandate, it does not need to be cited in the vision.

Given the time available for this topic, it was not possible to reach consensus on the final wording of the vision statement. Participants agreed that the Coalition Advisory Committee should consider the identified alternatives and propose a final version.

iii) Mandate:

The draft Terms of Reference proposed the following mandate for discussion:

To advocate to governments and decision-makers at all levels and in all sectors for improved community safety, health and well-being, by providing:

- **a unified voice promoting social development measures that contribute to the safe and healthy development of Canadian communities;**
- **links to organizations and agencies that hold evidence-based research and information on crime prevention through sustainable social development; and**
- **messaging that enhances public awareness of crime prevention through sustainable social development.**

Attendees liked the notions of “*to advocate*” and “*unified voice*”. Participants suggested several modifications to the mandate:

- The first bullet should refer to social development investments rather than social development measures.
- The mandate should clarify what the Coalition is accountable for (i.e., to create change).
- The notions of providing leadership and being pro-active should be added.

- The words government and decision-makers should be deleted from the first line of the mandate because the Coalition should be advocating to the public and Canadians in general. Others participants felt quite strongly that it is precisely towards governments and decision-makers that the Coalition should direct its energies.
- The word engage should replace advocate since advocacy is not very popular with the current government. A number of participants felt that this would distort the coalition's core mandate which is advocacy; in the end, most participants agreed that the notion of advocacy is crucial and fundamental to the *raison d'être* of the Coalition.
- The notions of *engaging the public, changing public attitudes/behaviours and investments and promoting solutions* for government and decision-makers should be added.

At the end of a lively discussion, there appeared to be consensus that the mandate should be revised as:

To advocate to government and decision-makers for improved community safety, health and well-being and to promote to the public the notion of crime prevention through social development by providing:

- *a unified voice promoting social development investments and solutions that contribute to the safe and healthy development of Canadian communities;*
- *links to organizations and agencies that hold evidence-based research and information on crime prevention through sustainable social development; and*
- *messaging that enhances public awareness of crime prevention through sustainable social development.*

B. Form of the Coalition

i) Governance Model:

Dorothy Ahlgren Franklin provided background information on the role the CACP is willing to play in the future. By March of 2007, the CACP will have achieved the deliverables to which it committed under the current funding arrangements through the National Crime Prevention Strategy. The CACP is keen to maintain momentum on Coalition development and thinks it is time for a national/pan-Canadian framework. The CACP is willing to continue on-going discussions with other federal departments and other levels of government on the question of sustainability.

Ms. Ahlgren Franklin noted that while the CACP is willing to continue its leadership, it cannot fund the level of activity which the Coalition has known in the last two years. The CACP will be looking to other national organizations to support the Coalition in a number of ways: first, by coming to the Showcase in Winnipeg in March, thus getting together a critical mass of people and generating outcomes that reflect all Coalition members and second, by stepping up to the plate and providing "in kind" support or funding.

During the discussion that ensued, it was emphasized that the Coalition would in no way be a *part* of the CACP; rather, the CACP would be a *member* of the Coalition – a member which could

provide varying degrees of support (e.g., a secretariat) and leadership. It was also noted that it was not necessary to create a formal organization under the *Corporations Act* (e.g., with a constitution, registration with Industry Canada, etc.) The Coalition could remain quite informal in its structure, with an organization such as the CACP that could sponsor it and request resources on its behalf with those funds maintained in a separate account. The CACP would have to make sure that its governance model allowed for this arrangement and that the Coalition members could see clearly how the funds in question were managed.

A few participants spoke about the importance of the Coalition and its potential to make a significant contribution to the future. They pointed out that in order for it to be the kind of leader and driving force that it can be, it must be managed. Some felt it was “incredibly important to have the Coalition housed in some way with the CACP” and recognized that when chiefs of police add their voice to the message of crime prevention through social development, it carries more weight. Chief MacLeod reiterated that if the Coalition wants the CACP to play a leadership role, the CACP will be there – it will work hard on those messages but, he emphasized, all members of the Coalition will need to work hard as well. “This is a coalition of equals,” he added.

Pragmatically, participants agreed, the reason this coalition has made so much headway in the past two years is because it hired a manager – a team leader who could pull members together and keep them on track. When thinking about the future and aiming for national change, participants felt it was essential to have the funds for a project manager.

Consensus was reached on the following principles:

- This is a coalition of equals.
- The CACP plays a convenor role to bring parties together; it can provide a certain level of support and leadership, but it is really one among equals.
- Funding is very close to ending; it was provided for very specific activities (i.e., the first Community Safety Round Table and the National Showcase) and therefore the sustainability of the Coalition needs to be addressed.

ii) Membership:

Some participants favoured dispensing with the notion that membership be open only to “national-level” organizations; others felt there was a genuine need for national organizations to speak out with a unified voice so that the Coalition would have more influence. The point was also made that opening up membership to all types and levels of organizations would make it a very difficult and expensive coalition to manage. After some discussion, participants agreed with the principle that the words “national-level organizations” would be removed, but that organizations or individuals which bring a particular expertise and want to join the Coalition would have to apply for membership and that a process would be put in place by the Steering Committee to approve or reject their applications.

iii) Advisory Committee:

Participants agreed that making the Coalition a more permanent organization would require a steering rather than an advisory committee. The Steering Committee should be a manageable size (e.g. nine to eleven members).

iv) Staff:

The need for a secretariat staffed at least on a part-time basis was underscored. Participants also suggested that a communications expert would be needed.

v) Sustainability and Membership Fees:

Most participants agreed it was imperative to seek continued funding from the National Crime Prevention Centre; they recognized that the NCPC does not supply core funding and that the Coalition would have to present funding requests only for short-term projects whose results could be measured and evaluated. Some participants emphasized the need to diversify funding sources, since NCPC may not be able to respond positively. Other sources of funding might include provincial associations and membership fees. It was suggested that consideration be given to the injuries prevention sector, where a study promoting the development of a National Injury Prevention Strategy was funded by the Insurance Bureau of Canada; following this model, the Coalition might find partners and sponsoring organizations who would agree to support the work of developing a National Framework for Action on Community Safety, Health and Well-being.

While no one seemed to disagree in principle with the idea that members should contribute to the sustainability of the Coalition, a number of participants indicated that their organizations do not have the funds to pay for membership; indeed, they stated that if membership fees were levied, they would be excluded and inequality created. Others felt that organizations “need to put their money where their mouth is” and at least some small contribution – even if an “in kind” contribution – should be mandatory. They added that this is essential to validate the Coalition and to ensure that when it speaks, it does so with the full knowledge that its members are truly behind it. A member of the Advisory Committee indicated that it was never the intent to eliminate anybody by asking for membership fees. Participants recognized that membership fees would not cover all of the costs of sustaining the Coalition and that other forms of funding would have to be secured.

In summary, participants agreed that:

- All possible sources of funding should be explored (e.g., governments at all levels and potential private sector sponsors).
- Members needed to be able to contribute to the Coalition according to their capabilities and capacities.

- Before approach any organization for funding, the Coalition should have a clear idea of what it wanted to accomplish and an action plan.

IV. Agreeing on Key Area(s) for Action

The discussion on the Coalition's key areas of focus and strategic priorities was launched with a brainstorming session that generated several ideas. The complete list of suggestions is attached at Annex D. The areas of focus were re-grouped into the following themes:

- a) Building a National Framework
- b) Developing the communications /advocacy focus
- c) Networking and building the Coalition itself
- d) Funding
- e) Building the knowledge base

Participants agreed that all of the focus areas must be addressed if the Coalition is to be effective.

V. Clarifying the Objective to be Achieved on the Chosen Area of Focus and Choosing the Strategy(ies) to Get There

Participants agreed on the following priorities for action in the short term:

1. Acquiring short-term, interim financing by:
 - working on a grant proposal which would require having a strategic plan that would set out the core project (i.e., the National Framework) and hiring a person to implement the plan. (*Note:* It was suggested that a national foundation could be approached to help fund the preparation of this proposal); and
 - exploring whether additional funds might be leveraged for and through the Showcase which could be used to interest potential contributors and attract new members.
2. Confirming which organizations are part of the Coalition by developing a final list of "on board" members.
3. Producing a paper to be used as a tool to facilitate discussion and decision-making. (*Note:* Dr. Hastings has agreed to prepare such a paper and deliver a keynote address at the opening of the National Showcase.)
4. Keeping up the momentum on the communications piece by asking all members to use the key messages proactively and by developing a simple communications tool. (*Note:* The DVD prepared during this meeting should help in this regard.)

It was agreed that the key priority in the medium term would be:

5. Developing a National Framework for Action on Community Safety, Health and Well-being.

Participants discussed at length the concept of a National Framework. What is meant by that term? What would the Framework cover? It was agreed that the National Framework should:

- Put things in context (i.e., present the vision and the current situation, examine the gap between the two and suggest how that gap could be filled);
- Identify the Coalition's priorities for action with deliverables, time frames and expected outcomes;
- Provide a structure and an organizing logic that sets out the values and principles underpinning the strategy and serves as a planning tool/guide for communities to help them work toward the vision;
- Allow funders to understand where the Coalition is going;
- Give criteria for prioritization of initiatives;
- Provide "best practices", including those from organizations that do not see themselves in the crime prevention business but are, in fact; and
- Identify partnerships and members.

To be useful, the Framework needs be developed so that:

- All potential players see themselves in it;
- It speaks to several audiences (e.g., governments, communities, partners);
- It rests on the concepts developed by Dr. Hastings (e.g., developmental, social and community streams of crime prevention);
- It is practical;
- It does not re-invent the wheel, but rather builds on what others, such as the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime, are doing in this field;
- It emphasizes the value of the Coalition and states what will be different as a result of this collaboration and the synergy created; and
- It mobilizes the system, keeping in mind that the Coalition's first priority is "to advocate".

VI. Wrap-up and Review of Key Decisions

Considerable ground was covered in a comparatively short period of time. There was general agreement that the Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Well-being should be formalized and led, in the short term by the CACP. NGOs expressed their appreciation for the CACP's efforts to develop this multi-sectoral collaboration.

The Coalition Advisory Committee will use the input received from Round Table participants to revise the Terms of Reference for the formalized Coalition. The redrafted Terms of Reference will be circulated to participating organizations and their membership in the Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Well-being confirmed.

The CACP will share the report on Community Safety Round Table II with the federal departments that attended the interdepartmental briefing on the CACP's coalition-building initiative. Efforts to acquire short-term, interim funding from public and private sources will continue.

Communications will be emphasized with a background paper on crime prevention through sustainable social development prepared, the key messages used as widely as possible by members of the Coalition and a simple communications tool developed (e.g., Ray J. MacLellan's DVD) for use by all members.

VII. Closing Remarks – Chief Edgar MacLeod

In his closing remarks, Chief MacLeod thanked everyone for their contribution to another successful Round Table. His reading of the meeting was that there is a strong desire to keep the dialogue going and continue to work together as part of an ongoing coalition that will take messages forward to governments and decision-makers at all levels.

He thanked the facilitator, Lise Pigeon, Dr. Ross Hastings, the Coalition Advisory Committee, in particular Dorothy Ahlgren Franklin, Gail Dugas and Peter Dudding, the national office of the CACP and the Project Manager, Sandra Wright. Chief MacLeod thanked the NCPC for giving Coalition representatives an opportunity recently to meet with other federal organizations. With regard to the participants, he emphasized that it's "all of you who have made this Round Table a success – you are the heroes in this, you work behind the scenes, you work on the ground". As result, he said, "we are more able to speak, we have moved forward and clearly, we don't want our collaboration to stop."

Annex B

Presentation by Dr. Ross Hastings Institute for the Prevention of Crime, University of Ottawa

The question I want to pursue today is how to turn a good idea, i.e., crime prevention through social development (CPSD), into a political and community practice that will actually help advance the cause? My presentation is therefore primarily about the challenge of social change.

The good news is first that CPSD is on the map; it is an accepted part of criminal justice policy. Secondly, it is also on the map financially, i.e., it is a funded part of criminal justice practice, although not to the point that we would like. In 1993, the Horner Report recommended that one per cent of federal funding every year should go to crime prevention and that this should be increased every year by one percent up to a total of 5%. It is worrisome that the actual amount spent is less than this target; recent cuts are even more worrisome. Finally, CPSD is very popular with the public and increasingly with politicians.

So, where next? We must remember that criminal justice is like a lot of other policy areas: there are fads and fashions. Is CPSD another fashion or is it a permanent part of the landscape? Will things get better or worse? And are we, at this point in time, organized for success or for failure?

My concern is that, at this point, we may not be organized for success. Failure occurs when three conditions exist. First, the notion (in this case, CPSD) is somewhat vague. There is less consensus than there seems. Everyone can jump on the bandwagon, but nobody really understands what wagon they are on. When commitments are required, people jump off. The vaguer the notion, the more difficult it is to build political momentum.

The second condition is a misreading of the climate for change, i.e., is this the right idea at the right time? In the 60's and 70's, during Trudeau's "just society" period, CPSD may have been the right idea for the times, but in the 90s and 2000s, Canada is moving much more in the direction of control. Sometimes, it is easy for the converted to agree it is a good idea and to ask why others resist our wisdom. We run into difficulties when we fail to address the reasons that our support is somewhat weak.

Thirdly, we don't spend enough time figuring out who is against us. Sometimes, those who are against us are against us conceptually, e.g., they believe in punishment rather than rehabilitation. Most of the time, however, the really tough resistance comes from organizations that don't

necessarily want to change the way they do things or from workers who don't want to change the conditions under which they perform the work or from clients who may not access the services for the reasons you think they do. For example, the government has made it clear that there will not be a lot of money available for crime prevention; the money will have to come from existing areas. This means taking money from, say, prisons or courts in order to put it in crime prevention. Of course, this is not likely to happen as everybody thinks, "Not from my pocket!"

So, are we making progress? Are we aiming for change in a context where we are not all that clear on what we are trying to do? Have we misread the climate for change, and have we taken on organizational change in a systematic way?

CPSD: a conceptual muddle

Unfortunately, one of the big problems we run into with regard to CPSD is that the notion is a bit of a muddle. There are at least three different streams that fit into the notion of crime prevention through social development; each of these rests on different theoretic premises, results in a different set of practices and requires different partners at the table in order to get results.

The three streams on CPSD are developmental, social and community. In the *developmental stream*, people argue that what we really want to focus on is persistent deviance. We are building on the notion that somewhere between 5% and 10% of people in society commit somewhere between 50% and 70% of the crimes. The preferred method to study this is to do longitudinal studies, e.g., take a cohort, follow the kids from birth through youth to adulthood and track their criminal record. Then, by going back in time, we can identify the predictors of criminal behaviour (e.g., violent families, academic difficulties, etc.) Interventions are then targeted to address the presence of those factors, thereby breaking the developmental sequence. This is the approach that is most consistent with the language of rehabilitation. For the most part, the focus is on the family (e.g., programs around family violence), the education system (e.g., programs around bullying) and to some extent the local community, as the best places to address the risk factors.

The two biggest problems with this approach are first that the methods are somewhat intrusive. They assume the very thing that the logic of law enforcement does not, i.e., that one is potentially guilty until proven innocent, thereby justifying the activities of prevention/intervention. The other problem is the tendency to blame the victim. The reality, however, is that risk factors are not randomly distributed in our society and the pattern of distribution is very predictable; it is highly correlated to poverty and inequity.

In the *social stream*, the focus is on patterns of inequality and the need for redistribution. It says that being poor is not just a happenstance situation; it has real consequences, including heightened exposure to crime, higher probabilities of offending and higher risks of being a victim. In the social stream, the focus is on developing social policy that will help redistribute resources to people who experience high levels of risk because, as we know, some communities are more criminogenic than others. The focus of action in this stream is on reducing stress and deprivation by reducing inequality.

The third stream focuses on the delivery of programs by the *community*. It uses a different language – not a language of causality, but one of mobilization and partnerships. It involves the recognition that the government will not be in position to take on the cost of larger initiatives and will be looking to communities to take on a bigger role. That doesn't mean that communities are necessarily scientifically proven to be the best place for this. Rather, local community is the default answer, i.e., it is what's left when you take away government subsidized programs and activities by the private sector. The kinds of things involved here are long term: what do communities need to do to engage in problem solving and to sustain that engagement over a long enough period of time to address individual risk factors, the reality of inequality and the potential for redistribution.

Ideally, when we talk about CPSD, we should be talking about all three approaches, and thinking about how to make links between them.

The climate for change:

It is true that the public likes crime prevention; 80% of Canadians – and 90% of Quebeckers – want more prevention. The question we want to ask is how salient and how strong is people's support for crime prevention? Attitude change is a necessary condition to behaviour change; but that is not sufficient in itself to produce that change. We have made good strides in convincing people that there are real limits to the existing criminal justice system, but we have been much less successful in actually getting people to change their behaviours as a result. For example, everybody approves of Neighbourhood Watch, but few people will actually go to the meetings and become involved. Over the last twenty-five years, there have been huge behaviour changes in some areas (e.g., smoking, drinking and driving, status of women, recycling). Using examples such as these, we need to learn about the best practices of behaviour change as opposed to just attitude change, and how to apply this to generating more support for prevention.

In addition, there is a difference between action and impact. A lot of people want to be involved in action, but unfortunately, what they do is not very lucid. For example, there is little indication that Neighbourhood Watch makes a major difference in crime rates. The reason is that it is quite easy to set up a Neighbourhood Watch in good communities where people are already doing most

things well; but the communities that most need Neighbourhood Watch types of activities are usually highly transient, where people rent their homes or don't necessarily have homes and don't want to invest themselves in their community. So we confuse implementation with impact. We are not using the best evidence-based crime prevention to assure the kinds of impacts that we would like, e.g., getting persistent offenders of the street.

So two areas of challenge: how do we get from attitudes to action and how do we get better at doing things that will work.

Resistance to change:

When we talk about resistance, we need to get out of our heads that it is blind and stupid. People do not resist things that improve their quality of life. When asked to change, people logically ask: "what's in it for me?" And if the answer is more work, less pay and more aggravation, they are more likely to resist change.

There are three levels at which we can look at resistance:

- 1) At the level of organizations: An organization's first imperative is not service delivery but survival. Survival requires an organization to be hard-nosed about making sure its mandate and client-base are protected and that money keeps flowing in. So organizations find themselves in a very "conservatizing" mode.

- 2) At the level of workers: The workers may have no objection to the intent and value of a change, but will resist its implementation if it requires them to make personal changes such as in their hours of work, commuting arrangements, child care arrangements. The reality is that most people work to live, they are not on a mission. If we start the change process by trying to change people's attitudes, we are going to fail. We should first change the behaviours, re-task the workers and focus the change on the middle management level. If the change works, they will adjust their attitudes.

- 3) At the level of clients: We should not assume that people interpret or respond to services in the way we hope and expect. For example: imposing probation rather than a jail sentence may be perceived as "having won" by the kid who committed a crime, but the mother may see it as the system asking her to be the cop. For her, the notion of probation is not good and she will resist it.

Conclusion:

So, where do we stand with respect to CPSD? First, we have a popular but very ambiguous notion; so we want to be very careful – there may be breadth of support for CPSD, but it may also be very shallow. It is unclear whether that support easily converts into actions and votes.

Second, it is not clear who speaks for CPSD and who will lead. For example, if you upset a chief of police, it is clear that the CACP will step in. If you upset a judge, the judicial council will step in. But who speaks for crime prevention? The Coalition could fill that job, but for politicians, crime prevention is an easy target; \$14M were just cut from NCPC and nobody said anything. There is a leadership vacuum, and no real popular constituency in support of crime prevention initiatives.

Third, there is a huge degree of cynicism about the expertise of criminologists and crime experts. People are incredibly confident that they know what is going on around crime and they know what to do about it; however, most Canadians don't actually know some of the most basic facts about crime and victimization in this country.

Finally, too often, the promise of crime prevention is reduced to those things that communities are able and willing to deliver. In practice, the tendency is to emphasize programs that address certain of the developmental risk factors; there is seldom much attention paid to the social dimension. Communities simply are not empowered by mandate or by resources to work on the social front.

The risk the Coalition runs is that it may actually become a voice for conservatism. It may actually be a coalition that supports the idea that in the end, crime is reducible to the developmental model, i.e., we need to address individual risk in order to make our communities safe. This basically leaves the social dimension out of the equation. Be very careful about drifting too far to the developmental and community streams because you may be taking up the space that you had not anticipated that you should be taking.

Thank you.

Annex C

Draft Terms of Reference Presented as a Starting Point for Discussion



Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Well-being
Coalition pour la sécurité, la santé et le bien-être des communautés



Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Well-being Starting Point for Discussion on Terms of Reference

Background:

The Coalition on Community Safety, Health and Well-being brings together at the national level police associations and non-police organizations whose individual mandates support the vision of community-based, sustainable social development leading to safe and healthy communities across Canada.

Vision:

Community-based, sustainable social development leading to safe, healthy communities across Canada.

Mandate:

To advocate to governments and decision-makers at all levels and in all sectors for improved community safety, health and well-being, by providing:

- a unified voice promoting social development measures that contribute to the safe and healthy development of Canadian communities;
- links to organizations and agencies that hold evidence-based research and information on crime prevention through sustainable social development; and
- messaging that enhances public awareness of crime prevention through sustainable social development.

The Coalition does not carry out specific social development projects nor does it provide funding.

Membership:

Any national-level organization or any individual involved in community safety, crime prevention and/or social development in its broadest terms and agreeing with the mandate of the Coalition.

Advisory Committee:

Overall direction is provided by an Advisory Committee of twelve to fifteen members elected from the Coalition membership for a two-year term and including at least one member from the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP). The Advisory Committee is co-chaired by a representative from the CACP and one representative from a non-governmental organization.

Secretariat:

Dedicated staff housed, as required, by one of the Coalition member organizations and responsible for support to the Advisory Committee, preparation and distribution of information and other tasks identified by the Advisory Committee Co-chairs.

Membership Categories:**Full Membership:***a) Who can join:*

- open to organizations

b) Role of full member:

- full voting privileges
- eligible to sit on the Advisory Committee
- receives information, publications, updates, etc.
- assumes responsibility for ongoing work of the Coalition
- takes an active role in promoting action on crime prevention through sustainable social development
- annual fee (1 April through 31 March) of \$500

Associate Membership:*a) Who can join:*

- open to organizations or individuals

b) Role of associate member:

- receives information, publications, updates, etc.
- supports mandate and objectives of the Coalition
- annual fee (1 April through 31 March) of \$100

Voting Rights:

Each organization having full membership has one vote.

The Coalition promotes consensus while respecting the agenda of individual member organizations; not every member has to sign on to every position taken officially by the Coalition.

Sustainability:

Funding is provided by:

- member organizations through their annual fees;
- CACP, as possible;
- private sector sponsorships;
- foundations; and
- government grants in support of annual meetings.

Any transfer of funds made as a result of a request from the Secretariat is handled by the CACP which has fiduciary responsibility.

“In kind” contributions are provided by member organizations to support the Secretariat (e.g., office space, translation services, ITT costs, printing, postage, office supplies, etc.)

Strategic Goals, 2007-09:

1. Develop a National Framework for Action on Community Safety, Health and Well-being.
2. Increase Coalition membership.

Annex D

Detailed Outputs from Brainstorming Session on Priorities (as expressed in participants' notes)

Building the Framework

- 1) Document our Framework and get organizations to officially support it.
- 2) Hire someone (e.g., author of “The Tipping Point”) to submit a proposal/blueprint to CCSHW on how best to create the social change we desire, from a social marketing perspective; clarify our messages and identify strategies for delivering them.
- 3) External - National Strategy with consultations; key reports along the way, leading to National Conference.
- 4) Develop strategies to hold different levels and players accountable for implementing crime prevention actions that work.
- 5) Identify process to build National Framework or Strategy for action to create/sustain safe, healthy communities.
- 6) Prepare strategic plan with outputs.

Communications /Advocacy

- 1) Speak to FPT governments as a Coalition (\$14M).
- 2) Education - sell the product/get the word out to:
 - a) our own organization
 - b) government
 - c) community
- 3) Prepare communications plan on opportunities for community safety.
- 4) Create an arm's length crime prevention commission with a budget of 5% of total federal budget.

Networking and building the Coalition

- 1) Look to similar networks which may already be making progress that we can build on such as National Health, Education and Enforcement in Partnership (HEP) or the National Framework for Action to Reduce the Harms Associated with Alcohol, Other Drugs and Substances in Canada.
- 2) Identify and involve other organizations and individuals to support the work of the Coalition to ensure inclusion is respected/reflected.
- 3) Seek government support for the Coalition to build a national framework.
- 4) Recruit new kinds of partners from socio-economic analysis fields, e.g., Caledon Communication Foundations (???)
- 5) Assess commitment to access to National Showcase – how representative will it be?
- 6) Get input from the “human dimension”, from grassroots: community groups, neighbourhood watch, community association, testimonies from families and schools.

Funding

- 1) Work with NCPC to obtain short term, “transitional funding” (e.g., 6 months).
- 2) Attract sponsorship or identify sources to sustain work.
- 3) (Internal) Sustainability group
 - a) funders
 - b) corporate
 - c) membership
- 4) Showcase in March: invite private sector, partners/potential sources for future funds.

Knowledge base

- 1) Assemble accurate information and messages about crime prevention actions that work.
- 2) Commit to sharing coalition with local and provincial/national crime prevention partners - showcase communications marketing based on successes.
- 3) Create key messages regarding our work on crime prevention through social development - disseminate through our constituencies.