PRACTITIONER GUIDE

on Crime Prevention and Community Safety & Well-Being Planning

CANADIAN MUNICIPAL NETWORK ON CRIME PREVENTION
Together for Safer Canadian Cities

RÉSEAU MUNICIPAL CANADIEN EN PRÉVENTION DE LA CRIMINALITÉ
Ensemble pour des villes canadiennes plus sécuritaires

This document is based on a national review of crime prevention and community safety & well-being plans, expert reviews, and additional resources.

Funded by:

- The City of Brantford (Ontario)
- The City of Burnaby (British Columbia)
- The City of Edmonton (Alberta)
- The City of Halifax (Nova Scotia)
- Halton Region (Ontario)
- Kent Regional Service Commission (New Brunswick)
- The City of Ottawa (Ontario)
- The City of Red Deer (Alberta)
- The City of Thunder Bay (Ontario)
- Waterloo Region (Ontario)
- The City of Winnipeg (Manitoba)
- York Region (Ontario)
- The Federation of Canadian Municipalities

This report is Part 1 of 2 documents related to Crime Prevention and Community Safety & Well-Being plans developed by CMNCP. Part 1 includes a detailed breakdown of the stages and best-practice elements involved in the development of CP/CSWB plans and Part 2 (forthcoming) is a toolkit that accompanies this document and can be used as a checklist when developing and implementing a CP/CSWB plan.

CMNCP

November 2020 Version 1

DISCLAIMER

This is a living document. New evidence, best practices, and promising practices emerge regularly. As a result, the information is neither comprehensive nor inclusive. To offer feedback or suggestions for additional information, please contact the Canadian Municipal Network on Crime Prevention (CMNCP) using info@safercities.ca

Information and documents for this practitioner's report were collected by CMNCP staff via reviews of existing Crime Prevention and Community Safety & Well-Being (CP/CSWB) plans, interviews, feedback from CMNCP members, publications from government websites, and other sources.

The purpose of the practitioner's report is to offer guidance and information on best practices related to the development and implementation of local CP/CSWB plans.

REVIEWERS

This Topic Summary was reviewed by:

- Jan Fox (REACH Edmonton)
- Scott McKean (City of Toronto)
- Jeff Honey (City of Winnipeg)
- Paul Lang (Kent Regional Service Commission)
- Christiane Sadeler (Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council)
- The Federation of Canadian Municipalities

CITATION

Canadian Municipal Network on Crime Prevention. (2020). *Practitioner Guide on Crime Prevention and Community Safety & Well-Being Planning*.

CANADIAN MUNICIPAL NETWORK ON CRIME PREVENTION

The Canadian Municipal Network on Crime Prevention is a Canadian membership-based community of practice mandated to build capacity and mobilize Canadian communities to prevent and reduce crime and foster community safety and well-being. For more information visit www.safercities.ca

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The main findings from CMNCP's review of Crime Prevention and Community Safety and Well-Being plans across Canada are as follows:

GENERAL



There is no "one-size-fits-all" approach to community safety and well-being planning. While there will undoubtedly be overlap, all plans have unique elements based on the specific needs and capacities of the location in which they have been developed and the same will occur with future CP/CSWB strategies. Approaches will also depend on the legislative requirements outlined by the governing body in each location.

Emphasize the importance of upstream, preventative approaches. This is often a challenge but investing in early responses will significantly reduce the need for interventions later on.

Flexibility is key. Unforeseen circumstances will arise and adjustments may be needed based on the experience of the community. This has recently been the case with the COVID-19 pandemic which significantly shifted priorities in communities across Canada and beyond.

RELATIONSHIPS



Ideally, a CP/CSWB plan requires community collaboration at all stages. Input and feedback from local stakeholders, residents, people with lived and living experience, as well as others within the community is vital to effectively identifying and addressing priority areas. Stakeholder input at the outset is critical.

Plans should be co-developed with the community. Regular community report-backs throughout the process are also crucial. This builds buy-in and political support.

A multi-sectoral approach is essential to this process. No single entity has the capacity to address the complex risks and protective factors associated with CP/CSWB. Examples of different sectors include education, health, child welfare, housing, Indigenous centres, priority populations such as black people and people of colour, LGBTQ+, and policing.

Building new, diverse relationships and leveraging existing connections is crucial to generate support and collaboration within the community.

FUNDING/RESOURCES

Funding may vary substantially and may be difficult to obtain. As a result, it is vital to discuss resource availability and allocation during the pre-development phase and ensure time and resources are used wisely.

Non-financial resources, including in-kind, should also be discussed alongside funding. There are many benefits of convening and collaborating, such as knowledge exchange.

DATA COLLECTION

Conducting a Community Safety Assessment is a vital step in identifying which resources are available and what gaps need to be filled in the community. It is important to include quantitative and qualitative data sources in this process because in combination they can provide a more holistic understanding of local risks and protective factors.

Asset-mapping is a key step to determine which CP/CSWB resources are available in the community, where, and how to more effectively coordinate interventions.

Measuring crime rates exclusively does not offer a full picture of well-being and as a result, other aspects such as community connectedness and civic engagement should be evaluated to determine the impact of a CP/CSWB plan.

EVALUATION

Sometimes the effects of a strategy or plan take time to emerge and therefore may not be fully captured in the early phases of an evaluation. However, the impact of collaborations as a result of the collective approach to planning can be assessed early on in the process.

When conducting an evaluation, it is important to collect information on both quantitative and qualitative CP/CSWB indicators to fully capture the effects of any strategy.

The findings in this document are neither comprehensive nor universal. As such, while they reflect general trends in the communities reviewed, each 'best practice' identified will not apply to every location. Communities will need to assess their own needs and priorities, and tailor their responses to these in order to achieve CP/CSWB at the local level. This document is intended to serve as a guiding tool for the development of future CP/CSWB plans based on the information collected from a general overview of the work that has been done on previous CP/CSWB plans as well as additional documents and notes from CMNCP and its members.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In recent years, there has been greater emphasis nationally and internationally among governments (including the Government of Canada) and global groups such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and United Nations (UN) on the importance of developing comprehensive and integrated upstream strategies to prevent crime and enhance community safety. The UN Habitat Safer Cities Programme[ii] emphasizes the importance of not only addressing the root causes of crime, violence, and insecurity through evidence-based practice, but simultaneously contributing positively to the social and economic development of the community when preparing and implementing local safety strategies. Additionally, it is important that any crime prevention and community safety & well-being plan also identifies and addresses local needs and priorities. This is a key component to effectively mitigating risk factors and promoting safety at the community level.[iii]

This emphasis on the importance of safety strategies has been reinforced by the Government of Ontario through its 2019 *Comprehensive Police Services Act* (Bill 68).[1] According to the Government of Ontario website, the goal of this provincial mandate is to establish a proactive and collaborative approach to community safety and well-being planning, in which the municipalities will take the lead in identifying and responding to local needs alongside other community service providers.[iv] Currently, other provinces are also working on their own guidelines for CP/CSWB plans, albeit not through legislation at the time of this report. Across Canada, several locations have had these plans in place for several years, while others are in various stages of developing them.

Given the increasing number of Canadian municipalities that will be establishing their own CP/CSWB plans and strategies in the near future, the purpose of this document is to provide a guideline for the development of such plans based on learnings from previous work in other communities, as well as best practices identified by CMNCP and expert reviewers. Building on work completed by York Region (Ontario), CMNCP staff reviewed the completed plans of ten Canadian municipalities to identify key findings from the development stage, all the way to evaluation, where possible. The body of the report is divided into four sections, highlighting the different phases of plan development, which are as follows: Pre-Development, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation.

[1] Schedule 1 of Bill 68 is the *Community Safety and Policing Act* of which Part XVI states that "Every municipality shall prepare and, by resolution, adopt a community safety and well-being plan" by January 1st, 2021 (Section 248).

WHAT IS COMMUNITY SAFETY AND WELL-BEING?


A key aspect of developing an effective Community Safety and Well-Being (CSWB) plan is having a strong understanding of what this term refers to and why the framework is important.

Conceptual Definition: "A targeted, aggregate result of our broader human service system that is achieved through collaborative generation of pragmatic solutions, evidence-based innovations, and shared community outcomes. It is the state at which the composite needs of a community's collective safety and well-being are achieved. Such needs are met when conditions of risk are mitigated, vulnerability is reduced, and the occurrence of harm is nil."[v]

Practical Definition: "The combined outcome from the greatest absence of crime, addiction, mental suffering, violence, poverty, homelessness, sickness, injury and/or other social harms that a community can collectively achieve."[vi]

In other words, CSWB refers to a sustainable state where everyone in the community is safe, feels a sense of belonging, has opportunities for engagement and participation, and individuals and families are able to meet their needs for education, healthcare, food, housing, income, and social and cultural expression. This is achieved through long-term, collaborative efforts to promote CSWB and reduce crime and other risks in the community using evidenced-based responses that address unique local circumstances and the needs of residents.[vii]

According to the 2018 Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General report titled *Community Safety and Well-being Planning Framework*[viii], there are four key aspects of CP/CSWB that everyone involved in the planning process should be familiar with. They are outlined in the image below[2]:



Promoting and maintaining community safety and well-being

Proactively reducing identified risks

Mitigating situations of elevated risk

Critical and non-critical incident response

[2] Visual from Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General *Community Safety and Well-being Planning Framework* Section 2 which can be found at: https://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/Publications/MCSCSSSOPlanningFramework.html

- **Social Development:** Refers to long-term, upstream investments to improve social determinants of health. This involves a broad range of sectors, agencies, and groups working collaboratively to address complex social issues like poverty, from all angles.
- **Prevention:** Refers to the implementation of proactive approaches (policies, programs, etc.) grounded in evidence to address local risks to CP/CSWB before they lead to crime, victimization, and/or harm.
- **Risk Intervention:** This aspect involves collaboratively addressing situations in which there is an elevated risk that harm will occur and preventing it just before it happens.
- **Incident Response:** This element refers to immediate response measures to situations that arise, such as crimes being committed or a fire in the community. These efforts most closely represent policing and first line responder mandates.

While it is recommended that planning occur in relation to each of these categories, particular emphasis should be placed on the outer layers including social development, prevention, and risk intervention to reduce the number of incidents that occur and therefore the need for response measures. Thus, the emphasis of these plans should be primarily on more upstream prevention approaches to promote CP/CSWB and reduce harms from occurring in the first place.

REVIEW OF CP/CSWB PLANS ACROSS CANADA

As highlighted in the *UN Habitat Annual Progress Report 2019*[ix], cities and settlements should be places where all residents are safe and enjoy equal rights and opportunities. This involves reducing and eliminating incidents and fear of criminal activity through integrated approaches that engage all levels of government and relevant stakeholders and span across multiple sectors, including housing, education, social development, policing, etc.[x] Given this emphasis on promoting safety and well-being in communities around the world, CMNCP reviewed plans of ten communities across Canada to examine the process(es) they went through in developing and implementing their respective CP/CSWB plans with the purpose of guiding the development of future strategies. The community plans that were reviewed include:

- Burnaby, British Columbia
- Surrey, British Columbia
- Edmonton, Alberta
- Bancroft, Ontario
- Brantford, Ontario
- Halton Region, Ontario
- Kenora, Ontario
- Thunder Bay, Ontario
- Waterloo Region, Ontario
- Halifax, Nova Scotia

During the time of the consultations, the communities were at different points of development and/or implementation of their CP/CSWB plans.[3] As a result, information was gathered based on the progress that had been made at that point. There is also additional information incorporated into this practitioner's guide based on other relevant sources (e.g. UN Habitat) and expert review.

REVIEW PROCESS


The review process consisted of four steps: preparation, document review, data collection, and developing the report. After preparing a list of questions and indicators to examine, CMNCP staff gathered the available CP/CSWB plans that were at least 50% completed during this stage (See Appendix 2 for links to each plan). Following this, the documents were reviewed and analyzed. Key themes, processes, and considerations were highlighted, and follow-up questions were prepared. Interviews were conducted with key individuals involved in the development and implementation of each plan (a full list of interview questions is available in Appendix 3) to clarify content, plan structure, key development processes, and implementation strategies.

To supplement the data collected from the review, CMNCP staff then incorporated additional information obtained from literature reviews and other documents related to CP/CSWB as well as input from various expert reviewers. The information was then compiled into this document to provide guidance for other locations developing their own CP/CSWB plans. The document was then disseminated and reviewed by CMNCP members who provided additional feedback based on their own expert knowledge and experience.

[3] Important to note is that for some communities the plan reviewed may be a new or revised version.

FINDINGS

Overall, CMNCP identified a number of key themes and considerations from the development and implementation of the reviewed CP/CSWB plans. Those key themes and considerations are organized based on the four phases of development identified above and are discussed in more detail here.



1. PRE-DEVELOPMENT



The pre-development phase refers to the work that was done in preparation for the development of the respective CP/CSWB plans. From reviewing the different plans, several key steps were identified. These include communicating and collaborating with key stakeholders, the establishment of advisory committees, requests for proposals, and examining options for resources/funding

SUMMARY OF KEY LEARNINGS

Key learnings that emerged from a review of the pre-development stages include the importance of communication and collaboration with local stakeholders to generate buy-in as well as establishment of a trained advisory committee with multi-sectoral membership. In addition, obtaining funding and other resources, including in-kind and political support, is often a challenge and should be considered early in the process to determine how the work will be completed and by whom.

1.1 COMMUNICATION WITH KEY STAKEHOLDERS

A key aspect of developing an effective CP/CSWB plan is generating support and buy-in from local stakeholders through communication. The plan review process shed light on the large number of partners that were involved the development of each plan including social service agencies, government officials, and local law enforcement (for more information see Section 1.2 below). This finding reflects best practice with respect to addressing the multitude of factors that contribute to community safety and well-being.

An important aspect of communicating with different groups in the community, such as youth and people with lived experience, is reaching out and engaging them in a way that is accessible and comfortable for them. In many cases, this may mean meeting them where they are and seeking advice from community leaders (i.e., Elders) on the best way to do this.[xixii]

Some suggested methods for communication with local stakeholders include:

- ❒ Meetings (one-on-one and group meetings)
- ❒ Presentations
- ❒ Newsletters
- ❒ Web pages
- ❒ Emails
- ❒ Advisory committee members
- ❒ eSubscriptions
- ❒ Networks and other programs that involve engaging in contact with them
- ❒ Community partners – sending to their networks

1.2 COLLABORATION WITH KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Addressing the complexities of challenges related to CP/CSWB requires coordinated efforts by a wide range of sectors within the community including (but not limited to) government, not-for-profit, business, education, police, healthcare, and city planning. Multi-sector collaboration involves "the linking or sharing of information, resources, activities, and capabilities by organizations in two or more sectors to achieve jointly, an outcome that could not be achieved by organizations in one sector separately."[xiii] This means bringing interested and invested partners from different sectors together around a common vision, mission, and/or goal.

Given that crime and victimization are typically influenced by intersecting systems (housing, education, poverty, etc.), addressing factors related to them often requires the greatest degree of collaboration among partners (formal roles, shared decision-making, frequent communication, high levels of trust, pooling of resources). Additionally, there are several benefits to collaboration, including greater capacity to define and respond to problems as a result of the combined knowledge and expertise around the table; greater access to resources as each party can contribute to the larger group; greater influence and credibility based on the support of multiple stakeholders with the power to generate support; a higher likelihood of long-term sustainability as a result of the combined efforts to secure networks and support from various sectors; and greater ownership from all involved over the design of the plan and its implementation success.

While collaboration involves multiple sectors working to achieve a common goal, there are several different forms it can take. Research indicates that of these different types, collective impact[xiv] has the potential to increase the collaborative's chances for success as it involves having "a centralized infrastructure, a dedicated staff, and a structured process that leads to a common agenda, shared measurements, continuous communication, and mutually reinforcing activities among all participants".[xv] In other words, having a backbone organization to oversee the collaboration increases its chances for success. In fact, research demonstrates that not having infrastructure to support collaborations is one of the key reasons they are unsuccessful.[xvi] This is because the backbone organization consists of dedicated staff who are not affiliated with the collaborating partners and are responsible for overseeing and supporting the process to ensure everything runs smoothly.

While there is ample evidence that demonstrates the value of having a backbone organization, it is important to acknowledge that this may not always be the case and successful collaborations can still occur without one. In these cases, partners

will need to ensure they are able to address issues as they arise and that others can step in to lend support in similar ways to staff from a backbone organization.

As mentioned above, addressing issues related to CP/CSWB requires participation from multiple sectors. It is important to recognize that working with these different groups may pose unique challenges that need to be addressed to maintain a positive working relationship and ensure that decisions and actions reflect the values and needs of multiple parties. Based on a review of academic literature as well as feedback from participants at the April 2017 CMNCP conference, some common barriers to collaboration have been identified and included in the chart below. If not managed properly, these issues can prevent cross-sector collaborations from occurring and/or being sustainable. As such, it is important to take steps to facilitate significant, effective, and healthy cross-sector collaborations. To do so, potential solutions to each barrier have also been included in the chart below.

Potential Barriers to Collaboration	Potential Solutions
Leadership	
Lack of leadership (i.e., not having a clearly defined individual/agency/group to oversee operations).	Ensure the collaborative has strong leadership from the level(s) of government most directly impacted by issues involving CP/CSWB (e.g., members of municipal council).
Lack of structure (i.e., not engaging in collective impact and having a backbone organization).	Where possible, ensure the collaborative has a backbone organization with a dedicated staff to oversee operations and support the process.
Lack of understanding the collaboration lifecycle.[4]	Ensure partners are aware of the collaboration life cycle and what each step involves with respect to their participation.
Structure	
Lack of preparedness to collaborate.	Ensure partners are prepared to collaborate. This can include training on its advantages and what this process involves, an understanding of what the collaborative is trying to achieve, and conducting an organizational self-assessment.[5]
Inadequate resources or lack of sustained resources.	Ensure collaborative has adequate and sustainable resources including financial, in-kind, and partners that are each dedicated to achieving the goals of the collaborative.
Competition over limited resources.	Work with competitors to pool resources, skills, and experiences to benefit the collective and achieve goals.

[4] Collaboration Life Cycle refers to the process through which the coordination of work occurs. It includes four stages: Initiation, Formation, Operation, and Decomposition. For more detail see Tellio˘glu, 2008: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4341441_Collaboration_life_cycle

[5] Organizational assessments ideally include an assessment of degree of organizational attitudes and commitment to collaborative work at many levels, a review of organizational missions in regards to community-engaged scholarship, and availability of organizational resources. For more detail, please see Munger & Reimer, 2012.

Potential Barriers to Collaboration	Potential Solutions
Different funding sources with competing mandates to which parties are accountable.	Ensure shared understanding of mandates for different funding sources to which various partners are accountable and develop strategies that can accommodate them as much as possible.
Lack of efficient structures and support systems for collaboration (i.e., backbone organization).	Reduce inefficiencies in the structure of the collaborative and support systems. Ensure that there is clarity around which structure supports the collaborative, accountability, etc.
Process	
Collaborations take time.	Recognize that cross-sector collaborations take time to be developed and sustained and express this requirement upfront with the collaborative.
Inadequate time spent on developing a shared vision, establishing clear and specific objectives, and establishing a common agenda; or, predetermined objectives not allowing room for partners to help shape and refine objectives.	Ensure partners spend adequate time establishing clear and specific objectives and developing a shared vision and common agenda. Allow opportunities for partners to participate in the development of collaborative objectives.
Inadequate time spent building trust among collaboration members.	Dedicate time and processes to build trust among partners of the collaborative via meetings in-person and as a group, trust-building activities, incorporating feedback from partners, etc.
Group Dynamics	
Negative relationships among participants.	Dedicate processes to building positive relationships among partners, i.e., through understanding the needs and interests of each group and attempting to develop a solution that appeals to everyone.
Territoriality over work.	Recognition and respect for the work of others; seek ways to support one another while recognizing and emphasizing that all participants share the common, universal goal of enhancing community safety and well-being.
History of communities being exploited by collaboration partners.	Understand historical relationships between partners and communities and take steps to ensure exploitation does not occur. For example, establishing a reference group and/or steering committee with community members who can play an active role in decision-making.

Potential Barriers to Collaboration	Potential Solutions
Cultural differences between partners.	Ensure cultural competency is established via training and developing an understanding of the needs of each group.
Difficult group dynamics.	Dedicate time and processes to ensure the collaborative is beneficial to all partners.
Limited information sharing (inability or perception that it cannot be done).	Establish information-sharing agreements, recognize that it can be done and is beneficial
Collaboration facilitator becoming partial to some members over others.	Collaboration facilitator (this could refer to a backbone organization, steering committee, council, or other decision-making alliance) should maintain neutrality with partners.
Different levels of competence and/or capacity to address issues or contribute.	Recognize the capacities of each partner and focus on drawing out contributions that they are effective at or specialize in.

While the chart above highlights general challenges and approaches to multi-sectoral work, in seeking collaboration with particular groups, there may also be unique circumstances or considerations to be aware of, which will be discussed in greater detail below.



For additional information and resources related to cross-sector collaboration, please see Appendix 4.

Overview of Potential Stakeholders:

- ❒ Elected Officials
- ❒ Police
- ❒ Indigenous Peoples
- ❒ Businesses
- ❒ Health Services
- ❒ Correctional Services
- ❒ Community/Social Services
- ❒ Funders
- ❒ Education
- ❒ Focused Populations
- ❒ Research and Development
- ❒ Emergency Services



This is by no means an exhaustive list. It is simply included to offer examples and considerations for collaboration. Please refer to section 1.3 for additional suggestions.

CONSIDERATIONS WHEN WORKING WITH STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

Below we discuss four stakeholder groups that will be core to effective collaborations. While there are many other stakeholders, these groups have been selected for a more detailed discussion because our experience shows that there tends to be a lack of familiarity in working with them. As such, the additional information below is intended to add clarity to this process by providing more detail with respect to specific considerations when working alongside them. CMNCP recognizes that there may be useful suggestions pertaining to collaborations with other groups; however, those discussed below reflect the current state of information we have been able to obtain for this document.

ELECTED OFFICIALS

Working with elected officials is an important part in the promotion of CP/CSWB as these individuals have the capacity to champion and influence policy and legislative change as well as strategic and funding priorities within different levels of government. In working alongside elected officials, there are some key things that should be taken into consideration. First, regardless of their position, these individuals remain members of the community who are accountable to its diverse needs and interests. Additionally, they are often attempting to maneuver competing interests, such as those of government officials at different levels as well as the community. Thus, the importance of developing strong relationships with elected officials is key to collaboration.

At the same time, not everyone is at liberty to establish these relationships with elected officials, highlighting the importance of leveraging the connections of those who are. Much like other relationships, this process should involve trust, integrity, transparency, confidentiality, as well as trying to find solutions that benefit both parties. A key aspect of establishing a strong relationship with elected officials that can result in change is ensuring a strong understanding of what their job is, how policy/legislation is developed/altered, doing the necessary preliminary research to justify why a change needs to occur, and maintaining the relationship through ongoing communication.

POLICE

The police play an integral role in the development and implementation of CP/CSWB strategies as they are generally the leaders with respect to crime prevention in the community. At the same time, they also recognize the importance of others in this process. As a result, they often collaborate with a variety of different groups both within and outside the criminal justice sector. These include, but are not limited to, probation, the courts, mental health services, and the school system.[xvii] More recently, the police have worked alongside other sectors to engage in upstream prevention initiatives. Research demonstrates that to effectively address the underlying causes of crime, this process should involve a diverse range of sectors[xviii], reflecting the complexity of these factors. Collaboration between the community and the police allows crime

prevention initiatives to go above and beyond traditional methods (i.e., law and order), and address the diverse needs of the community, including those of vulnerable populations.

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

In developing a CP/CSWB plan, or any other program/policy, it is important to consider how it will impact all groups in the community, such as Indigenous Peoples, and ensure that it not only respects their rights, but is relevant to them as well. To do this, there are a number of principles that have been outlined in CMNCP's *Charter of Indigenous Community Engagement*[xix] which was developed based on frameworks from groups including the United Nations, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada, as well as Indigenous ethics protocols such as the Inter Tribal Health Authority. They are as follows:

1. Respecting and promoting respect for the diversity and unique interests of Indigenous Peoples.

Acknowledge historic, and current impacts; recognizing our own systemic privilege, bias, and assumptions; deepening our understanding of Indigenous dynamics, systems, and structures; develop relevant materials, programs, and strategies; provide Indigenous-led training on understanding and combating racism, prejudice, oppression, discrimination, and marginalization while promoting understanding and good relations.

2. Supporting the inclusion and participation of Indigenous Peoples.

Include Indigenous representatives, selected by their own communities, in the decision-making process in all four phases of CP/CSWB plan development.

3. Incorporating and promoting Indigenous knowledge(s) and holistic approaches to crime prevention, community safety, and well-being.

Include Indigenous knowledge and approaches to CP/CSWB to support Indigenous populations.

4. Facilitating partnerships, collaboration, and capacity revealing amongst indigenous communities and organizations.

Invest in partnerships with Indigenous communities and Indigenous-led agencies and collaborate in a long-term, mutually-beneficial way.

5. Ensuring the development and implementation of relevant initiatives and activities by reflecting the needs of those being served and building on the strengths of communities.

Develop cultural resources that highlight Aboriginal strengths, perspectives, knowledge, and traditional practices.

6. Ensuring research and evaluation of CP/CSWB initiatives in Indigenous communities adheres to the relevant Indigenous research protocols, including OCAP and any community-specific research ethics protocols.

Consent and consult with Indigenous communities prior to beginning any research or evaluation practices, collaborate and agree on research ethics protocols, ensure research and evaluation activities are participatory, and present findings in an accessible format including translating some materials into the local language.

BUSINESSES

In addition to collaborating with various partners in the public sector, it should also be noted that working alongside private organizations, such as local businesses or large enterprises, can be beneficial. As highlighted by the European Forum on Urban Safety (EFUS)[xx] these companies play an important role in the development of cities and towns and can contribute both financial as well as human resources and other expertise to partnerships. While occasionally these collaborations can be challenging as a result of differences in professional culture and operations, it is recommended that private-public partnerships seek to build on the strengths of one another, identify common goals and priorities, establish regulations for collaborating, and ensure that the needs of the entire community are taken into consideration.[xxi]

1.3 ESTABLISHING AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The importance of community collaboration is highlighted in research as well as the Ontario legislation. As such, in addition to generating support, communicating with various individuals and agencies from the community is a key step in establishing an advisory committee for a CP/CSWB plan. Having a representative committee is vital, as it allows for the establishment of partnerships between different groups that can address local needs. Additionally, it results in the development of a group of individuals with a range of knowledge, skills, and resources they can leverage to identify current and emerging issues and determine the best way to respond to them and plan for their prevention in the future. For example, individuals from the police and health care sectors are likely to increase access to information such as local crime statistics and hospital data. Please see below for a list of potential advisory committee members based on findings from provincial legislation, plan reviews, and best-practice.

Suggested Advisory Committee Members	
General Categories	**Sub Groups**
❒ Health Services	❒ Addictions ❒ Community Health Centres ❒ Long-term Care Homes/Retirement Homes ❒ Local Health Integration Network* ❒ Mental Health (Adults) ❒ Mental Health (Youth) ❒ CMHA ❒ Medical Officer of Health ❒ Public Health ❒ Hospital representatives ❒ Provincial Department of Health Representatives ❒ SCSs and Other Harm Reduction Efforts

Suggested Advisory Committee Members	
General Categories	**Sub Groups**
❒ Education*	❒ Local School Boards (Public, Catholic, and French) ❒ Post-Secondary Education ❒ Provincial Department of Education
❒ Community/Social Services*	❒ Community and/or Social Services (Child/Youth)* ❒ Community Development ❒ Community-at-Large ❒ Neighbourhood Development ❒ Women's Crisis Services ❒ Restorative Justice, Rural Representative ❒ Urban Representative ❒ Commissioner of Social Services ❒ Family and Children's Services ❒ Victim Services ❒ Employment Support ❒ Housing, Homelessness ❒ Children's Aid Society ❒ Ministry of Children and Youth Services ❒ John Howard Society ❒ United Way
❒ Custodial/Correctional Services*	❒ Custodial Services (Child/Youth)* ❒ Local Warden ❒ Children's Aid Society
❒ Municipality*	❒ Employee of Municipality* ❒ Member of Municipal Council* ❒ Regional Chair ❒ By-law Services ❒ Social Planning

Suggested Advisory Committee Members	
General Categories	**Sub Groups**
❒ Focused Populations (i.e., people with increased likelihood to be victimized)	❒ Indigenous Peoples ❒ LGBTQ+ ❒ Older Adults ❒ Persons with Disabilities ❒ Youth ❒ Women and Girls ❒ Racialized People ❒ Faith Communities
❒ Research & Development	❒ Universities/Colleges
❒ Criminal Justice	❒ Crown Attorney ❒ Legal Aid ❒ Community Safety and Correctional Services ❒ Probation and Parole ❒ Crime Stoppers
❒ Emergency Services	❒ Paramedic Services ❒ Fire Department
❒ Funders	
*Indicates membership mandated by the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General	

In addition to the required advisory committees, some municipalities also established working groups, task forces, and/or hired coordinators/consultants to provide guidance.

1.4 EXAMINING RESOURCES/FUNDING OPTIONS

With respect to financial resources, a review of the existing CP/CSWB plans highlighted the range of funding sources that were used in this process. Some plans were implemented with funding from their respective municipalities, while other locations relied on resources secured through grants. Additionally, some locations were provided federal funding to serve as pilot sites for CP/CSWB plan implementation. Please refer to Appendix 5 for additional information on funding sources from CMNCP's review.

While only two locations provided numbers with respect to the budgets used to implement their CP/CSWB plans, a consistent finding in speaking with the different individuals associated with this process was the difficulty in securing funding to support them. In Ontario, for example, aside from the two pilot locations (Bancroft and Brantford), no other locations received government or other funding to support the development (and implementation)

of their CP/CSWB plan (at the time of the report). While others have applied for various grants and explored additional funding opportunities, this highlights a key factor that other communities should consider in the pre-development phase and throughout the remaining stages as well – how they will finance this process – as it will strongly affect the project moving forward with respect to feasibility. As a result, a funding framework should be established early on and will likely need to be updated throughout the process as different options may become available (i.e. grants) and alterations are made to the original CP/CSWB plan.

CMNCP recognizes the importance of funding in this process and while additional information is highly valuable, this information is out of scope for the current report. At the same time, given the substantial impact that funding has on the development and implementation of CP/CSWB plans, there is potential for future work to elaborate further in this area.

REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS

While some municipalities assigned existing staff to complete their CP/CSWB plans, another way in which individuals were hired for this work was through the use of a Request for Proposals (RFP).[6] Not all locations used RFPs to recruit community collaborators in this process. Ultimately, the decision to put out an RFP will differ by location, depending on suitability as well as the availability of resources to fund the hiring of an external entity or individual to support this process. As a result, this is something each location will have to consider when assessing the availability of resources during the pre-development phase.

In the case of CMNCP's review, three of the municipalities put out RFPs to aid in the development of their respective CP/CSWB plans. The documents included details pertaining to the project scope, expectations, as well as ideal qualifications of potential bidders. Please refer to Appendix 6 for a sample RFP. Proposals were then evaluated by respective steering/advisory committees based on pre-established criteria. Please refer to Appendix 7 for sample proposal evaluation criteria. This process allowed these locations to hire external groups/agencies that were well-suited for the CP/CSWB plan implementation process to ensure they had experts with highly relevant skills involved in the process. Specifically, they targeted external parties specializing in areas the municipalities themselves lacked in expert knowledge. For example, Kenora wanted to hire someone to help them develop a scoring matrix for their CP/CSWB plan, so they went with an individual possessing that particular skillset.

It is important to recognize that RFPs are not a necessity for this process but could be beneficial if resources allow for them to be used.

[6] An RFP is a document that an organization or agency releases which outlines a specific project they would like completed and then yields responses (or bids) from different groups. Based on particular criteria (i.e. qualifications, cost, experience, etc.) the organization or agency may then select a particular respondent to complete the task.

2. DEVELOPMENT



The development phase refers to the process of preparing to implement the plan or strategy. Once the different municipalities/regions established their respective advisory committees, hired coordinators/consultants (if applicable), gathered support from local stakeholders, and determined the available funding and resources for their respective CP/CSWB plans (if applicable), they moved to the development process. This included steps like consulting with members of the community, determining local priority areas, and establishing a list of available services in the area.

SUMMARY

An examination of the development process engaged in by various municipalities, as well as additional research, highlights the importance of completing a comprehensive review of what is currently happening in the community. This gives communities an understanding of which resources are currently available, what is still needed, and which areas should be prioritized in CP/CSWB strategies. It also allows them to establish baseline measures for the evaluation stage.

2.1 COMMUNITY SAFETY AND WELL-BEING ASSESSMENTS

In addition to speaking with local participants and stakeholders from the community, another aspect of gathering information to inform CP/CSWB plan development is through the use of Community Safety and Well-Being Assessments. These assessments involve developing an understanding of key risks, safety concerns, root causes, and available services/resources at the local level. While there are several general risk factors that negatively affect CP/CSWB (i.e., poverty, lack of social supports, high crime

rates), each individual community will have unique circumstances that result in particularly pertinent issues they need to address to promote CP/CSWB at the local level. As a result, it is important to collect this information for each location to inform decisions going forward and ensure they effectively address relevant concerns at the community level. There are a few different ways that this information can be gathered, which are discussed below.[7]

QUANTITATIVE DATA AND ANALYSIS

Quantitative data and analysis involves the identification, collection, and analysis of indicators related to community context, demographics, crime and disorder, health and well-being, perceptions of safety, risk factors, as well as impact and economic costs of various local issues. The use of quantitative data is an important part of community safety assessments as they can "powerfully convey the dimensions of a particular problem or issue, providing answers to questions about *what* and *how* much is happening".[xxii] At the same time, it is important to note that quantitative data on its own cannot sufficiently provide a complete understanding of the full scope of an issue, and as a result, should also be considered in conjunction with qualitative data (see the Community Consultations section below).

As a means to aid communities seeking to collect quantitative data pertaining to CP/CSWB at the local level, CMNCP has developed a survey tool that is available for use and can be accessed here: (http://safercities.ca/evidence-on-crime-prevention/#topicsummaries). For additional information, please refer to the CMNCP's Topic Summaries titled *Crime Prevention and Community Safety & Well-Being Survey and Indicators for Crime Prevention and Community Safety & Well-Being Plans.*

A LOCAL EXAMPLE: Community Safety Deployment Model

An interesting example of quantitative data collection and analysis comes from the city of Edmonton, which, in conjunction with the Edmonton Police service and REACH Edmonton has developed a Community Safety Deployment Model which combines information from all three sources to track and predict incidents related to community safety and ensure that resources are deployed to the right place at the right time. The data used in this process includes date, time, and type of incident that occurred, excluding any identifiers. Examining previous instances and where they occur allows those in charge of resource allocation to deploy law enforcement based on evidence, which early testing has found to be 7x more effective than the use of random deployment. Given the positive implications this tool has had for CSWB in Edmonton thus far, other locations may also want to consider a similar model. For more information please contact ace@edmonton.ca.

ASSET MAPPING

Asset mapping refers to identifying which services and supports are already available in the community and what they are addressing. This helps to avoid duplication and identify gaps in service. In addition to developing an inventory of what is already offered, this process also involves mapping the services to examine levels of access by area, identifying service overlaps and areas without services, as well as documenting exceptional historical examples of service. It also includes the examination of social networks and pre-

[7] Please refer to CMNCP's Practitioner Guide for conducting a Community Safety Assessment for further guidance.

existing collaborations within the community, in addition to individual service-providers and assets. This knowledge provides a starting point from which those involved in the planning process can determine where they need to go next.[xxiii] Asset mapping is therefore an important step in CP/CSWB plan development as it allows communities to develop an understanding of where they may want to allocate more resources and which areas may require less attention.



Please refer to Tool 3 in the *Community Safety and Well-being Planning Framework*[xxiv] from the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General for a guideline on how to engage in this process.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATIONS

Another important aspect of developing a CP/CSWB plan is extensive consultations with community members, including people with lived experience. In conjunction with the quantitative data sources discussed above, this process involves the collection of qualitative data pertaining to CP/CSWB. This type of information provides an understanding with respect to the *how* and *why* questions related to community challenges.[xxvxxvi] Consulting with local residents also reflects best practice for responses to local challenges as it allows for informed decisions to be made and helps generate support from the larger community.

There were several different methods that were used by the Canadian municipalities to engage members of their respective communities. These included educating the public on factors related to community safety and well-being (e.g., crime prevention, personal safety, and building community capacity) to generate support for the plan, as well as collecting information from locals with respect to the strengths, needs, and suggestions for improvement within the community. This was completed through public information events, community forums/consultations, surveys, focus groups, and interviews.

While generic engagements with community members are valuable and necessary, CMNCP – in its own practice – subscribes to value-based community engagement that provides opportunities for all (with a specific focus on those that are marginalized and/or have increased vulnerability) to participate in a meaningful, safe, and inclusive manner. This means that instead of public consultations, CMNCP regularly engages women, seniors, youth, Indigenous communities, LGBTQ+ and people with lived experience (among others) to understand the specific experiences and needs of these groups. This approach ensures that those who are more vulnerable and marginalized have a voice – something that is not always the case in open public engagements, such as town halls. As a result, this is something that should also be considered when consulting with members of the community.

In preparing for community consultations, there are a number of things that should be discussed ahead of time. These include:

- The goals of the consultations (What is being accomplished from them?).
- Relevant topics related to CP/CSWB that should be covered.
- The information to be collected (What do we want to learn from them?).
- The types of questions to be asked – agree/disagree, open vs. close ended, etc.
- The most effective way of collecting this information – surveys, focus groups,

general community discussion, etc.

According to CMNCP's findings from the review, once information was collected from numerous community members (ranging from hundreds to thousands of residents across the different locations), it, along with the recommendations from local stakeholders, was used to identify key priorities as well as other elements including community safety assessments, strategies, goals, activities, how to allocate resources, and milestones for the CP/CSWB plans.

2.2 IDENTIFYING PRIORITIES

Given that every location developed its list of priorities based on feedback from local residents and stakeholders, each had a different set of key issues to address with its plan. Despite this, they all specified particular priority areas that needed to be addressed within their respective plans, highlighting the importance of this step in the development process. While there were a broad range of priorities listed across the different CP/CSWB plans that were reviewed, there were a number of general themes that emerged among them. They are as follows:

- Crime prevention and/or reduction
- Mental health and substance use/misuse (particularly for youth)
- Supporting individuals in precarious housing situations/homelessness
- Supporting individuals living in poverty
- Supporting vulnerable people (including seniors, women, children and youth)
- Building community capacity
- Developing safe community spaces
- Enhancing community connectedness and sense of belonging among locals

There was strong overlap in priority areas

> **You have to get the public to understand how investing in a soccer program now may stop those youth from engaging in crimes later on.**
>
> Brad Smith, Community Development Coordinator, City of Brantford

across all the locations CMNCP reviewed, reflecting a number of key aspects related to overall community safety and well-being. As previously mentioned, while not all were included for every location, the list does highlight a number of important areas municipalities may want to consider in establishing future CP/CSWB strategies, alongside feedback from community members and stakeholders who can inform the municipalities which areas need the most attention. At the same time, it is important to recognize that the priorities for each area will depend on local circumstances and resources. Thus, while this information is interesting, it does not mean that it will affect the list of priorities established by other communities. That being said, overlapping priorities may provide opportunities for information sharing and even future collaboration in addressing broader issues related to CP/CSWB.

Not only does establishing a list of key priority areas serve as an important part of the development process, it also provides an excellent starting point for the development of goals and plans moving into the implementation process. For example, some locations developed sub-groups or pillars to address their priorities and then determined the approaches they would take in response to each one (please see the Implementation section for more information).

2.3 IDENTIFYING STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS


In addition to key priorities, municipalities should also consider the strategies and actions that should be taken with respect to their CP/CSWB plan. Key questions may include:

- How will key priorities be addressed?
- Which strategies should/will be implemented to address key priorities and how?
- What actions are needed to implement strategies to address priorities?
- How will strategies be evaluated?

2.4 EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

In the process of developing the strategy, another important factor to consider is how the evaluation will be completed for each component. While the actual evaluation occurs later in the process, this information should be discussed early on to determine which measures and/or methods will be used to determine the impacts of each element of the plan, what needs to be put in place to allow this information to be captured, and to ensure that baseline measures can be taken for comparative purposes later on.

3. IMPLEMENTATION



The implementation phase refers to the process of putting the CP/CSWB plan in motion. This includes addressing the priorities and gaps mentioned above via local programs and services, as well as ongoing communication between different stakeholders to receive feedback and ensure progress is maintained.

SUMMARY

Limited information was collected for this stage of the process as a number of the communities had not reached the implementation stage; however, key considerations include developing and implementing programs tailored to local needs and priorities and maintaining consistent communication with stakeholders as well as residents to ensure a constant feedback loop.

3.1 LOCAL PROGRAMS

In examining the way the different communities implemented their CP/CSWB plans, there was a broad range of local programs, policies, and actions across multiple sectors designed to address the needs of each community. This finding highlights the importance of taking a comprehensive approach to reduce risk and promote community safety and well-being. Again, this reflects best practice according to research on improving community capacity and addressing the factors related to healthy communities. [xxviixxvii] Much like other steps discussed above, the programs implemented as part of the CP/CSWB plans were largely unique to their respective community and its immediate needs. While there were some overlaps in the aspects of CP/CSWB addressed by the various locations (e.g., resilience, community connectedness, crime reduction, etc.) the way these aspects were addressed differed by location. Additionally, the number and type of programs depend on the current need and available resources in each location.

3.2 ONGOING COMMUNICATION AND MONITORING OF PLAN

Continued communication between the different groups, committees, stakeholders, and the public was another important aspect of the implementation process of CP/CSWB plans. While this was highlighted above as an important step in the development phase, it became evident that discussions between the advisory committee, stakeholders, and members of the community should continue throughout the duration of this process. Not only does this ensure that everyone remains aware of what is going on, it also allows the effects (or lack thereof) of plan elements to be monitored. Thus, it ensures the continuous validation of the implementation of plan initiatives and allows for reflection and adjustments as necessary.

It is also recommended that the community engage in some form of annual 'celebration' or presentation highlighting the efforts of the committee and the achievements of the plan while also ensuring the public remains informed of what has been done and the results that have been achieved. This maintains transparency and provides an opportunity for feedback and reflection moving forward.

4. EVALUATION



The evaluation phase involves monitoring and assessing the impacts of the plan to determine its effects – both intended and unintended and whether or not it is achieving what it was designed to do, i.e., address local priorities. Only some of the locations that were reviewed by CMNCP had reached this phase in the development process. As such, the findings reflect the information collected from a sub-section of the ten original communities reviewed by CMNCP as indicated in on page 9, as well as additional information collected from academic sources and expert reviewers.

SUMMARY

Evaluating the impacts of any CP/CSWB strategy is a vital step to determine if it is having the desired effects and to identify any unintended consequences. While the actual evaluation occurs later on in the process of plan implementation, much of the preparation work occurs at the front end as information is gathered, priorities and key questions are determined, and indicators are identified with respective baseline measurements being collected. This is then used to assess if any changes have occurred over time and whether or not they are having the intended impacts on the community.

4.1 KEY QUESTIONS

Among the locations that had begun the evaluation phase of this process, some had identified key questions or considerations with respect to evaluation – in other words, what they were looking at with respect to evaluation. This included things like if the plan was being implemented in the way it was intended and how the strategy is initially

affecting different groups in the community. By outlining the aspects they wanted to evaluate, the municipalities could then use this to guide the next step in this process - measuring the effects of their CP/CSWB plans.

4.2 MEASURES

One of the most important steps when it comes to evaluating the impacts of a CP/CSWB plan (or any plan/strategy) is measuring the effects it has on the community. Only a couple of the locations in CMNCP's review were at this stage when the data were collected. This process required each community to determine how to examine the changes that have occurred in each area (e.g., community safety) the plan was designed to address. Typically, this process is done through the use of indicators - observable, measurable pieces of information about particular outcomes, which show the extent to which the outcome has been achieved. Indicators can be quantitative (numbers and statistics) or qualitative (judgments or perceptions) and are used to identify changes that have occurred in different areas. Using community safety as an example, some potential indicators might include:

- Quantitative: crime rate (before and after CP/CSWB plan implementation), percentage of students who feel safe at school (has this changed?)
- Qualitative: do locals feel safe walking alone late at night (has this been affected?); do residents feel more/less/equally confident in the criminal justice system since implementation of the CP/CSWB plan?

These are just some examples of the types of indicators communities can use to evaluate the effects of their CP/CSWB plans following their implementation. Collecting this data is a vital stage in the evaluation process as it

> **There are a lot of things that can't be quantified but may be working well for the community – quantitative data isn't always the indicator of success – sometimes you have to let time go by to see the results.**
>
> Robert Bernie, Community Mobilization Officer, Kenora OPP

not only demonstrates where the plan is effectively contributing to change, but also areas that may need to be re-assessed or addressed further.

From the review, examples of indicators that were used in evaluations include: the percentage of residents who feel their city is safe and the percentage of residents who reported a crime to the police. Additionally, some examples of how communities in CMNCP's review have measured the effects of their CP/CSWB plans include: baseline and follow-up surveys, interviews with community agencies, analysis of program data, participation in community events and programs like Friends of Crime Prevention, and an examination of crime trends and statistics.

Again, this highlights the importance of using both quantitative and qualitative data collection strategies to generate a more comprehensive picture of the effects of the CP/CSWB plan. Additionally, one community highlighted the importance of not only measuring the effects of their plan, but also general changes occurring in the community as well. Sometimes there are additional unanticipated benefits (or setbacks) that result from the implementation of local strategies to address particular issues that should not be overlooked.



For a more comprehensive discussion of indicators, please refer to CMNCP's Topic Summary document on Indicators for *Crime Prevention and Community Safety & Well-Being Plans* which can be accessed here: http://safercities.ca/evidence-on-crime-prevention/#topicsummaries

4.3 OUTCOMES

Once again, because few locations had reached this stage of the CP/CSWB plan implementation during CMNCP's review, very limited information was collected with respect to evaluation outcomes. Based on the measurements discussed above, communities were/will be able to evaluate the progress and outcomes of their CP/CSWB plans. They can determine which aspects of the plan are effectively addressing the priority areas outlined in the development phase, and which aspects of CP/CSWB are improving in the community. At the same time, they can use this data to determine next steps, including which aspects of the plan should continue as-is, where adjustments are needed, and which areas may need greater resources, among other things. Additionally, an important consideration that was pointed out in an interview during CMNCP's review is that many changes take time to occur and as a result, initial evaluations may not capture the longer-term effects of the implementation of CP/CSWB plans. As a result, it is important to give them time to impact the community and recognize that even small improvements may be indicative of greater changes to come.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: OVERVIEW OF ONTARIO CSWB PLAN REQUIREMENTS

For access to the full list of requirements, please refer to the Comprehensive Ontario Police Services Act 2019, Bill 68, Part XVI Section 248: https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/s19001#Sched1323

1. They may be prepared individually or jointly with other municipalities or band councils.
2. The CP/CSWB plan must be adopted within two years.
3. Alongside the CP/CSWB plan, the municipality (or municipalities) must also establish an advisory committee.
4. The advisory committee must include a person who represents each (or multiple) of the following:
    A. A local health integration network for a geographic area in which the municipality is located.
    B. An entity that provides services to the physical or mental health of individuals in the community or communities.
    C. An entity that provides educational services in the municipality.
    D. An entity that provides community or social services in the municipality.
    E. An entity that provides community or social services to youth in the municipality.
    F. An entity that provides custodial services to children or youth in the municipality.
    G. The municipality (i.e. an employee) or a member of the municipal council.
    H. The police service board, or the commander of the local OPP detachment.
    I. A chief of a police service that provides policing in the area or his/her delegate.
    J. Any other person prescribed by the Minister.
5. In preparing the CP/CSWB plan, consultations must be made with the following:
    A. The advisory committee
    B. Members of the public including youth, individuals who have received/are receiving mental health or addictions services, members of racialized groups and of First Nation, Inuit, and Métis communities in the municipality/municipalities and (if applicable) the First Nation Reserve
    C. Community organizations including First Nation, Inuit, and Métis organizations, and community organizations that represent youth or members of racialized groups, in the municipality/municipalities and (if applicable) the first Nation Reserve
    D. Any other consultation requirements prescribed by the Minister
6. Municipalities shall consider all available information related to crime, victimization, addiction, drug overdose, suicide, and any other risk factors prescribed by the Minister, including information from Statistics Canada or other sources, in addition to

information obtained through consultations.

7. CSWB plans should include the following:
    A. Local risk factors including systemic discrimination and other social factors that contribute to crime, victimization, drug overdose, suicide, and other risk factors prescribed by the Minister.
    B. Identify risk factors the municipality or First Nation will treat as priority to reduce.
    C. Identify strategies to reduce prioritized risk factors, including providing new services, changing existing services, improving the integration of existing services, or coordinating existing services in a different way.
    D. Set out measurable outcomes the strategies are intended to produce.
    E. Address any other issues or additional information prescribed by the Minister.
8. Publish the CP/CSWB on the Internet.
9. The municipality shall take actions required by the plan and encourage and assist other entities to do the same.
10. Monitor, evaluate, and report on the effect the plan is having on reducing prioritized risk factors and publish the subsequent reports on the Internet.
11. Review and revise the plan within the period prescribed by the Minister.
12. Provide the Minister information regarding the CP/CSWB plan preparation, adoption/implementation, outcomes, and any other matter prescribed by the Minister, within the allotted time period.

APPENDIX 2: LINKS TO REVIEWED CP/CSWB PLANS

Burnaby, British Columbia: https://www.burnaby.ca/Assets/city+services/policies+projects+and+initiatives/Community+Safety+Plan.pdf

Surrey, British Columbia: https://www.surrey.ca/files/SurreyPublicSafetyStrategyFullVersion.pdf

Edmonton, Alberta: https://reachedmonton.ca/initiatives/

Bancroft, Ontario: https://bancroft.civicweb.net/document/24071/Bancroft_s%20CSWB%20Plan%20-%20Our%20Shared%20Committment%20(Fin.pdf?handle=816553B23E80481BA348F60A85D142C4

Brantford, Ontario: http://globalcommunitysafety.com/resources/community/brantford

Halton Region, Ontario: https://www.halton.ca/getmedia/8b348f60-7d3a-4e85-b503-d8166408fd6d/SCS-Community_Safety_Well_Being_report.pdf.aspx

Kenora, Ontario: http://ksamhtf.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/KSAMHTF_CommunitySafetyandWellBeingPlan1.pdf

Thunder Bay, Ontario: https://www.thunderbay.ca/en/city-services/resources/Documents/2017-2020-Safer-Thunder-Bay-Community-Safety-and-Well-Being-Strategy.pdf

Waterloo Region, Ontario: https://preventingcrime.ca/our-work/upstream/

Halifax, Nova Scotia: https://www.halifax.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-hall/regional-council/Public_Safety_Strategy.pdf

APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR CP/ CSWB PLAN REVIEW

1. What resources were used to develop the plan (FTEs, consulting fees, etc.)?
2. Did you put out a Request for Proposals (RFP)?
3. What was included in the RFP?
4. Who did you want to contract to help develop the plan?
5. What were the selection criteria for the consultants? What was their area of expertise?
6. How did you evaluate the proposals?
7. Who evaluated the proposals?
8. How did you select a proposal?
9. Do you have a template of a RFP?
10. What was the budget?
11. What are some tips/recommendations in preparing to develop a plan?

When developing your plan:

1. Who did you have on the Advisory Committee (or who were the people leading the development)
2. When doing community safety assessments what data (qualitative/ quantitative) were you able to consult to determine your strategies?
3. What kind of consultations/collaborations were you able to do? And who was involved in them?

APPENDIX 4: CROSS-SECTOR COLLABORATION INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

Collaboration Multiplier Tool:

https://www.preventioninstitute.org/tools/collaboration-multiplier

https://www.futureswithoutviolence.org/wp-content/uploads/A-Multi-Sector-Approach-to-Preventing-Violence.pdf

Shared Measurement:

Implementing Shared Measurement (Webinar): https://www.fsg.org/tools-and-resources/implementing-shared-measurement

Breakthroughs in Shared Measurement (Webinar and Report): https://www.fsg.org/publications/breakthroughs-shared-measurement

Guide to Evaluating Collective Impact (Webinar and Report): https://www.fsg.org/publications/guide-evaluating-collective-impact

Developing Shared Measures: Lessons Learned (PowerPoint Presentation): http://www.collaborationforimpact.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Developing_Shared_Measures_Lessons-Learned.pdf

Levels of Collaboration Chart:

https://captcollaboration.edc.org/sites/captcollaboration.edc.org/files/attachments/Levels%20of%20Collaboration.pdf

APPENDIX 5: FUNDING SOURCES

Location	Municipal	Provincial	Federal	Grant	Total Budget
Surrey, BC	Yes		Yes		
Edmonton, AB	Yes				
Bancroft, ON			Yes (Pilot)		
Brantford, ON			Yes (Pilot)		
Halton Region, ON	Yes				
Kenora, ON		Yes (OTF*)			
Thunder Bay, ON					
Waterloo Region, ON					
Halifax, NS					

**Ontario Trillium Foundation*

APPENDIX 6: SAMPLE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Request for Proposals
Process Management – Taskforce on Community Safety

Your firm is being invited to submit a proposal to provide Process Management services to the Taskforce on Community Safety. If you are interested please submit your proposal to:

Address
Email Contact
Proposals must be received no later than (date).

(Location) thanks all firms for their proposal submissions; however, only those firms seriously considered for award of the project will be contacted.

1. PROJECT PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	The Taskforce on Community Safety has been tasked to produce a report for City Council by (Date) that outlines recommendations for a long-term community safety strategy. The Taskforce requires a contractor to provide process expertise and support to ensure timely and successful completion of its objectives. Specifically, the contractor will help the Taskforce, its subcommittees, advisory and working groups to: · Plan and manage a productive, collaborative process. · Coordinate, support and integrate the work of all groups and subcommittees. · Develop materials, deliverables, reports and presentations.
2. BACKGROUND	The Taskforce on Community Safety was appointed by (Mayor) in (Date) to seek answers on how to make (City) a safe community, with reduced crime and improved security for citizens. The Taskforce will take a broad approach to crime prevention, exploring strategies that reach beyond existing police and justice systems and involve communities themselves. Supported by City staff and resources, Taskforce members will work towards innovative, evidence-based interventions to achieve the following mandate: *With a focus on preventative rather than punitive solutions, our goal is to coordinate a long term community safety strategy with our partners that will leave residents with a greater feeling that they live in a safe community.* The Taskforce on Community Safety is not about correctional facilities or finding better ways to clamp-down on crime after it's committed. It's about finding creative and effective programs and strategies that can help reduce crime before it even happens.

2. BACKGROUND cnt'd	The Taskforce's final report, due by (date), will align closely where possible with both the new vision for the City, and the work of the provincial safety secretariat. It will include recommendations and an implementation plan with tangible strategies, benchmarks, timeframes and costs. The Taskforce consists of (number) co-chairs and (number) members of the (City) community representing a diverse range of interests, experience and expertise. The following sub-groups will contribute to the work of the Taskforce: · Taskforce Executive Committee · Subcommittees focused on key strategic priorities · Internal Working Teams to support all other groups o Community Engagement and Communications o Research Advisory Panel · Administrative Support provided by City personnel For additional information on the structure, governance and organization of the Taskforce, please consult the attached Community Safety Framework document or see (link)
3. PROJECT SCOPE	**Key Timelines** · Date – Taskforce appointed · Date – Proposals due · Date – Contractor Orientation 2 hours, to be determined · Date – Project start date · Date – Inaugural meeting of Research Advisory Panel · Date – Taskforce monthly meeting · Date – Timelines, Deliverables and process for project set out (with roles and responsibilities scoped out) · Date – Interim recommendations · Date – Draft Research report for Date · Date – Draft Final Report · Date – Community Involvement process (Out of scope) · Date – Final Report and Presentation to City Council **Scope and Challenges** The successful contractor will provide process management and support to the work of the Taskforce. This will involve designing, managing and supporting a process to enable productive collaboration of all community members and subgroups. Concurrent to this process, a community involvement effort will be undertaken to inform and engage the public and stakeholders, however this work will be awarded based on a separate contract process. A number of important challenges must be addressed by the Taskforce and its processes: · A high-profile, high expectation assignment with tight timelines. · Providing evidence-based recommendations for crime prevention. · Integrating existing knowledge, information, and research. · Creating meaningful long-term change while also presenting recommendations with the potential for immediate impact. · Engaging the community in safety solutions. · Optimizing the time and resources of Taskforce volunteers and City staff. Alignment with existing initiatives, programs, and crime prevention efforts.

4. CONSULTANT RESPONSIBILITIES	Proposals must clearly detail how the contractor will conduct the following project tasks: Plan and manage a productive, collaborative process. · Design processes for the operation of the Taskforce and its subgroups to deliver results within project timelines. · Link to the Community Engagement and Communications working team as it develops a Communications Plan. · Provide project management and reporting processes. Coordinate, support and integrate the work of all groups and subcommittees. · Facilitate and support the work of the Taskforce. · Facilitate focused debate and discussion, while remaining cognizant of timelines and decision points. · Ensure subgroups are aware of the progress and the interconnectedness of other subgroups. Coordinate their efforts where practical. · Work with the Research Advisory Panel and Support team to address the needs and requests of Taskforce groups for information and research related to their area(s) of inquiry. · Integrate communication and engagement activities throughout the work of the Taskforce. Develop materials, deliverables, reports and presentations. · Produce materials and reports necessary for meetings and working sessions. · Facilitate productive Taskforce and subgroup meetings and working sessions. · Support Taskforce co-chairs to inform and update City sponsors. · Produce project deliverables and communications. · Prepare draft and final reports and presentations.
5. RESPONSE FORMAT	Proposals should be no more than fifteen (15) pages in length, excluding appendices. All proposals must include the following information: · Approach/work plan to achieve project goals. · Demonstrated understanding of the challenges and requirements of the project. · Breakdown of cost, according to the resources and level of effort that will be required. · Names and resumes of key personnel assigned to the project, including experience and qualifications this project. · Previous experience demonstrating the contractor's qualification for the project. Client references (minimum two) with a contact name and phone number who can attest to the contractor's relevant experience and qualifications.
6. SUBMISSION GUIDELINES	Please submit your proposal by Date to: Address Email Contact **We request 5 hard copies of your proposal (including all appendices) be delivered to the above address, and an electronic submission sent as well.** For inquiries about this contract, please contact (name and email) by (date).

7. PROPOSAL EVALUATION	All proposals will be reviewed by Community Services and the selection will be based on the best evaluated overall quality and value considering (not necessarily in order): · Approach/work plan described in proposal. · Budget/Fees. · Proposal completeness, detail and presentation. · Work plan and a demonstrated understanding of the assignment. · Past performance on City assignments and client references. · Firm's experience and experience of personnel. · Process and project management expertise. · Best fit between the conceptualization or need of the project and the proposal. This is a request for proposals, and the Taskforce on Community Safety reserves the right to: *Accept a proposal without negotiation. *Reject a proposal without negotiation. *Negotiate changes to the identified services of the successful proposal. Upon review of the proposals, Community Services reserves the right to conduct interviews with the submitting firms. The successful firm will be required to enter into a standard (City) Professional Services Agreement.

APPENDIX 7: SAMPLE REQUEST FOR EVALUATION CRITERIA

Scoring Matrix for Strategic Planning Facilitator

Name of Consultant:
Name of Steering Committee Member:
Date:

Criteria/Weighting	Score/Comments
Relevant previous experience	/15
Knowledge/understanding of subject matter	/10
Knowledge/experience with target audience (ie stakeholders, committee members, organizations etc.)	/10
Work Plan/Proposal	/10
Price	/5
Total Score	/50

ENDNOTES

[i] Bill 68 Part XVI Section 248(1) https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/s19001#Sched1323

[ii] https://mirror.unhabitat.org/downloads/docs/13544_1_596462.pdf

[iii] Ministry of the Solicitor General, 2018

[iv] Government of Ontario, 2018

[v] Nilson, 2018b: V

[vi] Ibid.

[vii] https://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/Publications/MCSCSSSOPlanningFramework.html

[viii] Ibid.

[ix] https://unhabitat.org/annual-report-2019

[x] United Nations, 2019

[xi] Nilson, 2018b

[xii] Ministry of the Solicitor General, 2018

[xiii] Bryson, Crosby, and Middleton Stone, 2006 p. 44 from Nilson, 2018a

[xiv] Ibid.

[xv] Kania & Kramer, 2011 p. 38.

[xvi] Ibid.

[xvii] Nilson, 2018

[xviii] Ibid.

[xix] www.safercities.ca

[xx] https://efus.eu/en/topics/tools-and-methods/partner-ships/efus/6136/

[xxi] www.safercities.ca

[xxii] EFUS, 2016: 22

[xxiii] Ministry of the Solicitor General, 2018

[xxiv] Found at: https://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/Publications/MCSCSSSOPlanningFramework.html#Tool3

[xxv] Nilson, 2018b

[xxvi] Ministry of the Solicitor General, 2018

[xxvii] Nilson, 2018b

[xxviii] Ministry of the Solicitor General, 2018

REFERENCES

Bill 68: Comprehensive Ontario Police Services Act. (2019). Assented to March 26th, 2019. Retrieved from the Government of Ontario website: https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/s19001#top

Bryson, J., Crosby, B., and Middleton Stone, M. (2006). The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature. In *Public Administrative Review-Special Issue (Articles on Collaborative Public Management)* v.66 :44-55.

EFUS. (2016). Methods and tools for a strategic approach to urban security. Retrieved from: https://efus.eu/en/resources/publications/efus/11191/

Government of Ontario. (2018, March 9). *Ontario passes legislation to strengthen community safety: Province taking action to ensure all people feel safer and more protected* [News Release]. Retrieved from: https://news.ontario.ca/mcscs/en/2018/03/ontario-passes-legislation-to-strengthen-community-safety.html

Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2011: 35-41.

Ministry of the Solicitor General. (2018). *Community safety and well-being framework: A shared commitment in Ontario*. Government of Ontario. Retrieved from: https://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/Publications/MCSCSSSOPlanningFramework.html

Munger, F., & Reimer, M. (2012). A process model for research collaborations and its application to environmental sustainability fields. *Umweltpsychology*, 16(1): 112-142.

Nilson, C. (2018a). *National Scan of Criminal Justice Involvement in Multi-Sectoral Collaboration Models: Final Report*. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

Nilson, C. (2018b). *Community safety and well-being: Concept, practice, and alignment.* Community Safety Knowledge Alliance.

United Nations. (2019). *Resolution adopted by the United Nations Habitat Assembly on 31 May 2019*. United Nations Habitat assembly of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme. Retrieved from: https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/documents/2019-07/hsp_ha.1_res.2_e.pdf



CANADIAN MUNICIPAL NETWORK ON CRIME PREVENTION
Together for Safer Canadian Cities

RÉSEAU MUNICIPAL CANADIEN EN PRÉVENTION DE LA CRIMINALITÉ
Ensemble pour des villes canadiennes plus sécuritaires