

# Promising Practices in Municipal Community Investment

A Background Report for the City of Guelph's Community Investment Strategy

---

Prepared by Eden Grodzinski and Rebecca Sutherns

April 2012

jpmmc

✉ 20 Lyon Ave., Guelph, ON N1H 5C6 ☎ 519 830-7254 🌐 [www.jpmmc.ca](http://www.jpmmc.ca) [eden@jpmmc.ca](mailto:eden@jpmmc.ca)

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report contains a review of the community investment practices of municipalities comparable to Guelph, as well as a summary of current social innovation research and best practice. It is one of three background research reports informing Guelph's Community Investment Strategy (CIS).

This report draws on the responses of an electronic survey, which was sent to 39 people representing 29 municipalities (on the City's comparator list), as well as interviews and Internet research. It outlines the community investment strategies and granting processes of those respondent municipalities. It also highlights research findings relevant to municipalities seeking to partner with the community benefit sector, as well as to foster social innovation. Examples of local organizations known for enabling innovation are provided. The report concludes with observations about the relevance of these findings to the CIS project.

According to recent literature, the primary desired or possible areas of involvement for municipalities in social innovation are social finance, public policy and culture. In those arenas, governments can be responsible for setting the tone, convening the players, enabling access to resources and mobilizing knowledge. They are encouraged to see the community benefit sector as a creative resource rather than an optional partner.

Based on the experience of municipalities, however, successful community investment is reflected in a well-run granting process to community groups. The report therefore provides comparative details of municipal granting, including types of support, eligibility criteria and exclusions, and evaluation processes where available.

Many comparable municipalities have or are currently reviewing their community investment practices. Guelph's CIS process appears to be more participatory and to include a larger bundle of services and sectors than most.

As the City of Guelph decides which parts of others' experience will inform its own, the following counsel is worth keeping in mind:

1. The CIS should be *both strategic and operational* in its orientation
2. *Enabling innovation* is an important role for government, and a strongly held desire for most. It is, however, exceptionally difficult for municipalities to do in practice and therefore requires the appropriate will, supports and conditions to make it happen.
3. Guelph's CIS should be *reflective of its own strategic objectives and the characteristics of its own local context and community benefit sector*.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	3
1. INTRODUCTION .....	4
1.1 Methodology.....	4
1.2 Limitations.....	4
2. LESSONS LEARNED FROM SOCIAL INNOVATION RESEARCH.....	5
2.1 Defining Social Innovation .....	5
2.2 Public Sector Roles in Enabling Social Innovation.....	6
2.3 Public Sector Involvement with the Community Benefit Sector.....	7
3. LESSONS LEARNED FROM COMPARABLE MUNICIPALITIES .....	8
3.1 Community Investment Strategy & Structure .....	9
3.2 Types of Community Investment Support .....	10
3.3 Community Granting Mechanisms .....	10
3.4 Challenges .....	12
4. RELEVANCE TO GUELPH'S COMMUNITY INVESTMENT STRATEGY .....	12
5. CONCLUSION .....	14
APPENDIX A – MUNICIPALITIES SURVEYED .....	15
APPENDIX B – SOCIAL INNOVATION ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED .....	16

## 1. INTRODUCTION

One element of the background research intended to inform Guelph's Community Investment Strategy (CIS) was a review of "promising practices", from which the City could learn. Initially, this exploration was anticipated to include other comparable municipalities. It was then expanded to include relevant examples of innovation and research from other types of organizations.

This report forms one of three background research documents for the City of Guelph's CIS project. It contains an overview of the research process, a summary of the research findings, and an analysis of the relevance of those findings to Guelph's CIS development process.

### 1.1 Methodology

As a first step, in the summer of 2011, Guelph's Community and Social Services staff sent an electronic survey to 39 people representing 29 municipalities taken from Council's approved list of comparator municipalities. The survey asked about the nature of the municipalities' investment in community activities and partnerships with community organizations. Twelve responses were received from 11 municipalities. Those responses were summarized by City staff, with the report and background details provided to the consulting team. The findings provided an initial overview and suggested which municipalities warranted more thorough follow up. In some cases, municipalities also provided relevant policy documents, which were then reviewed by the consulting team. A list of municipalities surveyed and interviewed is provided in Appendix A.

Based on the survey responses and on who was willing and available to provide further information, a more detailed review was then conducted, electronically and/or by telephone, of the community investment practices of Kitchener, London, Oshawa, Peel, Sudbury, Vaughan and Whitby. Abbotsford, Edmonton, Oakville, Brantford and Waterloo Region were also explored further electronically, in response to suggestions provided by the Management and Working Groups and leads emerging from the research.

Concurrently with the municipality comparative research, a review of organizational websites and published literature relating to social innovation, social entrepreneurship and the relationship between the community and public sectors was conducted. The organizations reviewed included policy think tanks, foundations, centres for innovation, and non-profit networks. Leads for this line of inquiry were provided by the City's project manager. A brief description of the organizations reviewed is provided in Appendix B.

### 1.2 Limitations

The research process was designed to generate reliable and useful information while staying proportional to the budget of the project and realistic about what can be thoroughly

understood “from a distance.” What is provided here is a summary of the most relevant and/or interesting findings, intended to provoke further discussion as the CIS development process unfolds.

This review is limited by various conditions that made gathering comprehensive data problematic. For example, more detailed research was conducted only among the municipalities that responded to our initial request for information, and then only among those who were willing to return our messages. Survey data and Internet searches alone are clearly insufficient, but even when relevant policy documents are available, they rarely describe the processes that occur in real life behind them. Even conversations with knowledgeable individuals provide only one lens into very complex municipal bureaucracies. It is therefore acknowledged that the information provided here offers a limited and partial view. It is nevertheless instructive in shaping the initial directions that the CIS development process could take, identifying important questions to ask, and offering points of further contact when the details of CIS implementation need to be worked out.

## 2. LESSONS LEARNED FROM SOCIAL INNOVATION RESEARCH

Considering how best to enable social innovation may seem tangential to the core task of this comparative review, but this review begins here for three reasons:

1. The CIS project is in part expected to explore innovative models of community investment. Many of those occur outside of the municipal sector and involve social innovation.
2. There is much to be learned from a starting place of imagination rather than replication. Consideration of possibilities leads to a more creative stance than only reviewing past initiatives, particularly since this review uncovered rather conservative investment practices in other municipalities.
3. Social innovation represents the direction in which the community benefit sector<sup>1</sup> appears to be moving.

### 2.1 Defining Social Innovation

Much of the emerging work in this field begins with definitions - differentiating between social innovation, social ventures, social purposes businesses, social finance and social

---

<sup>1</sup> Across the world, this sector is referred to in many ways – non-profit, not-for-profit, voluntary, charitable, social benefit, public benefit, community, and the third sector. The terms of reference for the City of Guelph’s CIS project originally used the term not-for-profit organizations to describe this sector. However, according to a survey conducted for the Government of Ontario’s Partnership Project (2011), this is not a descriptive term that individuals working within this sector prefer. And so, for the purposes of the CIS study and this research report, the broad term “**community benefit sector**” has been employed.

entrepreneurship.<sup>2</sup> For this study, the term “social innovation” is most directly relevant. It refers to “new ideas that work to solve pressing unmet [social] needs.”<sup>3</sup> Social Innovation Generation (SiG) cites examples such as Fair Trade, micro-finance and peacekeeping to illustrate this concept. In the context of municipal community investment, social innovation can occur directly (i.e. when a civic government implements a new idea to solve a socioeconomic problem), or indirectly (e.g. when a civic government creates an environment in which the realization of new ideas, helpful in the social realm, can flourish).

## 2.2 Public Sector Roles in Enabling Social Innovation

Numerous examples of social innovators and/or incubators for social innovation are emerging in Canada, many of which have municipal support. For instance:

- **Social Innovation Generation (SiG)** exists to promote a culture of continuous social innovation.
- **MaRS** fosters and promotes science, technology and social innovation, particularly among social purpose businesses. MaRS helps to create successful businesses out of Canadian innovations, by providing the resources needed to ensure that innovation happens – resources such as people, programs, facilities, funding and networks. It was founded and is funded by a wide range of public and private donors, including the City of Toronto.
- **The Centre for Social Innovation** creates physical spaces that help to foster innovation. It also advises governments on how to create environments that enable social innovation to occur.
- **The Toronto Enterprise Fund** funds social purpose businesses to combat poverty and homelessness in Toronto.
- **Capacity Waterloo Region** is an example of a pilot partnership intended to fuel social innovation. It is modeled after the investment Waterloo Region has made in its technology sector and is extending that investment to include the social sector.

The experiences of these organizations can provide helpful learnings for municipalities interested in entering this territory.

Much of the pioneering work in social innovation has happened in the United Kingdom.<sup>4</sup> A report from a group of Canadian policy makers and funders who were invited to participate in a UK social innovation policy tour in 2009<sup>5</sup>, identified three pillars to social innovation generation, all of which could be directly relevant to the municipal sector:

---

<sup>2</sup> Social Innovation Generation ([www.sigeneration.ca](http://www.sigeneration.ca)) provides a thorough and useful primer on social innovation and related terms.

<sup>3</sup> See SiG above.

<sup>4</sup> See for example Office of the Third Sector, NESTA and UnLtd, described in Appendix C.

<sup>5</sup> *Social Innovation Policy Tour 2009* sponsored by SiG, Causeway and Volans.

- Social finance (the flow of money to human need uses)
- Public policy
- Culture and enabling environment

Furthermore, a 2010 report on an international roundtable on social innovation<sup>6</sup> suggests four roles for government in fostering innovation in the social realm:

- *Tone setters* - be champions of innovation by removing barriers and lending credibility to initiatives
- *Convenors* - catalyze unlikely partnerships between multiple stakeholders
- *Enablers of access to resources* - provide appropriate regulatory and funding environments, and a reward system
- *Knowledge mobilizers* - expand the reach of information and proven solutions so that success spreads

The literature highlights the challenge of being innovative within risk-averse environments. Both the public sector and the community benefit sector are acknowledged as exhibiting numerous barriers to innovation. Evaluating the impact of social innovation is problematic, making decisions to invest in innovation all the more difficult to trigger or defend. SiG is currently developing a system to track outcome metrics for creating enabling environments for social innovation.

## 2.3 Public Sector Involvement with the Community Benefit Sector

Achievement in innovation often occurs at the intersection of multiple sectors. In the case of social innovation, the community benefit sector is particularly important. Various levels of government relate in various ways to community organizations and to the community benefit sector as a whole. The nature of that relationship - a local government's best role vis-à-vis the voluntary sector - is actually at the heart of Guelph CIS development process.

Tim Brodhead, in a 2010 article for *The Philanthropist* entitled "On Not Letting a Crisis Go to Waste: Innovation Agenda for Canada's Community Sector," encourages governments to see the sector as "indispensable and creative, not tiresome or optional." He asserts that governments should seek actively to strengthen the sector rather than simply to regulate it. A 2011 paper by the Mowat Centre entitled "Strengthening the Third Pillar of the Canadian Union" draws a similar conclusion, that strengthening the third sector should be an explicit policy goal for governments. As an example, the British government, until recently, had a ministry entitled Office of the Third Sector. Part of its mandate was to ensure a proactive government stance toward the community benefit sector rather than a relationship characterized primarily by reactive responses to funding proposals. It suggests a relationship between government and the third sector that facilitates each doing what it does best, for

---

<sup>6</sup> Public Policy Forum (2011). *Adapting and Thriving: Innovative practices by small and medium nonprofits emerging from the economic downturn*. Ottawa.

mutual benefit. It cites the third sector as being strong in engaging hard-to-reach populations, and the public sector as being best at creating an enabling environment for them in which to do so. The relationship can then be about co-creating a shared community.

One risk of this inter-relationship is inappropriate “downloading” of service delivery. There is increasing interest in exploring how the community benefit sector can assist with public service delivery in ways that are cost effective for and consistent with the strengths of both sides. Again, governments are called upon to do well what is within their mandate to do, and to have discernment regarding when the most appropriate action is to get out of the way.

Governments are encouraged to strengthen the community benefit sector by engaging in such activities as uniting networks, sharing knowledge, engaging multiple stakeholders and interests (particularly the private sector), offering space and taking youth engagement seriously – all with a view to building the critical mass of energy needed for the community benefit sector to flourish. Not surprisingly, this list is very similar to the roles suggested for government to foster social innovation.

Community organizations that demonstrated success during the recent economic downturn had the following additional advice for funders of the social sector:<sup>7</sup>

- Articulate clearly the desired impact of grants
- Support strategy/organizational/board development in community organizations
- Support networks for leaders and affordable professional development
- Streamline reporting requirements
- Support exploration of strategic marketing partnerships
- Enable/support collaboration, including providing space, facilitators, time, etc.
- Support new sustainable funding models

### 3. LESSONS LEARNED FROM COMPARABLE MUNICIPALITIES

Having explored the broad field of social innovation, and the roles of municipalities and the community benefit sector within that, this section shifts attention to the specifics of what can be learned from the community investment experiences of municipalities comparable to Guelph. The analysis begins with an overview of how community investment is thought about strategically and how it is structured within municipal bureaucracies.

It is worth noting at the outset that this type of information proved difficult to obtain. Without a deeper familiarity of the inner workings of each of the municipalities consulted, it is difficult to

---

<sup>7</sup> Public Policy Forum (2011)



describe how these strategic decisions are made because the mechanisms and processes are not usually made public or documented in detail.<sup>8</sup>

### 3.1 Community Investment Strategy & Structure

Several municipalities are in the midst of reviewing their community investment practices, or have recently done so. It appears that Guelph's CIS process includes a larger bundle of programs and services than many other municipalities have included in theirs. For example, arts, culture and recreation are usually included, but capital projects within those may not be. Social services, educational institutions and health care are often less visible or treated separately, as are environmental organizations, neighbourhood groups, youth organizations and in some cases civic celebrations. Often the groupings reflect the internal administrative structure of the corporation. For instance, Oakville has a recreation and culture department that includes sports, arts and special events. Edmonton separates Civic Events from Communities of Interest, all under their Community Strategies Branch. It has a Community Services Advisory Board that includes sports, social services and multicultural activities, which is separate from its Arts Council, which is responsible for celebrations.

For many municipalities, a CIS represents little more than community granting guidelines. This reflects a tension paralleled in Guelph's experience, where there is a desire to behave strategically and innovatively, and there is a recognition that the City's community contribution extends well beyond small grants, yet the focus repeatedly reverts back to the nuts and bolts of administering a defensible community granting system.

The level of public consultation and involvement in other municipalities' CIS has differed widely as well. Most municipalities have made revisions to their process internally with minimal public consultation, but largely in response to public complaints. In contrast, Peel Region engaged in a very thorough public engagement process in conjunction with the United Way to develop a shared strategy.

In most cases, community investment activities are tied back to the municipalities' strategic objectives in some way. In some cases, those directions were broad enough to encompass virtually any community investment direction, while in other cases, the aspired identity of the city gave clear direction to community engagement. For example, in cases where cities see themselves as exceptionally safe or physically active, the community investment activities would be shaped accordingly.

There was broad consensus that it is risky for municipalities not to have a strategy or policy that supports their community investment activities. Several people also mentioned the need to have someone who is clearly and directly responsible for administering and tracking community grants.

---

<sup>8</sup> Responses regarding capital funding and creative financing partnerships were limited and will require further research.

## 3.2 Types of Community Investment Support

The types of support offered by municipalities to community organizations were roughly similar, usually involving a combination of multi-year or annual grants for ongoing or one-off activities, waivers, subsidies, staff time and space. In some cases, municipalities highlighted specific types of support or supportive practices as being particularly helpful for creative. The following is a list of cited examples of innovation (it is by no means exhaustive):

- Leadership development for a charitable sector and in community leadership across sectors, using a model known as ACE communities first piloted in rural Alberta (Halton, London)
- Matching funds for neighbourhood groups, redirected from a Community Services Innovation Fund (London)
- Partnership with school board for shared spaces (Whitby)
- Formal partnership agreements (Vaughan)
- Recreation activity kits (Ajax)
- Social Enterprise Fund (Edmonton)
- Monetization of in-kind support (Oshawa)
- Start-up or one-off grants (Oshawa)
- Funding levels set per capita (Oshawa)
- “No grants” policy (Region of Durham)
- Give a donation to a community funder for allocation by them (mentioned by several municipalities as a possible approach)

## 3.3 Community Granting Mechanisms

In terms of the actual granting mechanisms and processes, all of the municipalities consulted agreed that there is a need for a clear and defensible process. They also highlighted the need for the process to be flexible so that it can adapt to one-off and/or unforeseen community requests.

The official criteria for receiving City grants showed considerable overlap across municipalities (i.e. organizations rather than individuals, no funding for political or religious activities, financial and governance capacity, residence requirements, etc.), particularly in cases where those parameters are outlined in the Municipal Act. There was also a shared desire to incorporate appropriate community expertise on the decision-making panels, while minimizing conflict of interest, and an understanding of the challenges presented by that goal.

Beyond those characteristics, the granting practices of municipalities varied in a number of ways. For example:

- Different processes for new and existing applicants, and/or large and small grants (e.g. Sudbury handles larger grants more internally and smaller ones are dealt with by a community committee)
- Varying levels of contact between applicant organizations and granting bodies (e.g. In Kitchener and elsewhere, the municipality is building a database of other funders so that staff can direct applicants to the funding channel that best suits their needs)
- What analysis occurs and by whom (e.g. Municipal staff? Community committee?) prior to Council making final granting decisions
- How the public is engaged or informed of support criteria, processes or decision-making rationale (e.g. Edmonton has a Public Engagement Policy; Kitchener’s policy refers to adjudication criteria “such as...”)
- Which events are delivered directly by the municipality or in partnership with neighbouring municipalities (e.g. Canada Day)
- Consistency and/or ease of making application for support (e.g. use of the CADAC<sup>9</sup> for arts application budgets)
- Reporting requirements, if any
- Level of recognition expected by the City
- Who is involved in adjudicating grant applications (e.g. internally, a mix of internal staff and external representatives, Council directly, in partnership with United Way, etc.) and how often intake dates occur
- Ability to apply funding criteria consistently and defensibly (e.g. in Oshawa, a lottery system has been proposed. In London, evaluation criteria are publicly circulated and are separate from eligibility criteria.)
- Naming of the community support process (e.g. “Grants to Groups” in Cambridge; “Cultural Investment Program” in Brantford)

Several municipalities that have recently reviewed their community investment practices (e.g. Peel, Kitchener, Oakville, Oshawa, Ajax) have moved to variations of a tiered granting system. This usually involves having a list of well established organizations or events on a list qualifying for multi-year (operational and/or project-based) funding, other organizations applying annually for project grants, and sometimes a smaller, separate innovation fund. There is variation among municipalities as to which events are housed in which tier. In some cases, certain organizations are funded as separate budgetary line items rather than through the granting process. In most cases, other types of community grants (e.g. environmental, youth, innovation) are available other ways outside of this tiered process.

---

<sup>9</sup> CADAC (Canadian Arts Data/Données sur les arts au Canada) is a web-based database, developed by the Canadian Council for the Arts, that is intended to lighten the administration burden on arts organizations applying for operating funding to one or multiple public funders by enabling them to submit one set of financial and statistical information.

Some municipalities have quite a formal process for groups to place themselves within a given tier. For example, Ajax has “community group affiliates” and Oakville frames theirs as “levels of membership.” Oshawa has “anchored events” and then three levels of grants, subsidies and waivers beyond that. In other cases, the tiers have been established less intentionally, seemingly by historical precedents or inertia.

Most communities admit that the process of moving between tiers is problematic. In Kitchener, five years of annual funding qualifies the organization to move to multi-year funding. In Cambridge, the decision lies with Council and there is no clear, public process for organizations to make an application to switch tiers. A few municipalities indicated that moves happen “in response to complaints.”

Classifying applications can also be a challenge. For instance, is a festival an arts event or an economic one? In Sudbury, cultural events are treated separately from sporting events. As one staff member said, “We would be in trouble if anyone suggested that hockey is a cultural phenomenon in Sudbury!”

Similarly, several municipalities expressed concern regarding their ability to adjust support levels in response to organizational performance. Tracking the impact of municipal dollars rarely happens, or is not reported back to the City when it does. Challenges or breakdowns can occur at various points in the process, ranging from not asking organizations for feedback, to not having adequate staff to monitor results, to not being able to measure or attribute impact with confidence, to not having processes in place to link future decisions to past performance.

### 3.4 Challenges

Municipalities appeared to be most similar in the challenges that they identified with community investment. Their primary concern, mentioned almost unanimously, was with the demand for resources outstripping the supply. Requests for resources are routinely in excess of the budget available. Other challenges included the time required to work with community groups, communication gaps, widely varying capacity within the community benefit sector to work effectively with municipal officials, maintaining the integrity of a new investment process in the face of varying levels of understanding of it internally (and at times political interference), and the financial sustainability of the activities.

## 4. RELEVANCE TO GUELPH’S COMMUNITY INVESTMENT STRATEGY

This section provides some analysis of the information summarized above, and a discussion of its relevance to Guelph’s Community Investment Strategy development process.

### *a) Strategic versus Operational Frameworks*

There are clearly two separate but interrelated dimensions of CIS: strategic and operational. The operational elements of community granting are the “top of mind” issues within CIS, both within the City of Guelph and among the comparable municipalities that were consulted. That operational side is important because it is perhaps the point of greatest community engagement and visibility, and greatest risk of complaint for the municipality within the current arrangement. Municipal workers are understandably concerned with the optics and the mechanics of community granting. It is also both relatively easy (because of its concreteness) and quite difficult (because of the complexity present within the community and the corporation) to fix. Revising the granting process would certainly take the City a long way towards creating a more accountable, transparent community investment practice. Limiting the CIS to a clean up of the grant management process alone, however, misses an important opportunity to review at a more strategic level what the municipality wants to achieve and its role vis-à-vis the community benefit sector. The City of Guelph could, for example, choose to actively strengthen the community benefit sector as a means to a more vibrant and resilient community, and/or to embrace social innovation as a main thrust of its CIS. At a minimum, it could articulate more explicit and targeted objectives in order to inform its granting decisions.

### *b) Innovation*

The split between strategic and operational matters is reflected in the promising practices research itself. Strategic innovation is found most often in the published literature, and is talked about mostly in aspirational terms. On the other hand, municipal workers talk about specific projects or features representing incremental improvements to their community granting processes (e.g. tiers, matching funds, and shared space agreements). Often municipalities are listed as contributing partners to larger provincial or federal multi-stakeholder initiatives. But clear, systematic and inspiring examples of municipal strategic innovation proved very difficult to uncover. There is a need for truly innovative, well-documented, scaled-up partnerships between municipalities and the community benefit sector.

The City of Guelph will also need to be realistic about its own capacity to innovate. The CIS may create some initial space for innovation, but in the absence of an ongoing structure, culture and political will to sustain that innovation, it is unlikely to gain enough traction to last.

There are likely some inspiring organizations that the City can watch and/or collaborate with. It will therefore need to enhance its “reconnaissance capacity” in order to take in, disseminate and learn from these trailblazers. Examples of interesting local initiatives include Pathways to Education and Capacity Waterloo Region, London’s Child and Youth Network, and the work of SiG, MaRS and the Centre for Social Innovation.

### ***c) A Made in Guelph solution***

It is incumbent upon the City, and the CIS process itself, to decide which of the experiences, advice and lessons that are documented here will apply to Guelph's experience and in what ways. "Connecting the dots" between others' advice and Guelph's story is a step that is easily missed, but essential to maximizing the learning from this review.

Guelph's CIS process is broader and perhaps more consultative than many other municipalities have undertaken. The resulting strategy needs to be informed by the City's strategic plan and contain defensible, practical criteria, multiple points of entry and other characteristics that will make it both rigorous and agile. The degree to which the various sectors within the CIS should be more clearly delineated or better integrated is a matter for further debate.

It will be important for Guelph's CIS to be reflective of its own local context. Where are the pockets of existing energy and innovation upon which the municipality can build? What does Guelph's identity suggest about how the City should approach this community investment opportunity? And what are the roles that the municipality is uniquely positioned to play?

## **5. CONCLUSION**

Based on a review of social innovation literature in Canada and the UK and community investment practices in comparable municipalities, there are evidently many learnings applicable to Guelph's context. These findings will be combined with the lessons learned from the other two background research reports (*A Portrait of Guelph's Community Benefit Sector* and an *Inventory of Guelph's Community Investment Policies and Practices*) and the public engagement processes to inform Guelph's CIS.

## APPENDIX A – MUNICIPALITIES SURVEYED

<i>Municipalities</i>	<i>Guelph's Comparator Municipalities that Received Survey Questions</i>	<i>Comparator Municipalities that Responded to Survey Questions</i>	<i>Provided Supplementary Information (written or by telephone)</i>	<i>Subject to Further Electronic Research</i>
Abbotsford, BC				X
Ajax	X	X	X	X
Barrie	X			
Brantford	X			X
Burlington	X			
Cambridge	X		X	X
Chatham-Kent	X			
Edmonton, AB				X
Halton Region	X	X		
Hamilton	X			
Kingston	X			
Kitchener	X	X	X	X
London	X	X	X	X
Markham	X			
Mississauga	X			
Niagara	X			
Oakville	X			X
Oshawa	X	X	X	X
Ottawa	X	X		
Peel Region	X	X		X
Pickering	X			
Richmond Hill	X	X		
St. Catharines	X			
Sudbury	X	X	X	X
Thunder Bay	X			
Vaughan	X	X		
Waterloo (City of)	X			X
Waterloo Region	X			
Wellington County	X			
Whitby	X	X	X	X
Windsor	X			

## APPENDIX B – SOCIAL INNOVATION ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED

Additional information was gathered from the websites and/or publications of the following organizations:

### ***ACE Communities***

A community leadership development model that helps communities become active, creative and engaged. Developed in rural Alberta, it has also been used in London, Ontario.

### ***The Accelerator Centre***

Based in Kitchener, it accelerates sustainable new technology companies by providing space, mentorship, educational and networking opportunities.

### ***Canadian Policy Research Network***

Although this network is no longer running, Carleton University is archiving its research materials.

### ***Capacity Waterloo Region***

Part of a five-year pilot project to fuel social innovation by supporting community change makers. Looking at building a similar enabling environment for social entrepreneurs as Waterloo has for technical entrepreneurs

### ***Centre for Social Innovation***

A Toronto-based organization that creates shared spaces that foster and catalyze innovation. It operates in multiple sites, using a constellation model of shared governance and “operating in the spaces between sectors.”

### ***Ontario Ministry for Research and Innovation***

This provincial Ministry builds “investor-ready companies” by building relationships between the players in Ontario’s innovation ecosystem. Its mission is to make innovation a driving force behind Ontario’s economy.

### ***Ontario Nonprofit Network (ONN)***

A collaborative network that shares information across and about the nonprofit sector and responds to government about policy that affects how the sector operates. ONN has recently completed a review of how the Ontario government can work more effectively with this sector, called the Partnership Project. One of its recommendation, “welcomed by the government,” is to create a minister responsible for the nonprofit sector.

### ***MaRS***

Describes itself as “driving social and economic prosperity by leading Canada’s innovation mission.” MaRS provides resources such as people, programs, spaces, funding and networks to ensure that innovation happens. It measures its success by the number of companies that emerge after receiving help from MaRS.



***Mowat Centre for Policy Innovation***

A think tank focused on how federal decisions affect Ontario.

***NESTA (UK)***

An independent body in the UK created to make the UK more innovative. NESTA is funded through an endowment to invest in early-stage businesses and influence relevant policies. It is currently in transition from the public to the community sector. It describes itself as “testing and demonstrating ingenious ways to tackle big problems.”

***Social Innovation Generation (SiG)***

SiG seeks to engage partners across sectors to create a culture of continuous social innovation. For example, it is involved in the development of open source social innovation curriculum and building a new finance infrastructure to bolster non-profits and social purpose businesses in Canada.

***Toronto Enterprise Fund***

Provides operational funding to social enterprises, to combat poverty and homelessness in Toronto. Multiple funding partners are involved, including the City of Toronto.

***UnLtd***

A UK-based charity that researches the impact of social entrepreneurs and rewards their efforts.

***Vibrant Communities***

An initiative that explores positive local strategies for poverty reduction, using a sustainable livelihoods approach. The project is funded by the McConnell Family Foundation, Tamarack Institute, Human Resources Development Canada and others. Waterloo Region was selected as one of twelve “trail builders.”

***Wellesley Institute***

Conducts research, policy analysis and community mobilization for urban population health.