



HARRC Operating Models Summary Results

Operating Models:

- 1) Independent Board of Directors
- 2) Board of Directors functioning as a Sub Committee of CAR
- 3) City Initiated Centre
- 4) Partner with Existing Community Hub
- 5) Hybrid Model (Incorporation of Independent Board of Directors and Partner with Existing Community Hub)

Facilitators:

Focus Group A - Jessica Bowen and Louic Leblanc

Focus Group B - Betsy Pocop, Annie Law, Tara Russo and Phillip Jeffrey

Focus Group C - Melissa Chiappetta, Angela Rocci and Shamini Jacob

Focus Group D - Lisa Hunt, Taimur Qasim and Sumaira Khurshid

The following comments are unfiltered and represent the inputs collected at the HARRC Focus Group Sessions held on October 29, 2019.

Table of Contents

- I. Independent Board of Directors.....Page 3
- II. Board of Directors functioning as a Sub Committee of CARPage 6
- III. City Initiated CentrePage 8
- IV. Partner with Existing Community HubPage 10
- V. Hybrid Model.....Page 11
- VI. Themes and Comments..... Page 12

1) Independent Board of Directors

26 votes in total

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent community led board with community input and community members represented on board. • There would be no political agenda and no politicians (no unnecessary influence on the board). • The board would be comprised of members from the racialized communities (having the lived experience). • The model would be an arm's length from the funders and would increase autonomy and independence. • Not tied to any other group, and no affiliations to any organizations. • No baggage or history and starting on a fresh page. Can start fresh and have more buy in from community • Will have more community engagement • Can determine its own funding • Needs to be diverse and needs to have expertise in various areas (equity, legal, social work, finance) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would likely be costs associated with providing adequate training on responsibilities of being a board member. • Not representative and this model historically leaves people out. • Hiring process may take a long time and the entire new focus will continue to delay the process • Difficult to find the right people. They don't know what is going on and don't have the lived experience. • When new boards are started, new focus groups are created. • Not fully funded by City; \$100,000 is not enough from City. Therefore, the need to fundraise. • City ownership of selection of BOD not seen as a good idea and bureaucracy can come into play. • CAR is already run by the City • Lack of trust with the City if they would have any influence. How is accountability to be exercised?

Implementation Plan:

Requirements	Details	Provider
Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide appropriate support for board members who may experience a level of exposure to trauma through the operations of HARRC. • One staff person not sufficient; should have minimum 4 staff. • Criteria for board member selection – diverse and sought-after expertise. Racialized personnel with lived experience. • To ensure board members have the skills to function appropriately within a board setting (and are aware of any legal implications) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social worker and/or counsellor • Administrative support and manager • Paid employees • Advanced training requirements • Outreach workers • Four people at a minimum • ED Trainer • Online survey reviewers • CAR could provide resources
Financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require an increase in funding to \$300,000 per year [not as a pilot project with an expiry date but ongoing/permanent center]. • 2-3-year pilot is not long enough, should be a 5-year commitment to funding with same amount of funds for each year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City should provide initial funding as well as indefinite funding which includes operations. • Fundraise

Requirements	Details	Provider
Legal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnering with the Law Schools • Legal clinic should be in a confidential space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire lawyers • Connection to community legal clinic.
Physical Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A central office and sub-office/satellite outreach locations into the community and those locations must be accessible. • Rotating locations and on the public transit line. • Bricks and mortar main hub that is welcoming and inclusive. • Large formal building can be traumatizing for some to visit, need a welcoming space and mobile branches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centers at library and hospitals. • Mobile satellites
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience on the board should consider intersectionality. • Annual report needed • Bilingualism would be needed. 	

Additional Considerations:

- Must be organized and supported with strong staff to be successful within the community.
- This board would require a term of reference for all members to stay focused on the shared overall goal of the center.
- The lived experience factor is of importance and therefore must be taken into consideration for selection of newly appointed board members. A review of applicants who are diverse. Make sure that there is a representation of age of BOD, including youth. Criteria for Board selection sought after expertise.

- A transparent process of selection through the hiring process.
- A fixed finance for 5 years minimum and then a subsequent review process should be in effect.
- This funding contract should be provided by the City of Hamilton and be more than \$100,000.
- Build relationships in different communalities
- Framework needed for anti oppression and anti racism for all work that comes from this.
- Mobile option – look at Canadian Blood Services and how they do community outreach
- Similar to the Conservation Authority
- Directors can serve as watch dogs
- Mobile option – look at Canadian Blood Services and how they do community outreach
- Is the pilot funding still there for the incubation stage? Would need to know this.

2) Board of Directors functioning as a Sub Committee of CAR

Zero Votes

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be general support for the work of the Centre • City Funds • One positive about this option is that it would be faster as it has already been done, but it does not outweigh all the risks (mainly the trust). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would likely be costs associated with providing adequate training on the responsibilities of being a board member. • How would the funding be provided, i.e. could CAR withhold funding if they did not agree with HARRC projects; Would CAR act as a gatekeeper. There may be questions about access to funding and project approval • Concerns about a volunteer committee running HARRC • CAR has no power as a sub-committee (would potentially be guided by Council directive/influence)

Pros	Cons
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67% of people don't want it tied to the City. Survey results indicated not to be run by the City. • Staff selection by City and equity concerns. • Do not trust the City and too many layers (bureaucratic) and City control. It would still be connected to the city and would still have power if attached. • Lack of political/advocacy • Cannot become charitable organization. • CAR is entirely comprised of volunteers and would put a huge strain would need to double the training. • The City would be downloading the responsibility of HAARC to volunteers and the City would not have to take responsibility for the really hard aspects of overseeing the Board.

Implementation Plan:

Requirements	Details	Provider
Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A term of reference would need to be developed 	
Financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training would have to be provided to those who are board members to ensure they are aware of board members' responsibilities. 	
Legal		

Requirements	Details	Provider
Physical Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Facility and must be accessible. 	
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding needed from City with the ability to fundraise.

Additional Considerations:

- Some felt that this was and a front to HAARC and anti-racism b/c orgs such as the Conservation Authority operate independently
- No support for community members who want to help but are not the individuals who experienced the discrimination. What is their role. Bystander intervention training.
- The same bias as #3 (City Initiated Center) would exist.
- Potential implications with Municipal Act – lack of independence which is important considering the topic is racism. Advocacy could be stymied
- There would be accountability to general public and City committee.
- A Board being selected by the City could mean same people on committees
- Make sure that we do what is needed for the community.
- Needs Accountability.
- Like the Farmer's Market
- Non-for-profit organization
- City will provide: recruit on, selection, payroll
- Board: 13-17-member City of Hamilton picks

3) City Initiated Centre

3 votes

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be access to resources including City Facilities and spaces, senior officials, additional staff. • It is funded and staffed. • This option offers opportunity for spaces (i.e. Recreation facilities) • Speed • Leverage spaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Centre would report into the City • The City as an institution perpetuates institution racism (the optics would be an issue). • Certain communities will not show up. • There could be a conflict and questions about safety if a concern arose involving racism if it involved

Pros	Cons
	<p>City staff and city services. It is not a safe space (especially in City Hall)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This model has the capacity to be transactional as opposed to being transformational. • In dealing with structural racism within institutions there are trust issues (mistrust) and this also needs to be taken into consideration. Structural, systemic racism. • Reputation Hamilton has right now...not a good idea (bias). • Does not align with feedback received. 67% of people don't want it tied to the City.

Implementation Plan:

Requirements	Details	Provider
Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 4 staff • Social Worker; employee to run the Centre. 	
Financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding needed from the City with the ability to fundraise. • All funding from the City. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City
Legal		
Physical Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would not need to be at City Hall; would need proper training. 	
Other		

Additional Considerations:

- This option does not align with survey feedback and there needs to be consideration for trust (community towards City).
- City has a stake to make it successful
- City initiated standalone center is a “no”
- Pretty sure everyone voiced resistance to this model

- Issues of power and conflict
- Legitimacy for outsiders
- Unsafe space
- If the space were put in city hall only those privileged not in the community.
- What if the complaint was regarding the city or city services?
- The city might be able to market it but could be exclusionary because it is a city initiative.
- Would hire City employers, city \$
- CAR would be advisory committee to HARRC and the City

4) Partner with Existing Community Hub

10 Votes

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would likely be in a location that is within the community • The staff would already have appropriate training related to the subject matter. • They would have a more significant voice/impact in the community. • They have the expertise and knowledge on the subject matter. • Can offer good incubation if done well. • Group of people from community can feel part of center. • Report to community and not the City. • Partner with an existing org. that has an infrastructure. • Quick start up which would ensure delivery of services. • Can be healthy place to incubate a new structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would stretch existing personnel and resources who are already over-extended • There would be competition among groups (i.e. Oppression Olympics) • Conflict may arise between communities. • What does partnership mean? • Don't want to partner with McMaster University – not trustworthy • Lack of trust with community partners • Be wary of who we partner with – they may just want power and control. Power dynamics. Avoiding power/privilege structure. • To have a completely neutral HUB is difficult. • Optics – folks felt it is difficult to talk. • Collaboration structure

Implementation Plan:

Requirements	Details	Provider
Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with different community hubs who have expertise. • A social worker and an individual to lead the Centre. 	
Financial		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding needed from City with the ability to fundraise.
Legal		
Physical Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stand alone, community-based City funded space. 	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community partners with HCCI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at other City's with other models.

Additional Considerations:

- The governance structure that existed had too many layers
- Could work if changes are made.
- This model may bring in money to reduce existing strain on community organizations.
- More staff needed to support the manager
- Community hub would not be able to support b/c of underfunding
- Competition for resources
- Resources around staffing
- Could be a great opportunity to leverage and share expertise among the community partners if they were both funded well and able to work well together
- Concerns about certain communities feeling uncomfortable attending spaces that are specifically geared to one community i.e. oppression Olympics
- It could also work out really well for educational opportunities and bringing students in, but downside is that using students instead of hiring people to important work
- Could lead to high turn over
- Current model, sort of
- Funding by City> to project
- Funding Agreement

***5) Hybrid Model (Incorporation of Independent Board of Directors and Partner with Existing Community Hub)**

- That it be implemented, to start, as model #4 and then transition to model #1
- Standalone community-based organization funded by the City of Hamilton

- Minimum of 4 staff
- 2-3-year pilot is not long enough, should be a 5-year commitment to funding with same amount of funds for each year
- Location – rotating locations and on the public transit line
- Board of directors should be diverse
- Criteria for board member selection – diverse and sought-after expertise
- Partnering with a community hub while transitioning to an independent board of Directors

Themes and Comments

- People feel don't have enough information to weigh into the conversation / didn't know what the models or enough about them
- This consultation is not sufficient; did not do due diligence equipping people to vote confidently
- we need to understand the past issues from members and what went wrong, then turn a new leaf
- Structure of this workshop is not working
- No clarity was brought to the discussion, poorly planned
- Not fair to bring these votes back to council
- We reject this consultation
- This exercise is just a rubber stamp to say it was done; not reflective of importance of community
- Other speakers were not allowed to present and had no voice
- The allotted time was not long enough to flush out the models
- If the information collected here tonight leads to a decision, can we say don't like it?
- Send a request to survey all people here tonight that provided email to ask if they felt this session was effective
- Important to affiliate with other groups that do the same work
- We don't trust the City or McMaster
- A participant voiced following concern: this room is bias and there are participants here who clearly have agenda. People won't even consider the options that include the City or McMaster. I am a black man with a 7-year-old son who will one day face racism issues and I'm here because of that and I'm not even able to participate in this conversation and vote – he then left the room
- It was not okay to pause the center
- The group agreed that there should be a main building/location that is welcoming and inclusive but there is a need for outreach into the community. Mobile units in different areas of the City.

- The group agreed that the City should fund the chosen model but with the ability to fundraise.
- More staff than in the previous model would be needed to be successful. ED, Counsellors, legal needed.
- The room agreed that the City should not run the Model, not own or participate in the selection process of the BOD or the Personnel.
- There was a mixed opinion about starting over from the beginning due to timing i.e. it will take longer to implement option #1 than #4.
- There was an agreement that those involved in the process from selection of the BOD to personnel should be members of a racialized community.
- The City should provide unlimited funding with no strings attached