



Winnipeg Inner-city Research Alliance

WIRA Summer Institute

June 3rd to 8th, 2002

Internal Evaluation

**Institute of Urban Studies
August 2002**

WIRA Summer Institute 2002

Internal Evaluation

Summary

	Page
1.0 Objectives	1
1.1 Shared Learning Experience	1
1.2 Hands-On Approach to Learning	1
1.3 Drawing on Community Expertise	1
2.0 Participants	2
3.0 Sessions	2
3.1 Daytime Sessions	2
3.2 Evening Lectures	5
3.3 Other Activities	6
4.0 Participant Evaluations	8
5.0 Conclusions	12

Appendices

A: Summer Institute Schedule	13
B: Course Outline	14
C: Course Assignment	17
D: Abstract of Gayle Broad's Paper	18
E: Abstract of Melanie Nimmo's Paper	19
F: Field Trip Outline	20
G: Publicity Material	24
H: Evaluations	29

Summary

The WIRA Summer Institute took place June 3 to 8, 2002.

The Institute combined theory and practice, and was aimed at an upper-year undergraduate university level.

The Institute consisted of 9 workshop-style sessions, a field trip, an optional social event, two evening lectures and a wrap-up session.

Sessions were taught by local experts in community development, and included both community practitioners and academics. The evening sessions were open to the public, and were presented by Gayle Broad (Sault Sainte Marie) and Melanie Nimmo (Edmonton).

Course Description

Building and Rebuilding Our Communities (23.3413/3)

This course is intended for community workers, residents and university students, and will explore community revitalization efforts by drawing extensively on case studies and field project work in Winnipeg's inner city. The course will examine broad approaches to revitalization, including: the role of leadership and partnerships; ways to rejuvenate older neighbourhoods; and how to plan for long-term social, political and environmental sustainability. The course will be presented in a workshop format over the course of one week, and will be organized under such themes as housing, youth, and mobilizing communities for change.

In total, 40 participants attended: 30 for academic credit and 10 for a certificate.

Students were asked to evaluate individual components of the Institute, as well as the Institute overall. Of the 40 participants, 29 completed the survey. Each of the sessions ranked highly with the students, as did overall course content, quality of presentations and organization of the Institute.

Overall, the Institute may be considered a success based on the observations of the organizers and the feedback received. The relatively small class size, mixed group of participants, hands-on style of instruction and intensive nature of the course were considered to be key contributors to the Institute's success.

1.0 Objectives

The WIRA Summer Institute was designed with a number of objectives in mind. The intention was to create a unique, shared learning experience for university students and community practitioners through a series of workshop-style sessions addressing a range of issues related to community development in Winnipeg's inner city. The Institute aimed to take a "hands-on" approach to learning, to combine classroom learning with "on the ground" experience of Winnipeg's inner-city communities, and to provide instruction that combined theory and practice.

1.1 *Shared Learning Experience*

The Institute was successful in creating a learning environment that validated the expertise of presenters and participants alike. Many of the sessions were structured in a manner that encouraged hands-on activities, question and answer, group work and dialogue. One community participant felt that the breaks should have been extended because she found she was learning a great deal through her conversations with other participants. Community participants made valuable contributions to discussion throughout the week, particularly in relation to their own neighbourhood or area of expertise.

1.2 *Hands-on Approach to Learning*

The Institute combined lecture-style classroom instruction with other types of learning experiences. Some presenters engaged the participants in group work (in one instance drawing on the knowledge and networks of participants to gather ideas for a current community-based project) or took them on tours of their neighbourhoods (Spence). A number of sessions were held off-campus in community venues (Crossways in Common, Ma Mawi Chi Itata Centre, West Broadway Community Centre). The 3.5-hour field trip - a bus and walking tour of the inner city - was very well received: many students indicated that this had been among the highlights of the course, as it had grounded many concepts and theories they had learned in the classroom.

1.3 *Drawing on Community Expertise*

While the two evening lectures were presented by individuals from outside of Winnipeg, all of the daytime sessions were facilitated by local community practitioners and



academics. The Institute was an excellent opportunity to bring together individuals working in different areas of community development in the inner city. Although presenters were invited to attend other sessions and a social event, few did so, potentially due to time constraints. In future, it would be helpful to make greater efforts to better involve the presenters.



In some instances, students made connections with community organizations which led to sharing of information and resources, and possible future collaboration.



2.0 Participants

A total of 40 participants registered for the Summer Institute: 30 took the course for credit and 10 for certificate.

Both university students and community participants indicated that the mix of backgrounds, knowledge and experiences was one of the most positive aspects of the Institute. There was extensive interaction between many of the participants and presenters during most of the sessions, between sessions, and during the excursions.

3.0 Sessions

A total of nine three-hour regular sessions were held over the course of the week, in addition to a field trip, two keynote lectures in the evening, and a wrap-up session on Saturday morning. The sessions addressed diverse themes, loosely grouped under the categories of youth, housing, community mobilization and capacity building, Aboriginal community development practice and environmental issues. The response was overwhelmingly positive overall, and most participants felt that all of the sessions had been valuable.



3.1 Daytime Sessions

Facilitating Community Learning
Lynn Skotnitsky (Consultant)



- # Through this session, participants explored how learning happens both at individual and group (community) levels. Using Kolb's (1984) model of experiential learning, participants had an opportunity to reflect on their own personal learning style preferences, to dialogue with others, and to develop strategies for building together a learning community during the course of the Summer Institute. The value of building social capital and how it relates to learning and community development was also discussed.

Working with Inner-City Youth

Ken McCluskey (Education; University of Winnipeg)

- # Drawing on his extensive teaching experience and work as an educator, McCluskey focussed on the role of education with a specific focus on mentoring programs in working with inner city youth. His presentation highlighted the advantages of mentoring programs and their role in enhancing self-esteem, self awareness, developing effective coping strategies and problem solving skills. He also highlighted the potential of mentoring to enhance access to education, employment opportunities and reduce involvement in substance abuse, violence and illegal activities. The importance of mentoring and improved education to community organizations, community schools and community development in general was highlighted throughout the presentation.

Participatory Action Research with Street-Involved Youth

Nancy Higgitt (Family Studies; University of Manitoba)

- # Focussing on a research initiative involving disenfranchised youth, this presentation illustrated the many advantages, as well as the difficulties, of engaging in participatory action research. Many disenfranchised youth enter life on the street to escape situations they perceive as desperate and unresolvable. Yet street life presents serious problems, puts the well being of young people at enormous risk and stresses the larger community. The costs associated with the social exclusion of youth are enormous in terms of human, social and economic capital. The project seeks to understand how youth themselves understand the situation, as this knowledge is necessary in designing effective solutions. The presenter, utilizing the project, illustrated how members of community organizations, university faculty and students, and the youth at risk can work together on a research project and build relationships, develop skills and by partnering build a better understanding of the issues and generate the necessary information to develop effective preventive strategies.



Housing I: Rental Housing and the Tenant-Landlord Cooperation Program

Linda Williams and Rico John (West Broadway Neighbourhood Housing Resource Centre)

- < This presentation addressed the issue of rental housing in the West Broadway neighbourhood, with particular attention paid to the Tenant-Landlord Cooperation program(TLC). Linda Williams traced the development of community organizations in the neighbourhood, while Rico John spoke to the TLC as a community-building program and an effective tool to encourage landlords to maintain their properties.

Housing II: Rooming Houses in Winnipeg

Jino Distasio and Michael Dudley (Institute of Urban Studies)

- < This presentation addressed the issue of rooming houses by providing a national overview of literature on the subject and presenting preliminary results of a study currently being undertaken in Winnipeg. Both the physical and social aspects of rooming houses were addressed, touching on issues such as regulation and policy, resident empowerment, and resident's perceptions of their environment.

Organizing for Community Change I

Sharon Taylor (Wolseley Family Place)

- < This presentation provided a broad overview of issues facing community-based organizations, as well as a critical perspective on community development work. Organizational issues such as program streamlining were addressed, as well as strategies for working with particular groups. Different ideological approaches to community development were also explored.

Community Development from an Aboriginal Perspective

Josie Hill (Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre)

- < As an introduction to this session, background was provided by the presenters about the Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre, its programs, clientele, services and mission. Examples from the Centre's experiences were used to illustrate their holistic approach to community development. The uniqueness of their approach was explained through a comparison of industrial and indigenous dichotomies, and examination of their values, plus philosophical and cultural institutions of First Nations, the Anishinaabe Medicine wheel, and the Indigenous research agenda.

Housing III: Affordable Homeownership Programs and Inner-city Households

Tom Carter and Paul Chorney (Institute of Urban Studies, West Broadway Development Corporation)

- < This presentation provided a broad overview of the role of housing as a tool in community development and urban revitalization. The housing problems facing inner city households were highlighted. Discussion was also provided on the role of housing as an employment and training vehicle, a focus for community capacity

building, and the potential that affordable, quality housing that provides security of tenure may have to improve the quality of life of low and modest income inner city households. Improved housing, it was noted, can be a stabilizing factor for families which improves their self esteem and often increases their capacity to improve other aspects of their life such as education, labour force skills and employment opportunities. Housing may also be the issue around which communities organize and come together, leading eventually to strong community based organizations that go on to tackle other community development issues. The discussion provided an overview of programs that community based organizations are using to improve housing in their neighbourhoods. The strengths and weaknesses of these programs were also discussed.

Organizing for Community Change II

Shannon Watson and Vince Sansregret (Spence Neighbourhood Association, West Broadway Development Corporation)

- < This presentation focussed on community organizing. As it was presented by two people very involved, and with a great deal of experience, in organizing community, the presentation provided practical and useful ideas for the class. Community organizing, it was pointed out, is a process of building power through involving a constituency (members of the community) in identifying problems they share and the solutions to those problems that they desire. Identifying people and structures that can make these solutions possible is also a key part of the process. Community organizing is not merely a process that is good for its own sake. Unless the organization wins concrete, measurable benefits for those who participate, it will not last very long. People want to see results, and that's why they get involved. The discussion included some very practical tips for community organizing including identifying local leaders, making good use of volunteers, relating to people's experience, effective networking, building local coalitions and a variety of other techniques. Participants were able to take away very practical approaches to assist in organizing communities.

Rooftop Gardens to Build Community and Environment

Merrell Ann Phare and Rodney McDonald (Centre for Indigenous Environmental Resources)

- < This presentation focussed on environmentally-friendly technologies and their application to the inner-city. The primary focus was on rooftop gardens, and participants conducted an exercise to explore community development opportunities inherent in them. Attention was given to the benefits of rooftop gardens for community education, partnership-building, and creating a stronger connection between urban residents and the natural environment.

3.2 Evening Lectures



Creating the Space for Praxis: Reflections on the connection of theory with practice

Gayle Broad (Community Development Consultant, Sault Sainte Marie)

- < This presentation looked at community development practice in terms of the role of the community developer. Various examples illustrated practical ways by which reflective practice may be incorporated into the community development agenda. Please see appendix D for abstract.



Understanding, Preventing and Responding to Violent Juveniles and Youth Groups

Melanie Nimmo (Doctoral Student, University of Alberta)

- < This presentation explored issues around juvenile youth violence, including contributing causes such as family dynamics and racism, as well as potential strategies to prevent and respond to juvenile violence. Please see appendix E for abstract.

3.3 Other Activities

Field Trip (Tom Carter)

- < The field trip was designed to enhance classroom discussions by:
 - # seeing first-hand some of the neighbourhoods characterized by decline, noting physical and locational characteristics;
 - # providing an appreciation and understanding of the magnitude of decline and the significance of the problem;
 - # observing many of the initiatives underway to revitalize these neighbourhoods and promote community development; and
 - # fostering a better understanding of the solutions required and the challenges faced by community organizations.

The field trip focussed on three inner city neighbourhoods: West Broadway, Spence



and William Whyte. The trip also included stops along Main Street and in the Exchange District. Class participants had an opportunity to tour houses under renovation, look at examples of the different types of housing initiatives, see examples of urban gardens, youth employment projects, and view first hand the indicators of urban decline, such as vacant lots, boarded up units, units destroyed by arson, as well as examples of vandalism common in these areas. There was also an opportunity to view examples of heritage restoration in the Exchange District, as well as various other initiatives that are helping to revitalize this area. The Aboriginal development focus on the corner of Higgins and Main was also a stop on the tour.

Students indicated that they found the trip to be one of the highlights of the Summer Institute because it provided very practical examples of many of the issues and initiatives that were being discussed in the classroom. The brief field trip outline that was handed out to the participants is attached as Appendix F.

Social Evening (Paddlewheel Dinner Cruise; optional)

- < Participants who took part in the Friday evening Paddlewheel Dinner Cruise enjoyed the meal and the opportunity the event presented for informal socializing with other participants and some of the presenters. Only a relatively small number of participants, however, attended the evening. Some suggested that a less expensive event, like a barbeque, might encourage more people to attend.

Wrap-Up Session (Tom Carter and Lynn Skotnitsky)

- < Lynn Skotnitsky and Tom Carter facilitated a wrap-up session on Saturday morning. This session was well-attended, with over half of the participants present. Material from the week was reviewed and synthesized. Participatory discussion brought together many of the week's different topics and themes. Participants also provided verbal feedback about the Summer Institute, with some recommendations for future Institutes.

4.0 Participant Evaluations

In the package of information provided on the first day of the Summer Institute, participants were given a course evaluation form (See Appendix H). They were asked to complete this form throughout the course of the Institute and hand it to one of the organizers following the final session. Below is a sampling of the range of comments provided by the participants.

Facilitating Community Learning (Lynn Skotnitsky):

- < Good focus on self-knowledge and self-reflection. I was sorry we did not get to the impact of that on community learning processes.
- < Learning style exercise was great, but could be designed in more user friendly language to be used as a tool when working with community and their literacy levels.
- < I think it is a great way of starting the course because I got to know almost everybody in class and it makes me look forward to attending class every morning. Also I got to know myself more.

Mentoring Inner-city Youth (Ken McCluskey):

- < Excellent, funny, lots of information and great speaker.
- < Very interesting, but too slow paced for the afternoon.
- < Grounded and engaging.

Violent Juveniles (Melanie Nimmo):

- < Great workshop, interesting discussion and debate.
- < The way she presents is good, but too academic. I was looking forward to hearing more about her experiences.

PAR with Street-Involved Youth (Nancy Higgitt):

- < The lecture assumed that the class members would be 'external researchers'. I wonder what it all sounded like to participants who were working in their own communities.
- < I had expected a lengthy insight into the youth life aspect. I felt that 10-15 min on the subject was too short and the research aspect too long. Great speaker.
- < Entertaining, easy to understand, enthusiastic.

Rental Housing and Rooming Houses (Williams, John, Distasio, Dudley):

- < It was a wonderful opportunity to go to West Broadway Community Centre. However, it was unfortunate that I could not hear the presentation well due to the poor facility.
- < Williams and John: good resources, but presentation disjointed.
- < Distasio and Dudley: clear, informative, well prepared.

Organizing for Community Change (Sharon Taylor):

- < Lots of new thinking and awareness.
- < Very smooth, lots of information, all tied together.
- < Very dry, could have used other media in her presentation.
- < Really enjoyed the presentation because she presents the theory and her experiences.

Community Development from an Aboriginal Perspective (Josie Hill):

- < More actual stories would have been better, more in-depth history of how aboriginal culture works (has worked) instead of just how mamawi works.
- < Excellent. Appreciated allowing for participant input, this sparked great discussion outside.
- < Her presentation is good. I think what I like most about it is the cultural sensitivity.

Creating Space for Praxis (Gayle Broad):

- < It felt more like the “meat” of the course, good to have a look at the theory.
- < Interesting to listen to an informational perspective. Focus on issues and space to deal with them. Need more discussion on best practices (positives), examples of community work projects.
- < Her experiences are very valuable. I really enjoyed her presentation and did not realize how fast the time passed.

Affordable Homeownership (Tom Carter and Paul Chorney):

- < Good to hear about what is working, what is not, and the challenges and struggles encountered in West Broadway
- < I enjoyed the slide show presentation, it helped put what we were learning and talking about into reality.
- < The presentation is a real open eye issue for me. I learned a lot about the importance of housing and it's not just a house, but a home. I also learnt that cultural perspectives can also impact on it.

Field Trip: Inner-city tour:

- < Hands on work and going to the sights were the best.
- < This was exceptionally eye-opening.
- < Helped me picture academic information in my mind.
- < Should have been done earlier in the week.

Organizing for Community Change (Shannon Watson and Vince Sanregret):

- < Most practical and hands-on, earthy wisdom.
- < The presentation with experiences is very good. I appreciate their effort in sharing their experiences and tips. Also letting us become part of their work

and showing us their neighbourhood. They showed me a great sense of pride for their neighbourhood that I admire.

Rooftop Gardens (Merrell Ann Phare):

- < Fascinating and motivating.
- < Extremely well-informed and well-spoken (professional).
- < Needed time for dissent.
- < Would have preferred to have visited an actual rooftop garden.
- < Unbelievably interesting information. We enjoyed break out exercise to expand on our newly acquired knowledge.
- < It is good and interesting, but I feel that it's too far from what I can relate to. I think because it sounds very expensive and complicated that it is almost unrealistic. But it's good to know about it.

Paddlewheel Dinner Cruise:

- < Company was great, but the food was terrible.
- < It would have been great to have a lunch together instead.

Overall course content:

- < As a community worker, I've heard the "why's" and the theory before. The examples of 'how to' and the exchange of possible options was to most useful.
- < Balance in theory and adult learning break out groups, network and learn current best practices models related in theory presented in every class
- < I really enjoyed the whole social dynamic of this course. Initially I thought that it was just going to be about how to construct new developments and community physically, but the social aspect was awesome.

Overall quality of the presentations:

- < Diverse.
- < Everyone is excellent in my opinion, just because they are willing to share their valuable experiences with me.

Usefulness of materials provided prior to the institute and in the workshops:

- < It was good to see posters on the evening events around the community.
- < All handouts are great sources to deepen my knowledge.

Logistics - organization of transportation:

- < Bus to Langside was redundant, we could have just had the bus to William Whyte

- organization of refreshments:

- < Great, students especially appreciated community inspired muffins, coffee,

cookies, etc. being brought to the sessions.

- *organization of meeting space:*

- < Class setting not great. Get the first room for the whole week.
- < It was good to get into the community when we could.

The helpfulness of the organizers:

- < Wow! You all are excellent.
- < Great assistance from Stephanie and Tom before the course to ease the transition back to school after 18 years.

Participants' Rating of Summer Institute

Session Title	Presenter	Rating (% of total responses)				
		1=Poor	2	3	4	5=Excellent
Facilitating Community Learning	Lynn Skotnitsky			27.6	48.3	24.1
Mentoring Inner-City Youth	Ken McCluskey			6.9	34.5	58.6
Violent Juveniles	Melanie Nimmo		7.7	46.2	34.6	11.5
PAR with Street Involved Youth	Nancy Higgitt		3.4	34.5	51.7	10.3
Rental Housing and Rooming Houses	Williams & John; Distasio & Dudley	3.4	3.4	48.3	27.6	17.2
Organizing for Community Change	Sharon Taylor		3.8	19.2	46.2	30.8
Community Development from an Aboriginal Perspective	Josie Hill & John Lussier		3.7	51.9	37	7.4
Creating the Space for Praxis	Gayle Broad		4.2	58.3	20.8	16.7
Affordable Homeownership	Tom Carter & Paul Chorney		3.4	3.4	55.2	37.9
Field Trip: Inner-City Tour				14.8	22.2	63
Organizing for Community Change	Shannon Watson & Vince Sansregret			21.4	46.4	32.1
Rooftop Gardens	Merrell Ann Phare		3.7	11.1	25.9	59.3
Paddlewheel Dinner Cruise				16.7	16.7	66.7
Overall Course Content				3.4	62.1	34.5
Overall Quality of Presentations				3.6	64.3	32.1
Usefulness of materials provided prior to Institute		14.8	22.2	29.6		33.3
Usefulness of materials provided in workshops				7.1	32.1	60.7
Logistics and Organization: transportation				7.4	14.8	77.8
Logistics and Organization: refreshments					20.7	79.3
Logistics and Organization: meeting space				17.2	24.1	58.6
Helpfulness of Organizers					10.3	89.7

5.0 Conclusions

Although the comments of participants and our thoughts on the initiative were positive overall, we feel there are a number of issues that have to be discussed prior to a decision to continue with the Summer Institute initiative in future years. These issues include:

1. What should the theme of future initiatives be?
2. Should the Institute be expanded (time frame and number of participants)?
3. Should the Institute be expanded to include a range of courses constituting a program in community development?
4. How - or should - the Institute be integrated with programs at the University of Winnipeg, or other programs in the City focussing on community development?
5. Should the target audience be expanded, perhaps to include high school students or people from other communities? Should the Institute be promoted to a national/international audience? Winnipeg is a good "case study" theatre for both successes and failures in urban revitalization and community development.
6. Can the program be made sustainable so that it can be delivered after the CURA funding expires? If so, how?

Although our first initiative has been quite successful there are major issues and questions that have to be addressed prior to proceeding with the planning necessary for a similar event next year.



APPENDIX A: Summer Institute Program Schedule

Time	Mon. June 3 2M70	Tues. June 4 2D12	Wed. June 5 2D11	Thurs. June 6 2D12	Fri. June 7 2D11	Sat. June 8 2D11
am (3hr) 9:00- 12:00	Facilitating Community Learning Lynn Skotnitsky <i>Consultant</i>	Participatory Action Research with Street- Involved Youth Nancy Higgitt <i>University of Manitoba</i>	Organizing for Community Change Sharon Taylor <i>Wolseley Family Place</i>	Affordable Homeownership Tom Carter and Paul Chorney <i>Institute of Urban Studies; West Broadway Development Corporation</i>	Organizing for Community Change Shannon Watson and Vince Sansregret <i>Spence Neighbourhood Association; West Broadway Development Corporation</i>	Wrap-Up Session (3 hours)
pm (3hr) 1:30-4:30	Mentoring Inner-City Youth Ken McCluskey <i>University of Winnipeg</i>	Rental Housing and Rooming Houses Linda Williams and Rico John; Jino Distasio and Michael Dudley <i>West Broadway Neighbourhood Housing Resource Centre;</i>	Community Development from an Aboriginal Perspective Josie Hill <i>Ma Mawi Chi Itata</i> *pick up 1pm in front of Duckworth Centre (Spence St.), drop-off 5:15pm at Duckworth Centre	FIELD TRIP Winnipeg's Inner City *pick up 1:00pm Duckworth Centre, drop-off 5pm Duckworth Centre	Rooftop Gardens to Build Community and Environment Merrell Ann Phare <i>Centre for Indigenous Environmental Resources</i>	
evening (1.5 hr) 7:30-9:00	Violent Juveniles Melanie Nimmo <i>Crossways (at Young United Church) 100- 222 Furby St.</i>		Creating the Space for Praxis Gayle Broad <i>University of Wpg. Ekhart-Gramatte Hall 3rd floor Centennial</i>		Paddlewheel Dinner Cruise *pick-up 5:15pm <i>Duckworth C., drop-off at 10:15pm Duckworth Centre</i>	

APPENDIX B: COURSE OUTLINE

WINNIPEG INNER CITY RESEARCH ALLIANCE (WIRA) SUMMER INSTITUTE

3413/3 BUILDING AND REBUILDING OUR COMMUNITIES

Classroom:	4CM13	Lead Instructor:	T. Carter
Time:	June 3rd to 8th, 2002	Office Number:	5L09
	Intensive, full-day sessions with some evening events	Phone:	786-9237, 982-1148
		e-mail:	t.carter@uwinnipeg.ca

Course Description: This course is intended for community workers, community residents and university students. It will explore community revitalization and development efforts by drawing extensively on case studies and field project work in Winnipeg's inner city and other cities in Canada and abroad. The course will examine broad approaches to revitalization and development, including: the role of leadership and partnerships; ways to rejuvenate older neighbourhoods; and how to plan for long-term social, political and environmental sustainability. The course will be presented in a workshop format over the course of one week, and will be organized under such themes as housing, youth, and mobilizing communities for change.

The Winnipeg Inner City Research Alliance (WIRA) Summer Institute is targeted at university students with backgrounds in areas such as Geography, Sociology, Urban and Environmental Studies, Political Science and International Development Studies. Community practitioners, with a strong interest or background in community development will also find the course of interest and value to their work. The material and level of instruction will be equivalent to an upper-year university course.

The Institute will adopt a practical, hands-on approach. Instruction will consist of lectures, seminars, field trips and sessions with community groups. Sessions will be led by local and national experts in the field, and will facilitate an exchange of ideas among participants.

The WIRA Summer Institute is offered as a 3-credit hour course through the University of Winnipeg, and may count toward degrees in Geography, Environmental and Urban Studies, and International Development Studies. The course can also be used as an elective in many other majors.

Participants may take the course for academic credit, or receive a certificate. Those taking the course for credit will be required to complete a major assignment within six weeks of the conclusion of the course.

Text: A list of relevant readings will be provided.

Term Assignment and Mark Distribution:

Major Research Assignment	-	85%	due Monday, July 22, 2002
Attendance & Participation	-	15%	

The research assignment only has to be completed by participants taking the course for credit.

Course Organization and Outline:

The course content will be organized around three broad thematic areas: *Housing and Community Development*; *Youth Perspectives in the Community*; and, *Organizing for Community Change*. In addition there will be a session on *Community Development from an Aboriginal Perspective* and another on *Facilitating Community Learning and Capacity Building*. A range of topics will be discussed within these broad themes, ranging through revitalization initiatives, economic justice, community health and safety, crime, youth violence and gangs, social integration and other issues of particular relevance to Winnipeg's inner city.

The Institute will consist of eleven sessions, each of which will be led by different presenters. The presenters will include community organizers/workers and academics with backgrounds in community development and inner city issues.

In addition to the eleven sessions, there will be a half-day field trip during which students will have an opportunity to view first hand both the challenges facing the inner city and initiatives to address neighbourhood concerns and problems.

The attached sheets illustrate the organization and general themes of the course. Students should note that they will be required to attend two evening sessions.

Learning Outcomes:

Students who complete this course can expect to achieve the following learning outcomes:

- a) a better understanding of the economic, social and physical processes associated with neighbourhood decline;
- b) an appreciation of the complex nature and complicated interrelationship of these processes;
- c) what planning and community development approaches and initiatives have been used successfully to arrest and reverse decline;
- d) how to determine, collect and organize decision-relevant information that will support the community building and revitalization process in cities;

- e) the basic knowledge and planning tools necessary to work with, and in, communities to improve both the physical infrastructure and quality of life;
- f) a knowledge of the limitations cities and communities face in attempting to arrest decline; and,
- g) an understanding of community dynamics, how to mobilize community and build community capacity.

Grading:

The following grading system will be used as a guideline in this course:

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
A+	86-100
A	80-85
B+	75-79
B	70-74
C+	65-69
C	58-64
D	50-57
F	less than 50

The numeric boundaries separating letter grades may be adjusted at the demand of the Department Review Committee or the University Senate.

Senate Regulations:

Students are expected to conduct themselves according to the standards and regulations set out by the University of Winnipeg. The University Senate would like you to be particularly aware of the following regulations published in the 2001-2002 General Calendar: GRADING (Regulation VII-3, pp. 47 to 48), APPEALS (Regulation VII-8, pp. 52 to 54), and ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT and DISCIPLINE (Regulation VII-7, pp. 50 to 52).

APPENDIX C: COURSE ASSIGNMENT

BUILDING AND REBUILDING OUR COMMUNITIES (23:3414/3)

Participants taking the course for credit will have to complete one assignment. There will be no tests during the course and no final examination.

The assignment:

- 3) will require a focus on an inner city revitalization/community development issue. This can include of topics focussing on issues ranging from social themes such as homeless youth, street gangs, poverty and crime, through topics that focus on organizing and building community capacity, to housing development, urban gardening, economic and business development and many other issues that are important to communities that are attempting to reverse long term, systemic decline and improve the quality of life for inner city residents;
- 4) may focus on the inner city of Winnipeg but students, if they wish, can focus on other cities or issues that apply to declining areas of cities in general;
- 5) will have to be substantive (4000-5000 words) as it will be the only assignment for course credit;
- 6) should include a review of relevant literature, provide supporting data (qualitative or quantitative as the topic dictates), information from interviews or discussions with key informants and other supporting documentation as the topic requires;
- 7) will be worth 85% of the final grade, the remaining 15% will be awarded for attendance and workshop participation;
- 8) will be due six weeks after the end of the Institute (July 22, 2002); and,
- 9) will be marked by Tom Carter, Director, Institute of Urban Studies.

A list of possible topics will be provided, however participants may choose their own topic. If participants choose a topic of their own it should be approved by Tom Carter, lead instructor for the course.

Participants will be provided with a list of general readings prior to the beginning of the course which will assist with the assignment and the course in general.

Detailed project guidelines will be provided to assist participants in completing the project.

APPENDIX D: Abstract

CREATING THE SPACE FOR PRAXIS: Reflections on the connection of theory with practice

Gayle Broad

Community development is about making the world a better place for our families, neighbours and communities. Compelling issues such as poverty, unemployment and environmental damage urge action rather than developing analysis. The time constraints posed by individual casework, project management, and limited resources make it even more difficult for community developers to take the time to reflect on what they have learned from one project before moving on to the next. Innovative research methods, theories of the community change process, and observations about the relationship between individual analysis and community activism are some of the theoretical tools essential to informing community action. This presentation uses examples from a number of community case studies to illustrate how these tools can be applied to improve community development practice. The presentation also discusses how community actions can be better used to inform our theories of community change, thereby creating a cycle of continuous improvement in both theory and practice. The presentation concludes that the need to incorporate ongoing dialogue and exchanges between practitioners and theoreticians can be accommodated without sacrificing the time needed for action – by creating the space for praxis.

(Complete document available from the Institute of Urban Studies)

APPENDIX E: Abstract

Understanding, Preventing, and Responding to Violent Juveniles and Youth Groups

Melanie Nimmo
Department of Sociology, University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

Abstract

This paper begins by explaining why some juveniles act aggressively and may choose to affiliate with a street group. Following this brief exploration into the etiology of juvenile violence and motivations toward gangs, the focus of the paper shifts from *understanding* the underlying issues to *addressing* the needs of these youth. As such, the primary focus of this discussion consists of practical strategies that will both prevent and respond to juvenile violence and gang affiliation. Central to this project, the paper will suggest a number of ways that individuals and agencies can work together to promote safer communities for our youth and ourselves

(Complete document available from the Institute of Urban Studies)

APPENDIX F:
Field Trip: June 6, 2002

Field Trip Objectives

- 10) to view some of the neighbourhoods characterised by decline, noting physical and locational characteristics
- 11) to observe some of the initiatives underway to revitalize these neighbourhoods and promote community development
- 12) to achieve an understanding of the magnitude of decline and the significance of the problem
- 13) to develop a better understanding of the solutions required and the challenges faced by community organizations

The field trip will focus on three inner city neighbourhoods: West Broadway, Spence and William Whyte. We will also spend time on Main Street, in the Exchange District/Forks area and, time permitting, at the offices of the Winnipeg Housing and Homeless Initiative (WHHI).

WEST BROADWAY

1.0 Profile Comments

- S** a neighbourhood in transition
- S** very high proportion of rooming houses
- S** modest number of vacant lots
- S** several boarded up dwellings
- S** high proportion of renters
- S** several heritage dwellings
- S** unit design dominated by 2, 2½ and 3 story dwellings
- S** mix of single and multi-family units

2.0 What to Watch For

- S** new renovations
- S** placarded/boarded up units
- S** community gardens
- S** development of parks and green space
- S** youth employment and training
- S** activity under the Community Land Trust

3.0 Specific Sites in West Broadway

- a) Balmoral: 270-266 (student housing)
- b) Young: Little Red Spirit Park
230 and 246 (housing activity by West Broadway with vacant lot between)

- c) Langside: 250, 258 (Boarded), 265-271, 272, 296, 305, 308 & 310 (Rooming house), 316 (housing activity in all but 3 marked addresses)
- d) Furby: 294 (Westminster Housing Society), 283 (terrible condition), 251 (large brick house in good condition)

4.0 Questions for Discussion

- e) Is mixed income the best approach?
- f) Should there be concerns about gentrification? How do you prevent this from happening? Should you?
- g) Does West Broadway deserve continued funding given the improvements that have occurred, or should funding now be allocated to other neighbourhoods? Should success be rewarded?
- h) What will/should be the role of the private sector?
- i) Should more open space be provided?
- j) Should we be concerned about rising land and housing prices? If so, how can we prevent this?

SPENCE

1.0 Profile Comments

- S** many of the characteristics of West Broadway, but more vacant lots, more boarded/placarded units
- S** more smaller dwellings
- S** housing stock may be in poorer condition
- S** higher percentage of single detached dwellings than West Broadway
- S** less revitalization activity
- S** fewer “concerns” about gentrification

2.0 What to Watch For

- S** new renovations
- S** placarded/boarded up units
- S** vacant lots
- S** poor quality of some dwellings
- S** activity spearheaded by local church group

3.0 Specific Sites

- a) Langside: *Ellice to Portage*
 - vacant lots both sides of street
 - family housing both sides of street
 - 493, 514, 515, 517 - Spence Neighbourhood Housing
 - 520 - Lazarus Housing
 - 541 - Spence Neighbourhood Housing
 - 545 - Boarded unit
 - 558 - Spence Neighbourhood Housing
 - 557 - Spence Neighbourhood Housing: Infill (new)
 - 568 - Spence Neighbourhood Housing
 - 574 - Spence Neighbourhood Housing (For Sale)
 - 578 - Spence Neighbourhood Housing

- b) Langside *Ellice to Cumberland*
 - community garden on east side
 - 661-663 - The Castle - Lazarus Housing
(Emergency, Transitional and Permanent Housing)

- c) Spence: 453, 449, 443, 440 (student housing)

4.0 Questions for Discussion

- d) Should more student housing be promoted?
- e) What level of subsidy is justified?
- f) Is housing enough?
- g) Is youth employment/training justified?

WILLIAM WHYTE

1.0 Profile Comments

- S** contains some of the worst housing stock in the City
- S** some houses very poorly built initially
- S** experienced severe declines in property values in recent years
- S** ownership levels actually higher than in Spence and West Broadway
- S** serious arson problems in recent years

2.0 What to Watch For

- S** renovations
- S** new units
- S** significant number of vacant lots
- S** significant number of boarded up units
- S** very poor quality stock
- S** small lots
- S** significant amount of public/social housing
- S** activity by Aboriginal Housing groups

3.0 Specific Sites

(Too numerous to mention)

4.0 Questions for Discussion

- a) How much effort (time/money) should be spent on saving old dwellings?
- b) Should renovation activity be concentrated or disbursed?
- c) Are the designs of new/renovated units appropriate?
- d) Should we be trying to increase densities?

APPENDIX H: EVALUATION: BUILDING AND REBUILDING OUR COMMUNITIES

Workshops/ Activities:

Rating: please circle

Comments:

(1 =Poor – 5 =Excellent)

Monday, June 3

- Facilitating Community Learning (Lynn Skotnitsky) 1 2 3 4 5
- Mentoring Inner-City Youth (Ken McCluskey) 1 2 3 4 5
- Violent Juveniles (Melanie Nimmo) 1 2 3 4 5

Tuesday, June 4

- PAR with Street-Involved Youth (Nancy Higgitt) 1 2 3 4 5
- Rental Housing and Rooming Houses (Williams, John, Distasio, Dudley) 1 2 3 4 5

Wednesday, June 5

- Organizing for Community Change (Sharon Taylor) 1 2 3 4 5
- Community Development from an Aboriginal Perspective (Josie Hill) 1 2 3 4 5
- Creating the Space for Praxis (Gayle Broad) 1 2 3 4 5

Thursday, June 6

- Affordable Homeownership (Tom Carter and Paul Chorney) 1 2 3 4 5
- Field Trip: Inner-city tour 1 2 3 4 5

Friday, June 7

- Organizing for Community Change (Shannon Watson and Vince Sansregret) 1 2 3 4 5
- Rooftop Gardens (Merrell Ann Phare) 1 2 3 4 5

- Paddlewheel Dinner Cruise 1 2 3 4 5

Please let us know what you thought about the:

Rating: please circle
(1=Poor – 5=Excellent)

Comments:

- Overall course content 1 2 3 4 5

- Overall Quality of the presentations 1 2 3 4 5

- Usefulness of materials
 - provided prior to the institute 1 2 3 4 5
 - provided in the workshops 1 2 3 4 5

- Logistics and Organization
 - transportation 1 2 3 4 5
 - refreshments 1 2 3 4 5
 - meeting space 1 2 3 4 5

- The helpfulness of the organizers 1 2 3 4 5

What did you enjoy most about the WIRA Summer Institute?

What suggestions can you offer for improvement?

Additional Comments:

Thank-you for your input. It is invaluable. Enjoy the rest of your summer!