

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Urban Development Agreements: Lessons from the West

Tuesday, April 27, 2004, 8:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Simcoe Room, Macdonald Block, 900 Bay Street, Toronto

SPEAKER SESSIONS: (1=Strongly Disagree -----5=Strongly Agree)

	Response Average	Number of Responses
URBAN DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS IN VANCOUVER AND WINNIPEG	4.2	36
The speakers provided us with new, interesting or important information.		
GOVERNMENT PERSPECTIVES	3.4	36
The speakers provided us with new, interesting or important information.		
APPLICABILITY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS TO TORONTO	3.9	36
The speakers provided us with new, interesting or important information.		

FACILITATED DISCUSSION: (1=Strongly Disagree -----5=Strongly Agree)

	Response Average	Number of Responses
The facilitated discussion was useful and insightful.	3.0	12

GENERAL: (1=Strongly Disagree -----5=Strongly Agree)

	Response Average	Number of Responses
Overall, the forum was useful to the work that I do.	3.9	36
The forum stimulated my interest in improving the capability of governments working together in Toronto.	4.1	35
The forum provided a good networking opportunity.	3.5	35
The forum was well organized overall.	4.1	36
The meeting facilities were comfortable and conducive to learning.	3.6	35

Summary of Comments

Comments and suggestions on the speakers:

- Best were Phillip from the City of Toronto, Naomi Alboim, Derek Ballantyne and Doug Kalcsics
- Very good forum; especially enjoyed hearing about the Winnipeg experience
- How do the police (in Vancouver and Winnipeg) respond to the agreement – harm reduction – totally different way of dealing with the issues
- Very honest sharing of experiences from Vancouver and Winnipeg – very helpful
- Government perspectives, except for the City, were a bit too soft, non-committal
- I feel this is a very exciting topic and would like to hear more about it
- Excellent presentations – would have liked copies of the presentations in my registration package as they would help with note taking
- Very good panels
- Federal speaker didn't really say anything and the inability of the provincial speaker to speak on behalf of the province says volumes about the commitment of these two levels of government to this process
- The panel format was very effective; maintained a good pace for the session
- Lots of information – great start!
- For the most part, on topic. The “pinch-hitter” from the City (Mr. Abrahams) was very good!
- It was good to hear James Kennedy's perspective of the Vancouver Agreement. I would have liked to have heard from the Social Services perspective of their involvement, if any, and if there has been an impact to the services they provide
- “Applicability” was the most interesting. Less descriptive and more analytical – generates new thinking
- Again, without strong government voices and committed government leaders/advocates, Ontario will forever remain on the “hamster wheel” – lots of noise, action and effort extended with no apparent results
- Great balance of speakers – interesting, informative
- Relevant conclusions/recommendations – particularly appreciated balance of government, community, business representatives
- Key issues for Toronto: immigration; housing; and private sector role
- Would benefit from another Toronto-specific session on how to proceed (i.e., how much does City Summit define what agreements emerge vs. waiting for governments to decide)
- Some really practical viewpoints – important and relevant
- The talk on the Urban Development Agreement in Vancouver provides an excellent model for a formalized intergovernmental collaborative process. This model proves that it is possible to have the leaders in government work together to produce positive results
- Federal contribution was a combination of cliches and press release snippets – not forward looking – not useful. The federal level seems to have a fundamental confusion between cities and communities

Comments and suggestions on the facilitated discussion:

- Very difficult to hear
- Too short – however, there didn't seem to be much interest in asking questions from the audience
- No time for this – too bad
- Sound was an issue – couldn't hear anything
- Better microphones for the speakers and microphones for the audience would have allowed everyone to hear all of the discussion
- Should have been better prepared with an audience microphone and speakers' responses were affected by difficulty hearing through the background noises picked up on the microphones
- The applicability section provides some very practical and interesting ideas; the ideas really touched on the heart of the problems that the government has to focus on. A "targeted" approach on "places and people" not necessarily community – excellent point

General comments and suggestions:

- Very cold and sound was poor
- Too much presentation and not enough conversation
- Minor problem with microphones at the end
- Well done and timely
- Excellent topic and speakers; would suggest adequate time to not "rush" speakers – when planning, staying an hour more would be fine, i.e., 9 am to 2 pm or 3 pm
- Very interesting day overall
- Good session – hope it starts to move things forward; a very full session but very informative
- Cold
- More short "bio-breaks" would have been nice
- Sound issues / too cold
- The room was too cold
- A whole day would probably have worked better – a lot of information was crammed into the morning
- I had trouble hearing several of the speakers – audio facilities were very poor
- Could have been a full day; lunch would have been nice seeing how the meeting went until after the noon hour
- The room was pretty cool – warn people to bring sweaters (if you turn up the heat we might nod off)
- Needed microphone for questions
- Overall very interesting and diverse ideas presented

Suggestions of topics and/or speakers for future forums and roundtables:

- Education and civil society
- Education/schools as hub of community
- CED from the ground up
- More of the same. Excellent topic. May be opportunities for greater participation by government staff. Perhaps a forum with political figures
- “Social Economy” – very little is written on the Canadian experience with supporting the social economy. This sector contributes tremendously to communities but it doesn’t receive the degree of focus and importance needed