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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2006, United Way Toronto (UWT) launched the Building Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy (BSNS), a multi-level initiative focused on Toronto’s inner suburbs in general and 13 priority neighbourhoods in particular. The Community Hubs initiative (Hubs) is a major component of United Way Toronto’s Building Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy. Hubs support the BSNS objectives of increased community space and strengthening the social infrastructure and services in high-need inner suburban neighbourhoods. A Community Hub is a central place that brings together local residents and service providers. It offers a broad range of services and programs that respond to community issues, needs, and priorities. UWT promotes a set of principles for the Hubs, which are referred to collectively as the “Hub Model.” UWT has helped fund and plan eight Hubs. To date, seven Hubs have opened and one more is planned.

An Outcome Framework was developed in 2009 to monitor the development and implementation of the Hubs initiative and to delineate the intended short-term and long-term desired goals of the Hub initiative at each stage of its implementation and development. This Evaluation project was initiated because UWT and the partner agencies wanted to improve their understanding of the impact of the Hubs for residents, lead, and anchor agencies and to draw lessons from the Hub Model. This Evaluation project was led by Access Alliance Multicultural Health and Community Services, with funding from UWT. This Evaluation focuses on the Hubs that have been operational for at least two years: Mid-Scarborough Hub, AccessPoint on Danforth (APOD), Victoria Park Hub and Jane Street Hub.

**Key questions**

This Evaluation sought to answer the following key questions:

1. From the perspective of five key stakeholders (service users, lead agencies, anchor partners, UWT and community members at large), what has been the value added of the Hub Model as it relates to improving the lives of residents?
2. What are the strengths of this approach and what are the gaps or challenges?
3. Who benefits (and does not benefit) from the Hubs, and why?
4. What are some lessons learned to date?

The Evaluation sought feedback from the Hubs’ main stakeholder groups — Hub users, lead agency, partner agency, community residents in general and UWT — using focus groups and/or surveys.

**Limitations**

There are limitations to this Evaluation, as it was not designed to provide an exhaustive understanding of Hub operations/processes or outcomes for Hub users or to engage with a large number of Hub users. Focus group samples at each location were convenience-based, and participants were not representative of all service users. In addition, the non-user survey sample size was very small and was primarily intended to provide a “snap shot” — not a representative sample of the broader community.

**Findings**

Nevertheless, this Evaluation generated rich data about stakeholders’ experiences with the four Community Hubs.

The findings indicate that Community Hubs are adding value to the community in a number of ways, including:

- Improved access to programs and services for residents.
- Better information exchange between agency staff and residents and among partner agency staff.
- Improved referral of residents to appropriate services/programs.
- Enabling social connections among residents (i.e., bringing people together).
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- Enabling intercultural exchange among residents.
- Increased space and opportunities for community members to connect with each other.

**Strengths**
The key strengths of the Community Hubs are:
- Services are co-located under one roof.
- Community services are better coordinated and integrated.
- Staff are friendly and the environment is welcoming.
- Accessible and free space is available for community residents.
- Hubs are client-centred and they engage community residents.

**Challenges and lessons**
However, the findings indicate that there are several challenges or gaps in the Hub Model. It’s interesting to note that some of the challenges identified are similar to the strengths described above; since the Hubs are still in the developmental stage, this isn’t surprising.

The study identified the following as areas for improvement:
- Outreach to the community to inform them about Hub programs and services.
- Formalized processes and best practices/strategies for community engagement.
- Common vision, mission, and culture across and within Community Hubs.
- Enhanced resources and an improved funding/funding formula to support start-up, facility management, and operations.
- Data should be consistently collected and reported in order to support the development of best practices.

The last two years of Hub operations have provided many lessons. To start, since community engagement is challenging amongst the Hubs, it would be useful to identify community-appropriate engagement strategies, outcomes, and measures. The findings also indicate that resources for dedicated and skilled staffing is needed in order to facilitate community engagement, and to support Hub operations and activities. Finally, the study shows that Hubs may benefit from opportunities to share information and lessons with each other.

**Critical success factors**
Based on the experience of the Community Hubs over the past two years, the following have been identified as critical success factors:
- Diversified, sufficient, and sustainable funding for both operations and community engagement.
- Access to resources for dedicated and skilled staff for both operations and community engagement.
- Action for Neighbourhood Change (ANC) presence/cooperation increases the Hubs’ capacity to engage with residents.
- Strong lead agency and anchor partners that are both committed and community-based.
- Engaging in routine planning to develop a shared vision, mission, and values.
- Formal policies and structures to support interagency collaboration.
- Defined community engagement goals and indicators.
- Mutual respect and trust among staff in order to facilitate interagency collaboration and staff learning.

As a next step, the Hubs will be meeting to review, discuss, and validate the findings from the Evaluation. Overall this Evaluation demonstrates that the Community Hubs are aligned with the Outcomes Framework developed at their outset. Community Hubs are bringing value to users and the broader community and, there is significant opportunity for the Hubs to improve over time as the Model is further developed and matures.
In 2006, United Way Toronto (UWT) launched the Building Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy (BSNS), a multi-level initiative focused on Toronto’s inner suburbs in general and 13 priority neighbourhoods in particular. The BSNS aimed to address deficits in these communities: a lack of opportunities for residents to become involved in their communities and to have their voices heard; and a lack of services and programming upon which people rely to help them get ahead in life. These deficits compound the challenge of long-term poverty reduction in the inner suburbs.\(^1\)

The BSNS formalized UWT’s commitment to taking a place-based approach to addressing neighbourhood needs and represented UWT doing its part to respond to the *Call to Action* of the Strong Neighbourhoods Task Force (SNTF). But the BSNS was also central to UWT’s broader organizational shift towards becoming a “community impact” organization, focused on working at multiple levels and in multiple ways to achieve long-term systemic change. In this way, the BSNS represented the beginning of a transformation of how UWT works with and supports communities.\(^2\)

The ultimate goal of BSNS is to improve the quality of life of people by creating stronger neighbourhoods — those that are socially and economically vibrant, cohesive, safe, and inclusive. While there is no single definition of a “strong” or “good” neighbourhood, it is generally agreed that strong neighbourhoods are:

- **Socially and economically vibrant**: The neighbourhood has active street life, opportunities for community interaction and economic development, and a strong sense of place and pride.
- **Cohesive**: The neighbourhood has a sense of mutual responsibility and strong bonds of reciprocity, trust, and negotiated solutions to conflict.
- **Safe**: The neighbourhood has subjective feelings of safety and objective measures of safety.
- **Inclusive**: The neighbourhood has active community involvement, democratic processes, a strong sense of belonging, a welcoming community, respect for diversity, and tolerance of differences.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) *Building Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy, Theory of Change*, United Way Toronto, May 2013

\(^2\) *Building Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy, Theory of Change*, United Way Toronto, May 2013

3. OVERVIEW OF COMMUNITY HUBS INITIATIVE

The Community Hubs initiative (Hubs) is a major component of United Way Toronto’s (UWT) Building Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy (BSNS). UWT has helped fund and plan eight Community Hubs. Hubs support the BSNS objective of strengthening the social infrastructure and services in high-need inner suburban neighbourhoods.

A Community Hub is a central place that brings together local residents and service providers. It offers a broad range of services and programs that respond to community issues, needs, and priorities. Hubs provide an opportunity for the community and service providers to connect, build trust, and exchange knowledge. It is envisioned that the services and activities delivered in Hubs are based on the needs of the community and modified based on changing local community needs and demands.

Each Hub is managed by a well-established non-profit organization. The lead agency not only provides services and programs, but is also responsible for managing partnerships and facilitating the ongoing planning and involvement of stakeholders. They can also be seen as the “landlords” of the Hub, dealing with rent, lease agreements, and structural upgrades.

Community partners deliver ongoing services at the Hub and may also have permanent office or program space. Partners also support the sustainability of the Hub as they contribute to operating costs through rent or staffing and may have planning, community engagement or other responsibilities related to the management of the Hub.

Other community stakeholders use space in the Hub as needed. The extent of stakeholder involvement varies at each Hub.

The first Hub — Mid-Scarborough Hub — opened in December 2009. Since then, six additional Hubs have opened and one more is planned.

Further information on the Community Hub Initiative and the Building Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy may be found at: http://www.unitedwaytoronto.com

COMMUNITY HUB PRINCIPLES

Each Hub has its own defined partnership agreements to guide the engagement of organizations, local groups, and community residents. UWT promotes a set of principles, which, are referred to collectively as the “Hub Model.”

These principles are to be reflected in the partnership agreements set up for each Hub.

The principles of the Hub Model are as follows:

- **Neighbourhood-based and locally responsive:** Hubs reflect the needs and interests of the local neighbourhood. The design, development, and ongoing operation of Hubs include participation from neighbourhood residents, service providers, local institutional leaders, and other community stakeholders.

- **Accessible and engaging of diversity:** Hubs embrace the diversity in local communities and involve the diversity of people who live in the local area. Hub programs and activities are designed to be accessible to address the interests and needs of marginalized and racialized people living in the neighbourhood. Hubs establish inclusive policies and practices to encourage involvement and participation of diverse individuals and groups.

- **Community involvement in decision-making:** Hubs have transparent decision-making and accountability structures that encourage local residents to participate and determine priorities and directions jointly with Hub agency partners, local organizations, and other community stakeholders.

- **Service coordination and collaboration:** Hubs are a platform for service providers to coordinate the
delivery of a broad range of relevant and accessible services/programs, and to collaborate on addressing and responding to local neighbourhood needs and priorities.

- **Community space**: Hubs include space that is available to resident groups and grassroots groups involving residents, as well as agencies responding to resident requests for service on a flexible basis. This space is free to residents for the purposes of community engagement or community and social services activities. Community groups and/or residents are involved in developing policies and procedures regarding the use of community space.

- **Financial sustainability**: Hubs establish mechanisms to efficiently and effectively manage financial resources as well as secure additional revenues for ongoing financial stability and viability of operations.

- **Evaluation**: Hubs assess the progress of operations, as well as effectiveness and impact of implementation to building opportunities in the community.

## OUTCOME FRAMEWORK

The Outcome Framework below was created in 2009 and is based on the Hub principals discussed above in consultation with Hub Managers and lead agencies. It delineates the intended outcomes of the Hub initiative at each stage of its implementation and development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Short Term Outcomes (6 mths to 1 yr from establishment of Hub)</th>
<th>Short Term Outcomes (1-3 yrs from establishment of Hub)</th>
<th>Medium Term Outcomes (3+ yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify Lead Agency for each Hub</td>
<td>Eight Hubs have doors open and are providing services as planned</td>
<td>Services continually responsive to identified needs and priorities of community</td>
<td>Improved and expanded services</td>
<td>Hubs contribute to increasingly vibrant, strong and healthy communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultation and planning</td>
<td>Residents beginning to engage in Hub planning and decision-making</td>
<td>Increased resident engagement in Hub planning and decision-making</td>
<td>Enhanced social infrastructure (services and programming)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor and partner agency negotiation and agreement</td>
<td>Neighbourhood residents are aware of the Hub</td>
<td>Services are increasingly interconnected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site selection and development</td>
<td>Residents begin to use Hub services and community space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Hub structure, principles and components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Evaluation Report – April 2014*
4. EVALUATION BACKGROUND AND METHODS

Since 2010, United Way Toronto (UWT) has been collecting monitoring data on Hub operations, community engagement, and service use. While the data has been useful in tracking changes in the Hubs, UWT and the partner agencies wanted to improve their understanding of the Hubs’ impact on residents, lead, and anchor agencies, and to draw lessons from the Hub Model. This Evaluation project was initiated as a result.

The Evaluation project focused on the Hubs that have been operational for at least two years: Mid-Scarborough Hub, AccessPoint on Danforth (APOD), Victoria Park Hub, and Jane Street Hub. A brief overview of these participating Hubs is provided in Appendix A. Three additional Hubs have opened within the past two years: Dorset Park, Bathurst Finch, and Rexdale. It is anticipated that other Hubs will participate in learning and dissemination activities that result from the Evaluation.

This Evaluation project was led by Access Alliance Multicultural Health and Community Services, with funding from UWT. Access Alliance submitted a proposal and work plan for this project and subsequently developed a Memorandum of Understanding with UWT.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

Taking into account intended outcomes for the Hubs Initiative as described in the Outcome Framework, the Evaluation focused on the following key questions:

1. From the perspective of five key stakeholders (service users, lead agencies, anchor partners, UWT, and community members at large), what has been the value added of the Hub Model as it relates to improving the lives of residents?
2. What are the strengths of this approach and what are the gaps or challenges?
3. Who benefits (and does not benefit) from the Hubs and why?
4. What are some lessons learned to date?

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND PRINCIPLES

Community-based participatory evaluation is focused on communities and conducted in partnership with the community. It involves project-level or community-level evaluation questions, community-sensitive evaluation methods and measures, and community-focused evaluation reporting and dissemination.

Key stakeholders were engaged throughout the process through their participation on the Evaluation Advisory Committee and/or as team members carrying out Evaluation activities. The Evaluation Advisory Committee included the following members:

- Hub Managers from each of the four participating sites.
- Research and Evaluation Manager at United Way Toronto.
- Project Coordinator, Community Evaluators and Analysts.
- Executive Director of Access Alliance.

In keeping with the principle of community-based participatory evaluation, the project hired two Community Evaluators to support various aspects of the project, including survey administration, focus group facilitation, data entry, and analysis. The Community Evaluators were community members, each of whom had volunteered at one of the participating Hubs. Each received an orientation to the project and to evaluation methods.
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In addition to the principles of Community-based Participatory Evaluation, this Evaluation was also informed by principles that guide evaluation at UWT, as outlined in its Measurement and Evaluation Action Plan\(^4\).

These are:

- **Evaluation should be of high quality:** Evaluation activities should be aligned with the program evaluation standards of utility, feasibility, propriety, accuracy, and accountability.
- **Evaluation should be strategic:** Evaluation activities should be purposeful and pragmatic, planned at the beginning of an initiative, used to answer the most important questions, and intended to inform action on key priorities.
- **Evaluation should be collaborative:** Relevant stakeholders should be engaged as partners in evaluation to build on and foster collective expertise and to ensure evaluation is meaningful for participants and users.
- **Evaluation should facilitate learning:** Research questions, methods, and knowledge exchange approaches should be selected to maximize the sharing and use of findings.

METHODS

Planning, design, data collection, and analysis activities were carried out between May and November 2013. A Research Coordinator at Access Alliance led the process with support from the two Community Evaluators. Members of the Advisory Committee met several times to review the project’s progress to provide input and feedback on the survey questionnaire, focus group guides, data analysis, and interpretation.

The Evaluation sought feedback from each of the five main stakeholder groups, using focus groups and/or surveys. Data collection activities are summarized in the following table:

Table 1: Summary of Evaluation methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Methods used</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hub users (clients)</td>
<td>• 4 focus groups (one at each location)</td>
<td>Aug. 27–Sep. 20, 2013</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>(average = 12.8/location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-users (community members who had not used programs/services at their local Hub)</td>
<td>• Survey (administered in each of four locations)</td>
<td>Aug. 16–Oct. 1, 2013</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hub Managers at each location recommended locations for outreach, including other community agencies and public spaces, such as libraries and places of worship.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(average = 19.5/location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner agencies</td>
<td>• 4 focus groups (one at each location)</td>
<td>Aug. 14–Sep. 27, 2013</td>
<td>26(^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(average = 6.5/location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead agencies (from each Hub)</td>
<td>• Focus group</td>
<td>Sep. 16, 2013</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWT staff (involved in the BSNS initiative)</td>
<td>• Focus group</td>
<td>Sep. 16, 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant recruitment was done in coordination with the Advisory Committee members from each Hub. Staff members attended focus groups during work hours. Hub users received an honorarium of $20 and 2 TTC tokens for participating in a focus group and completing a survey. Non-users (residents) received a $10 gift card for completing a survey.

The information collected for this Evaluation was sorted and coded to identify key themes. Key findings for each theme were prepared for a collaborative analysis session attended by the Evaluation Advisory Committee members and the Executive Director from each Hub lead agency. The analysis session was used to validate findings, identify opportunities for improvement, and brainstorm potential recommendations.

\(^5\) One partner agency at the Victoria Park Hub, that was not able to attend, submitted responses in writing.
LIMITATIONS

This Evaluation captured a diversity of perspectives from five stakeholder groups: lead agencies, anchor partners, Hub users, UWT and community members at large. However, it was not designed to engage with a large number of Hub users or to provide an exhaustive understanding of Hub operations/processes or outcomes for Hub users.

There are some limitations to the data collection processes used. Focus group samples at each location were convenience-based, and participants are not representative of all service users. Also, the methods captured the perspectives of current service users only. Most of these participants were regular users of the Hub services and were therefore more likely to have had positive experiences with the Hub. It does not capture the perspectives of those who may have used services in the past and decided not to return.

For the survey of non-users, the sample size was very small and was intended to provide a “snap shot,” which included non-user knowledge and perceptions about the Hub, where they socialize, and where they obtain information. In addition, respondents self-selected their participation. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to the broader community.

UWT has been collecting monitoring data from the Hubs that has been valuable in terms of understanding what kinds of services are provided, who is using the services, and how the community space is being used. However, there have been some challenges with the collection and interpretation of this data because some organizations do not collect routine demographic data and some information is not defined and collected consistently across the Hubs.

In spite of these limitations, this Evaluation generated rich data about stakeholders’ experiences with the four Community Hubs.
5. FINDINGS & ANALYSIS

HUB USERS’ (CLIENTS’) PERSPECTIVE

Respondent characteristics
A total of 51 Hub users participated in one of four focus groups across the participating Hub locations. Selected participant characteristics are summarized in the table below.

Table 2: Respondent characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Newcomer status(^6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newcomer(^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Ages 18-35</td>
<td>Ages 36-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Ages 18-35</td>
<td>Ages 36-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English: 75%</td>
<td>English: 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bengali: 7%</td>
<td>Tamil: 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamil: 38%</td>
<td>Other: 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number completing survey

Top preferred languages (including multiple responses)

Currently looking for work

Number of times/week (t/w) accessing the Hub

Strengths

Hub users in all four focus groups spoke about the convenience of having multiple programs and agencies co-located within the same building. The location of Hubs was identified as convenient for users.

Hub users in each of the focus groups praised the staff working at the Hub, describing them as “friendly,” “supportive,” “helpful,” and “outstanding.” Similarly, each focus group noted that their Hub offers an environment that is comfortable and welcoming. Some described it as a “second home,” while others noted that it was a safe space, where they feel “comfortable and at ease.” Only one participant noted that the Hub was not friendly. In addition, some participants identified the availability of free community space as strength.

---

\(^6\) One missing response

\(^7\) Newcomers are those who arrived in Canada in the last 10 years (2003-2013)

\(^8\) This category combines respondents that were born in Canada and those who immigrated before 2003.
**Benefits**

Users noted many different benefits that the Hubs offer them and their community. The most frequently cited were as follows:

- The Hub improves access to programs and services by offering multiple services under one roof — and at a convenient location.
- The Hub helps users get the information they need and to obtain referrals to other services.
- The Hub facilities social connections. For example, participants noted that the Hub helped them meet new people, make new connections, and reduce feelings of isolation.

The following benefits were discussed by participants in most of the user focus groups:

- The Hub provides opportunities for intercultural exchange. Participants noted that they met people from different cultures and nationalities, and they were therefore able to learn about other cultures.
- Participating in various ways at the Hub leads to a sense of belonging and ownership for some users. For instance, one participant said, “I feel like this Hub is my Hub,” while another felt a “sense of pride.”

**Benefits, in the words of Hub users:**

“I like the Hub because it helps me to get connected with the other places that I don’t go to.” – Mid-Scarborough Hub client

“I feel that the best part of the Hub is that it is coming to meet people ... it’s really good, developing that community. [Residents are] connecting to each other, breaking the isolation.” – APOD client

“For people who are not working but want something to do in the neighbourhood, at least they can come here and interact with others.” – Jane Street Hub client

“The Hub is really important so that people can come here and make friends. And speak what they have in mind. And that’s when I say this hub is like life giving to the community.” – Mid-Scarborough Hub client

“We also learn so much about different cultures. This is from diversity to the unity. We become like a cohesive group. And it is so interesting to know the language, the customs and then their traditions. So it is a good place to find people and learn about them.” – Mid-Scarborough client

“I feel like this Hub is my Hub ... I feel like I belong to this.” – APOD client

“[The Hub] completely changed my life, [with] the help that I got ... so ‘helpful’ is really an understatement” – APOD client

**Strengths, in the words of Hub users:**

“This is really convenient, because ... under one roof we are getting everything.” – AccessPoint on Danforth (APOD) client

“It is easy to find so many services in one place and it is quite easy for us to reach them. So this is a good idea that we don’t have to travel... from one place to another.” – Mid-Scarborough Hub client

“The customer service people, the staff, they are all excellent.” – APOD client

“The Hub is like a second home to me” – Jane Street Hub client
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There were other benefits identified less frequently by the participants. These benefits were typically discussed in relation to specific programs or services that the user had participated in:

- Programs at the Hub enhance the skills and capacity of community members (e.g., learning about starting a business, balcony gardening, and communication and language skills).
- Programs at the Hub promote participants' health and well-being (e.g., participants said they learned about specific health issues, such as diabetes management, and food and nutrition).

**Gaps, challenges, and opportunities**

Challenges and opportunities related to communications and outreach were discussed in each of the four user focus groups. In general, participants felt that there was a lack of awareness about the Hub and its services in the broader community. They also noted that even existing users are often not aware of various programs and services offered by their local Hub. In order to address this shortcoming, participants talked about opportunities to improve outreach in through better communication and advertising.

Some users would also like the Hubs to offer more opportunities for community members to connect and socialize with each other. Participants valued existing opportunities to meet others; however, they did not specify the kinds of additional events that they would like the Hub to organize.

Participants also identified various programs and services that they would like to see added or enhanced at their local Hub. The top survey responses across the four sites were as follows:

- Recreation or exercise programs: 9 (18%)
- Kids programs/activities: 6 (12%)
- Youth programs: 5 (10%)
- Employment services: 5 (10%).

In addition, free or low-cost dental services were identified as a need in two of the focus groups (Jane and Mid-Scarborough).

**What users said about communications and outreach:**

“*A lot of people don’t know what’s going on here ... There are so many people, thousands of people within the neighbourhood, you’ll be surprised, they don’t know about here, they don’t come here.*” – Jane Street Hub client

“We would really like to know more about what goes on in the Hub.” – Mid-Scarborough Hub client

“They need to advertise more. The programs should be advertised every week in the areas... more people should know about those.” – Mid-Scarborough Hub client

“*More advertisements [are] needed*” – AccessPoint on Danforth (APOD) client

Some additional gaps and challenges were identified less frequently by focus group participants:

- **Community involvement in decision-making:** Some participants felt that participants/community members could have more input into the kinds of programs and services that the Hub offers.
- **Volunteer engagement:** Clients at the Victoria Park Hub noted that participants are capable of leading programs. However, they felt that volunteers should receive a stipend for helping to run programs and that all volunteers should receive TTC tokens. They also expressed frustration that volunteering is not helping them to get a job.
STAFF PERSPECTIVES (PARTNER AND LEAD AGENCIES)

Focus groups

Five focus groups were held with agency staff: with partner agencies at each participating site, and one with staff from lead agencies. A total of 25 partner agency staff members and four lead agency staff members took part in a focus group.

Strengths

Staff at all focus groups spoke about the co-location of agencies and services as a key strength of the Hub Model.

What agency staff participants said about the benefits of the Hubs:

“It gives us access to clients who we may not normally see.” – Mid-Scarborough partner agency

“The linkages, the accessibility of services under one roof, that I found to be very encouraging and empowering for residents.” – Partner agency, AccessPoint on Danforth (APOD)

“Now we are able to work as one organization, instead of five.” – Partner agency, Victoria Park Hub

“Referrals among agencies are much easier since it only requires that a person steps out from the program’s office and reach out to the next office.” – Partner agency, Victoria Park Hub

“What the community has a voice, feels like that they have a voice. Not a token voice ... They really have a voice and they feel that. And they appreciate that.” – Partner agency Jane Street Hub

Co-location makes services more accessible for clients and it also benefits agencies, making it easier to do outreach and referrals (see also “Benefits” section below).

The following strengths were commonly mentioned:

- **Client-centered approach**: Participants identified ways in which their Hubs have adapted to client needs; for example, by customizing workshops or services based on client demographics or staying open until 8:00 pm in the evening “when people really need it.”

- **Collaboration among partner agencies**: A few staff participants discussed ways that they work collaboratively with other partners within their Hub to deliver programs and to solve problems. At the same time, collaboration was identified as a work in progress (see “Gaps, challenges, and opportunities”).

- **Community involvement in decision-making**: Staff participants discussed the importance of engaging community members in decisions about the Hub and its operations. Several different examples were provided, such as the annual Resident’s Action Plan (RAP) process at AccessPoint on Danforth (APOD), and a knitting club at Victoria Park that was initiated by community members. At the Jane Street Hub, there is a Community Advisory Panel that provides “suggestions, updates, anything that we need to hear from the voice of the community.” Participants acknowledged that they want to strengthen community involvement in decision-making within the Hubs (see “Gaps, challenges, and opportunities”).

Other strengths were mentioned less frequently including:

- **Availability of shared/community space**: As noted by some of the participants in the user focus groups, the Hubs have made new community space available for use by agencies.

- **A comfortable and welcoming environment**: Like Hub users, staff also recognize that the Hubs strive to create a safe space to the community, and an environment that is warm and welcoming.
Services provided in multiple languages: Because Hubs house multiple organizations under one roof, the range of staff and the programs and services offered is expanded as has been the languages in which services are provided.

Volunteer and student engagement: Hubs provide opportunities for volunteer and student engagement.

Effective for agencies: Increasingly, agencies and staff at the Hubs are working in more coordinated ways, and report that some processes are being carried out more effectively. For example, rather than having each of the partner agency’s staff having to provide information and referrals to Hub users, AccessPoint on Danforth (APOD) has set up an information kiosk to carry out this function for all of the partners.

What agency staff said about engaging diversity (all quotes from Lead Agency focus group):

“You have been able to do some LGBTQ stuff on a really basic level. We’ve been able to do some stuff on Black History month, Chinese New Year ... at the really basic, trying to get people exposed to different ideas, kind of level. To get people working with different religion, different groups. So I’m hopeful I can bring some more of that ... more progressive openness ... I think that we are in a unique position; we can actually move forward some of those agendas as long as we do it from a community development perspective.”

[There is an] “opportunity for building bridges and building those connections [among diverse community groups]”

“There are challenges that are not insurmountable, just require more resources and trainings or just space to bring people together and chill out and get past a lot of assumptions that people may have about each other.”

Benefits
Several benefits of the Hub Model were discussed at most or all of the staff focus groups:

- The Hub facilitates information and referrals. Participants report that agencies regularly refer clients to other agencies within the Hub, although the process is mostly informal.
- The Hub improves access to programs and services by offering multiple services under one roof and at a convenient location.
- The Hub enables service coordination and integration, which benefits both clients and providers.

Gaps, challenges, and opportunities
Collaboration among partner agencies was identified both as a challenge and an opportunity in four of the five staff focus groups. Participants acknowledged that collaboration is a slow process and that they would like to see more and stronger collaborations and partnerships, along with the development of policies and structures to support this work. Participants from the lead agencies also discussed opportunities to expand partnerships with external agencies.
What agency staff said about collaboration:

“I think it’s a slow process and its taking longer than I would have imagined… it takes time to build the relationships and find the connections.” – Anchor partner, Jane Street

“There is some collaboration on the management level. But I don’t see it on the grounds in terms of the staff… I think to bridge that gap is about looking for projects that we can collaborate [on].” – Anchor partner, Jane Street

“Collaboration is fun but at the same time it’s kind of challenging too. … When we were trying to implement some procedures and some activities it’s really hard to collaborate with everyone and communicate with everyone and make things happen.” – Anchor partner, Victoria Park Hub

“I’m looking forward to expanding the collaborations that we have in place. And also looking at what services are we missing in here and bringing in those through either external partnerships [or] through itinerant services.” – Lead agency staff member

“The lead agency has a critical role in identifying mechanisms that can facilitate the work and the integration and within the Hub. Just by being in the one roof, that’s not enough. It has to be more intentional.” Lead agency staff member

A second key challenge/opportunity from the perspective of agency staff is community involvement in decision-making. Staff saw this as a work in progress. They would like to introduce more resident-led programs and increase the ways in which residents can be involved in the Hubs.

A third key challenge/opportunity is community outreach and engagement. Staff members felt that more could be done to raise awareness about the Hub in the community, which is consistent with what Hub users said. Participants did not share many suggestions about how communications and outreach could be improved; however, one partner agency felt that signage could be better; and another suggested that they would like to have a “broad outreach plan [for] the whole area.” Participants also identified challenges associated with doing outreach to specific demographic groups, for example, vulnerable youth and adult men. Participants (mainly in the lead agency focus group) discussed the challenges associated with engaging diverse communities (in terms of ethno-cultural background, sexual orientation, etc.). One partner agency talked about the challenge of integrating diverse communities and achieving a sense of belonging. Another Hub manager mentioned racism and intolerance in the community and the need to think about the role of the Hub in addressing these issues in order to effectively outreach to and engage with diverse groups.

What agency staff said about community involvement in decision-making:

“Residents are involved. They could be more involved, absolutely, and we are moving towards that.” – Anchor Partner, AccessPoint on Danforth (APOD)

“I don’t think they [residents] feel that they have been included in lot of things … it’s supposed to be resident-driven.” – Anchor partner, Mid-Scarborough

“It would be nice if we could really get the input of the residents when we are making decisions … I want to include them in lot of the discussions that we have. I think it’s vital, because it’s about them, it’s not really about us.” – Anchor partner, Mid-Scarborough
Other challenges and opportunities were mentioned less frequently:

- **Coordination and integration of programs and services.** As mentioned in the previous section, coordination and integration of programs and services is happening very slowly within the Hubs and is identified by some as an opportunity that should be further explored.

- **Customer service.** In particular, Hub staff identified the importance of having knowledgeable, well-trained reception staff because these staff are the users’ first point of contact with the Hubs.

- **Limited resources.** Staff identified the need for increased and more stable funding for the Hubs. They suggested additional resources at the front desk, equipment, and materials, as well as resources that can support agency collaboration.

- **Availability of space.** The Hubs have increased the availability of space in the community, yet booking rooms in the Hubs for programs and services or for community events is sometimes a challenge.

- **Sharing best practices and lessons learned among Hubs.** Staff identified an interest in improving opportunities to share their knowledge and experiences with each other.

- **Advocacy on systemic issues.** Some staff suggested that Hubs should work with the community to identify and address systemic issues such as poverty. Doing so creates trust with the community and can strengthen the Hubs presence in the community.

**Hub success factors**

Participants in the agency staff focus groups touched upon a number of success factors that are important to operating an effective Hub:

- **Mutual respect and trust among partners.** Participants in some groups noted that it was important for staff members to develop working relationships with each other and that these must be based on mutual respect and trust.

- **Processes and structures to support collaboration and integration.** Participants in some groups suggested that it would be helpful to have more formalized processes and structures to support collaboration and integration within the Hubs.

- **Shared mission, vision, and goals.** Participants stated that it is easier to collaborate and move forward when there is something that binds organizations together.

- **Supportive management, especially from the lead agency.** Staff reported that they value management who are engaged in the Hubs, responsive to staff concerns, able to make effective decisions, and who engage staff in decision-making.
UNITED WAY TORONTO STAFF

Strengths and benefits
Consistent with the other stakeholder groups, United Way Toronto (UWT) focus group participants identified the co-location of services as a key strength of the Hub Model. Participants noted that users like coming to one place to get services. In doing so, they spend less money on transportation, and they don’t have to tell their story as often.

The UWT representatives also discussed various ways the Hubs help to build and strengthen the communities they serve. For example, they noted that the Hubs:

- Are becoming part of community identity and a source of pride for residents.
- Attract resources for the community.
- Increase traffic for local businesses.
- Provide employment opportunities for local community.
- Connect residents to each other and give them a “place to celebrate.”

Another strength noted by UWT participants is that residents are learning to participate in decision-making at the Hubs. However, they acknowledged that residents are more engaged with some Hubs than others.

Finally, participants noted that the Hubs have increased the amount of space available for community use. As a result, this allows community members to do things that they previously did not do because they did not have the space.

Gaps, challenges, and opportunities
Many of the challenges and opportunities identified by UWT staff echo those identified by partner agencies and lead agencies.

UWT focus group participants discussed the challenges associated with engaging community members in decisions about the Hub. They noted that resident engagement sometimes starts too late and that managing resident expectations and communication are important challenges. Although resident engagement is a key principle of the Hubs, participants pointed out that UWT has not clearly articulated its expectations regarding resident engagement within the Hubs (i.e., in the Hub Model/framework/funding formula). Participants suggested that a formal resident engagement strategy is needed and that agency staff would benefit from training on community development and resident engagement.

UWT participants felt that there was an opportunity to improve collaboration within the Hubs and to better integrate services and referral systems. They also mentioned some possible barriers to collaboration and integration; for example, that agencies don’t see themselves as part of “a collective,” and that Hubs may not have enough staff to support this kind of work.

Another key challenge identified by UWT staff is the availability of resources needed to sustain the Hubs over time. It was noted that UWT is the main funder at the table for most of the existing Hubs and that other revenue streams are needed. They also noted that there is pressure to raise rents for partner agencies and that higher rents will make it more difficult for smaller agencies and groups to afford (office) space.

UWT staff also suggested that there is a need to improve the Hubs’ data collection and reporting. UWT would like the Hubs to regard data collection and evaluation as routine, integrated components of their operations.
Hub success factors
Participants in the UWT focus groups identified a number of success factors that are important to operating an effective Hub:

- A strong lead agency that understands community development, lives it on the ground, and can “lead from behind.” Adequate financial resources to ensure sustainability. Hubs require diversified revenue streams beyond UWT.
- Staffing that is consistent and that has the skills to do community development and partner engagement.
- Coordinated and integrated services and processes. Staff identified the need for collaborative planning processes to ensure efficient program delivery (i.e., avoid duplicating similar services within a Hub); they also suggested processes for enhancing referrals among agencies (i.e., a shared referral form).
- Capital development. Hub agencies have been learning about the capital development process from each other; for many, this has been a new experience.
- Structures to engage residents, including access to best practices/models for community engagement and dedicated staffing for community engagement.

NON-USERS (RESIDENTS)
Non-users are community members who live within the areas served by specific Hubs, but who have not used their local Hub. A total of 78 non-users across the four locations completed a survey. Table 3 provides a summary of responses to selected survey questions. Of the 78 survey participants, 36% had heard of the Hub, 26% knew about the Hub’s services, and 29% said that they participate in neighbourhood programs. The majority of survey participants (77%) said they currently socialize at ‘private homes’ and only 8% identified community agencies as a place for socializing. Parties and community events were identified by 40% of the respondents as strategies for getting residents involved in the community.

Table 3: Non-users survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response (all sites, including multiple responses)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you heard of the Hub?</td>
<td>Yes = 28</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know what kinds of services are offered in the Hub?</td>
<td>Yes = 20</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you participate in neighbourhood programs or services?</td>
<td>Yes = 23</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do community members socialize?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private homes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Malls</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Places of worship</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community agency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What suggestions do you have for getting residents involved in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community events/parties</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotion/outreach</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Volunteer opportunities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incentives to attend programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. DISCUSSION OF KEY FINDINGS

The previous section provided a summary of findings organized by stakeholder group. This section highlights several of the major themes that emerged from an analysis of the findings in relation to the questions that this Evaluation sought to answer, namely:

1. From the perspective of five key stakeholders (service users, lead agencies, anchor partners, UWT and community members at large), what has been the value added of the Hub Model as it relates to improving the lives of residents?
2. What are the strengths of this approach and what are the gaps or challenges?
3. Who benefits (and does not benefit) from the Hubs, and why?
4. What are some lessons learned to date?

QUESTION 1: VALUE ADDED AND BENEFITS

The Evaluation findings indicate that Community Hubs are adding value to the community in a number of ways including:

- Improved access to programs and services for residents.
- Better information exchange among agency staff and residents and among partner agency staff.
- Improved referral of residents to appropriate services/programs.
- Enabling social connections among residents (i.e., bringing people together).
- Enabling intercultural exchange among residents.
- Increased space and opportunities for community members to connect with each other.

The findings also indicate that service providers benefit from the Community Hubs. Staff suggested that having services under one roof facilitates interagency collaboration and referrals. Further, while there are few formal intake or referral processes in place at the Hubs, staff value the informal and organic collaboration that has been emerging over time.

QUESTION 2: STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES

The key strengths of the Community Hubs approach are:

- **Services are co-located under one roof.** Staff report that housing diverse agencies, services and teams of staff under one roof facilitates information/best practices exchange and referrals among staff. Users report that the Hub provides a one-stop shop for community members.

- **Community services are better coordinated and integrated.** Increasingly, staff at the different Hubs are increasingly striving to work as a single team of service providers as opposed to distinct agencies. They are collaborating to deliver workshops, communicating with each other to strengthen information and referrals, and coordinating program planning to ensure that programs are not duplicated or overlapping.

- **Staff are friendly and the environment is welcoming.** The Evaluation demonstrates that Hub staff value customer service. They are perceived as friendly and supportive and have created environments that are welcoming and safe for residents.

- **Accessible and free space is available for community residents.** The Evaluation also demonstrates that the Hubs provide access to space that is conveniently located in residents’ neighbourhoods, and Hubs are easy to reach either on foot or by TTC. Staff reported that they are now able to plan and deliver programs for which previously space had been unavailable.

- **Hubs are client-centred and successfully engage community residents.** Staff report that they try to take community demographics into account when developing programs and services. In addition, Hubs are
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open on the weekends in order to be accessible to the community. Users report that the Hubs reflect the diversity in the community and provide residents with opportunities to engage and participate in the community.

However, the findings indicate that there are several challenges or gaps in the Hubs Model. Some of the challenges identified below have also been discussed as strengths above. This is not surprising, given that the Hubs are in the development stage and are continually striving to achieve the principles of the Hubs Model (described in the “Overview of Community Hubs Initiative” section).

- **Communications/Outreach**: Users reported that they do not have a good understanding of the services provided by the Hubs, and staff said that there is a misperception that the Hubs are intended for newcomers. Hub users and staff members suggested that the Hubs could do a better job of promoting programs and services to existing and potential clients in the community. At this time, it appears that the Hubs are promoted to residents through word-of-mouth from one resident to another. Feedback indicates that commonly used outreach and communications tools such as posters and flyers are not very effective in the Hub neighbourhoods.

- **Inter-agency collaboration and service coordination**: While there is some coordination and integration happening within the Hubs, this is often taking place informally among staff without agency processes or systems in place to support staff efforts. Many stakeholders acknowledged that improving collaboration and integration is a slow process but also identified the need to significantly increase these activities and to develop structures and processes to support collaboration.

- **Community connections and engagement**: All of the Hubs indicated that community engagement is a work in progress. Currently, the terms used to describe and discuss engagement (i.e., engagement, decision making, governance, involvement, etc.) are inconsistent and it is not clear whether the purpose or outcomes of community engagement are commonly understood. Most Hubs lack formalized processes or strategies for engaging community members at decision-making and governance levels. Staff articulated that they are challenged to engage residents at this level and identified a need to explore and/or develop new outreach and engagement strategies.

- **Common vision, mission, and culture**: Many of the agencies participating in the Hubs do not have a history of working together under one roof and sharing clients. Some staff suggested that there is a need for agencies to develop a common culture and approach to working with clients and the community (i.e., to deliver youth-appropriate and friendly services). While UWT established high-level principles for the Hubs, there has been little opportunity for the Community Hub stakeholders to engage in planning exercises, to articulate a shared vision, mission, and values, and to develop a common culture or approach to serving the community.

- **Limited resources and funding/funding formula**: UWT continues to be the main funder for most of the Hubs and is challenged to provide the level of funding that the Hubs require to operate their physical space and to fulfill their community engagement mandate. For example, most of the Hubs do not have dedicated staffing for community engagement and one Hub does not have a dedicated Hub Manager. While many of the Hubs have the potential to generate revenue through rental income, it has been difficult for them to raise current rents as this could drive away current anchor partners or deter new partners from joining. There is a need for the Hubs to diversify their funding beyond UWT.

- **Information collection and reporting**: Agency staff identified the need for standardizing information collection, sharing that information to support ongoing learning and improvements, and sharing best practices.
QUESTION 3: WHO BENEFITS AND WHY

A review of monitoring data reports submitted to the UWT provides an approximate overview of which groups of residents use the Hub for different types of services. However, due to the limitations discussed earlier, it is not possible to obtain an accurate picture of the demographic profile of Hub users. In addition, the retrospective monitoring data does not explain why certain groups may or may not use the Hubs. Overall, there is an opportunity for the Hubs to improve data collection and reporting to better support ongoing program planning and monitoring.

The survey of non-users also provided limited insight into who does or does not use and/or benefit from the Hubs. At the same time, the non-user survey did provide some insight into outreach strategies that Hubs may consider using to connect with residents (e.g., most non-users stated that they socialize in shopping malls or private homes; therefore promotional flyers distributed at agencies are unlikely to reach these residents.) In addition, focus group respondents, while they account for a very small number of total Hub users, did provide some insight into the benefits of the Hubs as described in this report.

QUESTION 4: LESSONS LEARNED

The last two years of Hub operations have provided many lessons, including:

- **Community engagement**: The findings and analysis demonstrate that community engagement is a challenging process across all of the Community Hubs. As mentioned, the Hubs do not have common definitions or consistent measurements for concepts such as community engagement, and numerous terms — including ownership, decision-making, governance, and engagement — are used interchangeably. In addition, there is some perception that traditional modes of engagement may be based on organizational practices and values but may not reflect resident preferences, needs, or values. There may be a need to clarify the purpose of community engagement and to carry out research to identify community-appropriate engagement strategies, outcomes, and measures (i.e., a community board, town halls, public meetings, social action groups, etc.).

- **Dedicated and skilled staffing**: The findings also indicate that dedicated and skilled staffing is needed to facilitate community engagement and to support Hub operations and activities. Some of the lead agencies experience tension between managing the facility operations and community engagement activities. In the absence of dedicated staff, several Hubs rely on the Action for Neighbourhood Change (ANC) to facilitate community engagement; however, the work of the ANC may not be integrated or aligned with the planning and governance priorities of the Hubs.

- **Communications/outreach/engagement strategies**: Community Hubs, particularly those with locations in both the inner city and the inner suburbs, have learned that outreach strategies that are successful in Hub neighbourhoods differ from those at their downtown locations.

- **Sharing Learnings**: The findings indicate that Hubs may benefit from opportunities to share information and learnings with each other; however, at this time, these opportunities are limited.
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

Moving forward, all of the Hubs, including those that did not participate in this Evaluation, may reflect on these critical success factors and use them to identify areas for improvement. Based on the findings, the critical success factors for the Community Hubs are as follows:

- **Funding:** Diversified, sufficient, and sustainable funding for both operations and community engagement.
- **Dedicated staff:** Access to resources for dedicated and skilled staff for both operations and community engagement.
- **Action for Neighbourhood Change (ANC) presence/coordination:** In the context of limited resources, integrating with an ANC to increase the Hubs’ capacity to engage with residents.
- **Strong lead agency and committed anchor partners:** Operating collaboratively under one roof to deliver coordinated services requires lead agencies and anchor partners to be committed, community-based, and values driven.
- **Shared mission:** Engaging in routine planning to develop a shared vision, mission, and values.
- **Policies and structures:** Putting in place formal policies and structures to support interagency collaboration and coordination (i.e., service coordination can be strengthened by developing and implementing a collaborative referral system).
- **Community engagement:** Defining community engagement goals and indicators and developing an understanding of the full continuum of community engagement (e.g., inform, consult, collaborate, and empower).
- **Mutual respect and trust:** Providing informal and formal opportunities for staff to come together and develop interpersonal relationships facilitates interagency collaboration and staff learning.

7. NEXT STEPS

Overall, this Evaluation demonstrates that the Community Hubs bring value to users and the broader community and that there is significant opportunity for the Hubs to improve as the Model further develops and matures.

The Evaluation findings also demonstrate that the Hubs are striving to achieve the outcomes identified in the Outcome Framework. Since the Hubs now have valuable experience to draw upon, it may be timely for the Hubs to review and update the Framework.

This report will be shared with all the Hubs and their Hub partners and follow up discussions will take place to discuss learnings and potential implications.
## APPENDIX A: SNAPSHOT OF HUBS – JANUARY 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AccessPoint on Danforth (APOD)</th>
<th>Jane Street Hub</th>
<th>Mid-Scarborough Hub</th>
<th>Victoria Park Hub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>3079 Danforth Ave (at Victoria Park)</td>
<td>1541 Jane Street (at Trethewey)</td>
<td>2660 Eglinton Ave East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority neighbourhood</strong></td>
<td>Crescent Town (Taylor Massey)</td>
<td>Weston-Mt. Dennis</td>
<td>Eglinton East/Kennedy Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date opened</strong></td>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead agency</strong></td>
<td>Access Alliance Multicultural Health and Community Services</td>
<td>Unison Health and Community Services</td>
<td>Scarborough Centre for Healthy Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anchor partners</strong></td>
<td>East York East Toronto Family Resources (EYET); Action for Neighbourhood Change: Taylor Massey/Neighbourhood Link Support Services (ANC-NLSS); Toronto Employment and Social Services (TESS)</td>
<td>COSTI Immigrant Services; Macaulay Child Development Centre; Midaynta Community Services; North York Community House; Yorktown Child and Family Centre</td>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters of Toronto; Community Resource Connections of Toronto (CRCT); Toronto Public Health Dental and Oral Health Services; Vasantham-A Tamil Seniors Wellness Centre; YMCA Scarborough Employment &amp; Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Itinerant partners (as of Fall 2013)</strong></td>
<td>NIA Centre for the Arts; Eritrean Youth Collective; Bangladeshi Community Services; Girl Guides Canada; Nupur Dance; Children’s Peace Theatre; DECNET</td>
<td>Youth Justice of Peel</td>
<td>Toronto District School Board; Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA); TPH – Growing Up Healthy Together; Salvation Army Addiction Services; Victim Services of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AccessPoint on Danforth (APOD)</td>
<td>Jane Street Hub</td>
<td>Mid-Scarborough Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community space available for residents</td>
<td>6 meeting rooms (can be combined into larger spaces); 1 community kitchen; Rooftop garden; 1 mezzanine area</td>
<td>5 meeting rooms; 1 community kitchen</td>
<td>4 meeting rooms; lobby area with green wall and seating; 1 community kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making/planning structure</td>
<td>- Community Reference Group (not active during current reporting period), Anchor Partners Working Group, and Anchor Partners Advisory Group are the three main bodies that inform the decision-making at APOD. The Hub Management plans, implements and executes day-to-day Hub operations.</td>
<td>- Hub Governance Committee is comprised of senior representatives for all anchoring agencies and the Hub Manager. Makes decisions regarding the Hub’s policies. - Operations Committee and Finances makes decisions re. day-to-day Hub operations. Comprised of all agency managers, including Unison. - Community Advisory Panel (CAP) consists of 9 community members serving as information resource and feedback. Members provide input on Hub’s policies and services while highlighting community needs.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal referral system</td>
<td>Help Desk with two staff that provide information and general referrals to the clients, and service users, about the services and programs being offered at the Hub.</td>
<td>Service providers use a tracking form. However in order to provide a service that is more personalized most staff walk clients to other agencies to introduce and have clients receive assistance they need (warm hand-off). This provides a higher comfort level and better connection to the service being introduced.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>