



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of the Sharing Our Future developmental stage was to prepare for a full pilot project. Specifically, we wanted time to put together a network of partnerships and collaboratively develop the foundation of a sustainable initiative.

1. Through discussion the partnership evolved based on the principles of local control; mutual benefit, and inclusiveness. The partners are the Community Education Network; L'Association Regionale de la Cote Ouest; Port au Port Economic Development Association; Stephenville Lions Club; Cormack Trail School Board; Burgeo Broadcasting System; Ramea Economic Development Corporation; Ramea Broadcasting Company; Bay St. George South Area Development Association; Long Range Regional Economic Development Board; Communication For Survival/Communiquer Pour Survivre; Sir Wilfred Grenfell College (Memorial University); College of the North Atlantic; Communities In Schools; Conservation Corps Newfoundland and Labrador, and Ryakuga. We would expect to add more partners during the replication process.

2. Sharing Our Future will utilize participatory communication tools (community television/radio and internet communication including webcasting; web boards; email and video conferencing). It will be implemented by local community communication facilitators working primarily with youth but focusing on the whole community (inclusivity and cross generational participation are important). The goal is cultural celebration and interactive discussion of local issues. To ensure sustainability, we have identified two strategies - a collaborative project management model where the facilitator will work for both Communities In Schools and SOF, and a local funding model where the facilitator will be required to raise a salary percentage in the community. Much of the training and reporting procedures for the facilitators will be adapted from the CIS Newfoundland model. We have developed job descriptions. Most of our required funding is to seed the community communications facilitators.

3. We have designed a pilot project in two phases. In year one we will work with local communication facilitators in five communities of our region (zone 9). In year two we will develop replication guides and replicate the process in two communities outside the region.

4. During the developmental stage we identified a need for community development (economic, education and communications) professionals to improve networking. We have included a program of internet communication (email, web boards and video conferencing) on a phased in (regional to Atlantic) design. Our plan to initiate discussion with other Atlantic rural communities will begin at the professional level.

5. The program will publicize itself locally but we have also developed a plan to advertise provincially and nationally. We have already begun to make contact with expatriate Newfoundlanders and link to their web sites about Newfoundland. Our webcasting strategy has been initiated with a video broadcast on the internet by Sir Wilfred Grenfell College. We plan to nationally advertise and webcast community forums from rural communities. We have

consulted local press and the national magazine for Newfoundlanders.

6. The developmental stage allowed us to design a comprehensive strategy of goals, objectives and success indicators. This forms the basis for our evaluation process which is both qualitative and quantitative. The latter is informed by our reporting procedure while the former will be implemented according to the participatory evaluation guide. The evaluation committee has been identified. The evaluation process will inform the replication model and guides.

7. We modified our approach to partnership during the developmental stage. The importance of local control became apparent while it was also obvious that people were not going to give the same credence to a developmental stage proposal as a pilot project in progress (participatory communications is also more meaningful as an experience than as a presentation). This has a number of ramifications. Some of our prospective partners were slow to join the initiative. We decided to proceed with an advisory group and wait until the pilot project to establish an overall steering committee. Instead of travelling about the zone describing the initiative, we decide to model its implementation in Lourdes and Stephenville and to produce a number of Sharing Our Future community television events with a minimum of outside interference). It also became apparent we need to have a pilot project underway before we can initiate meaningful dialogue with other Atlantic groups and communities.

8. During the past six months we have experimented with emerging internet communications microtechnologies (some of the software only became available during our developmental stage). Our criteria is that the technology must be accessible and inexpensive - for the user, at least, the software should be freeware. We have experimented with two leading webcasting technologies and identified a free video conferencing software. We have produced a website; interactive web board; streaming video web servers, and we are developing a participatory web server. During our Sharing Our Future community television events in Stephenville, we plugged a web-connected computer into our participatory "portable, television studio" (POP VDO).

9. The Sharing Our Future developmental stage may be perceived as another step in the almost two decade history of participatory communications in sou'western Newfoundland. The two year pilot project will develop capacity for community learning through interactive forums throughout the region; legitimize the process provincially and nationally, and produce a replication model and guides.

10. Sharing Our Future web site: [www.web.net/~ryakuga/sharing.html](http://www.web.net/~ryakuga/sharing.html)

Interactive web board: [www.glinx.com/~ryakuga/sharing/sharing.html](http://www.glinx.com/~ryakuga/sharing/sharing.html)

Video webcast: In Real Player/Open Location: <rtsp://198.165.60.132:554/waves56.rm>

Participatory webserver: <http://145warp76.newtel.com>

## RÉSUMÉ PRINCIPAL (EXÉCUTIF)

Le but de notre étape de développement, en ce qui concerne “Partager Notre Avenir”, a été, la préparation d’un Projet Pilote Intégré. Plus spécifiquement, nous voulions prendre le temps d’établir un réseau de partenariats, et une collaboration, développer la base d’une initiative soutenue.

1. Après discussion, le partenariat a suivi une évolution basée sur les principes de: “autonomie locale, bienfaite mutuels, et inclusion de toutes et tous.” Les partenaires de cette initiative sont: Le Réseau d’Éducation Communautaire, L’Association Régionale de la Côte Ouest, L’Association de Développement Économique de Port au Port, Le Club des Lions de Stephenville, Le Conseil Scholaire de la Piste Cormack, Le Système de Diffusion de Burgeo, La Corporation de Développement Économique de Raméa, La Compagnie de Diffusion de Raméa, L’Association de Développement de la Zone sud de Baie St-Georges, Le Conseil Régional de Développement Économique à Long Terme, Communiquer Pour Survivre, Le Collège Sir Wilfred Grenfell de l’Université Mémorial, Le Collège de L’Atlantique-Nord, Les Communautés Présentes à L’École, Les Corps de Préservation de Terre-Neuve et Labrador, et la compagnie Ryakuga.

2. Partager Notre Avenir utilisera des outils de communication participatifs tels que: la télévision communautaire, la diffusion par radio et la netdiffusion, les bulletins électroniques, le courriel, et la conférence vidéo. Le tout sera opérationnalisé par des facilitateurs de la communauté locale, en communication d’abord avec les jeunes, mais aussi avec toute la communauté (l’inclusion et la participation trans-générationnelle étant très importantes.) Le but est: “la célébration culturelle, et une discussion interactive des réalités locales.” Pour assurer la viabilité, nous avons identifié deux stratégies: “un modèle collaboratif de gestion de projet, où le/la facilitateur/trice travaillera à la fois avec “Les Communautés Présentes à L’École”, et “Partager Notre Avenir”, et un modèle de levée des fonds, local, où le/la facilitateur/trice devra obtenir un pourcentage de son salaire, directement de la communauté. Nous avons élaboré des descriptions des tâches; la majeure partie des fonds sollicités, vise à l’implantation des facilitateurs et facilitatrices en communication, dans la communauté.

3. Le design du projet pilote a deux étapes: (i) Durant la première année, nous allons travailler avec les facilitateurs/trices, dans cinq communautés de notre région (la zone neuf). (ii) La deuxième année, on développera les guides de reproduction, et on répétera le processus dans deux communautés en dehors de la région.

4. Pendant l’étape initiale, on a identifié un besoin de développement communautaire (économique, éducatif, relationnel/communications), on a besoin de professionnel(le)s pour améliorer le réseautage. Nous avons donc inclus un programme de communication par l’internet (courriel, bulletins électroniques, et conférences vidéo), avec un design de déploiement graduel (du régional à l’Atlantique). Nous avons l’intention de commencer la discussion avec les autres communautés rurales de l’Atlantique au niveau professionnel d’abord.

5. Au départ, le programme s’auto-publiera localement, mais, nous avons aussi développé un plan publicitaire provincial et national. Nous avons commencé à contacter les Terre-Neuvien(ne)s “expatrié(e)s”, et à connecter leur sites web à ceux de Terre-Neuve. Notre stratégie de diffusion sur le web, fut inaugurée par un programme vidéo via le net, en direct, du Collège Sir Wilfred Grenfell. Nous avons l’intention d’annoncer nos forums communautaires et de les disséminer par webdiffusion. Nous avons consulté la presse locale et

le magazine national des Terre-Neuvien(ne)s.

6. L'étape de lancement nous a donc permis d'effectuer le design d'une stratégie intégrée, qui comprend: buts, objectifs, et indicateurs de succès. Ceci forme, la base de notre processus d'évaluation qui est à la fois qualitatif et quantitatif; ce dernier étant nourri par nos procédures de rapports, tandis que l'autre proviendra de notre guide d'évaluation participative. Le comité d'évaluation a déjà été nommé, et le processus d'évaluation va nourrir nos modèles et guides de reproduction dans autres communautés.

7. Durant le lancement, nous avons dû modifier notre approche en partenariat; il est devenu évident que la notion de contrôle local était impérative, en même temps, il était aussi évident que les gens ne donneront pas le même niveau de crédibilité à une proposition en élaboration, qu' à un projet pilote qui évolue (l'expérience de la communication participative ayant une signification bien plus engageante, qu'une simple présentation). Ce phénomène a engendré beaucoup de ramifications; certains des partenaires ciblés furent, au départ, "tièdes", à l'initiative; nous avons alors décidé de démontrer la mise en application à Lourdes, et à Stephenville, et de produire une série télévisée, "Partager Notre Avenir", avec un minimum d'interférences externes, ce qui les a convaincu. Ceci a confirmé l'importance d'un projet pilote actif et en route, avant même de pouvoir initier un dialogue intelligent avec les autres groupes et les communautés dans la région Atlantique.

8. Pendant les derniers six mois, on a eu l'occasion d'expérimenter avec les microtechnologies de netcommunication qui émergent, (par exemple, certains logiciels n'ont vu le jour que pendant notre étape initiale). Nos critères sont: "que cette technologie doit être accessible, et non-couteuse pour l'utilisateur(trice) et que le logiciel soit gratis." (Avantage compétitif) Nous avons testé deux technologies de pointe en webdiffusion, et identifié un logiciel graduit pour les conférences vidéo. Nous avons construit un site web, un bulletin électronique interactif, des serveurs-net pour le flot vidéo, et on a même élaboré un serveur-web participatif. Pendant la diffusion de l'émission télévisée, "Partager Notre Avenir", à Stephenville, nous avons réussi à connecter un ordinateur relié à l'internet, directement à notre studio de télévision mobile/portatif (POP VDO).

9. L'étape de développement initiale de: "Partager Notre Avenir", s'enlignait dans deux décennies historiques, de communications participatives au sus-ouest de Terre-Neuve. Le projet pilote de deux ans, va augmenter la capacité de cette communauté d'apprendre via ces forums régionaux; cela va aussi légitimiser le processus au niveau provincial et national, et produire un modèle et des guides de reproduction pour les autres communautés.

10. "Partager Notre Avenir":

Site web: <http://www.web.net/~ryakuga/sharing.html>

Bulletin électronique interactif: <http://www.glinx.com/~ryakuga/sharing/sharing.html>

Web diffusion video: en Jeu Real/Lieu d'accès Ouvert:

<rtsp://198.165.60.132.554/waves56.rm>

Serveur-web participatif: <http://145warp76.netwel.com>

## SEPTEMBER

Beverley Kirby, executive director of the Community Education Network met with Tom Hutchings, executive director of the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board in late August. The RED board has representatives from most of our targeted region and its development officers work in the communities. The zone board is a partner in the Community Education Network and has worked with Ryakuga in public consultations. Tom supports the developmental phase of Sharing Our Future.

On September 20 Fred Campbell of Ryakuga met in Stephenville with Bev to review plans for the developmental phase. Fred prepared a list of the differences and similarities between Sharing Our Future and Communication for Survival; a list of incremental developments (during the past 14 years) which have led to this new initiative, and a list of tasks to be accomplished during the next six months (all included as appendices to this report).

Fred advised that Ryakuga had produced a website for the developmental phase ([www.web.net/~ryakuga/share.html](http://www.web.net/~ryakuga/share.html)). During a grassroots radio conference he had also spoken to an Acadian radio producer regarding licences for francophone “special event” community radio.

On September 21 Bev and Fred met with zone board economic development officers John MacPherson and Vanessa Glasgow to discuss Sharing Our Future. They were enthusiastically supportive and agreed to initiate local committees in their areas (Robinson-McKay’s and the Port au Port Peninsula), as well as facilitate local community communications needs, skills and resources assessments.

Fred prepared “customized” community communications needs, skills and resources assessments for the developmental phase of Sharing Our Future. He also set up the Community Education Network computer with video conferencing and streaming video software.

On September 22 Fred met with Terri Blanchard, executive assistant of the zone board and regional development officer Jim Marsden. Both support Sharing Our Future. Jim played a key role in Communication for Survival.

Also on September 22 Fred met with Don Murphy from the College of the North Atlantic and Jack Cook of the Stephenville Lion’s Club to discuss both Sharing Our Future and the formation of a local community television committee. Fred also spoke to Jack about scheduling a webcast at the Lion’s Club next February.

On September 23 and 24 Fred met with Communities In Schools coordinators in Port aux Basques. They talked about teaching internet skills to the community in Isle aux Morts and the new community television initiative in Rose Blanche. They discussed community communications assessments in the area. Mary Squim talked to Cable Atlantic personnel about initiating community television in Port au Basques.

At the suggestion of Bev, Fred set up a private web board so participating partners can discuss the implementation of the developmental phase of Sharing Our Future.

### What was Planned

<p><b>Formation and meeting of overall steering committee *</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Begin the participatory evaluation process (develop goals and objectives).</b></li> <li><b>2. Conduct a community communications needs, skills and resources assessment in Stephenville.</b></li> </ol>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Consultant develops a website and discussion board for the project.</b></li> <li><b>2. Consultant initiates video conferencing among the steering committee.</b></li> <li><b>3. CEN establishes contact with targeted supporting partners and the targeted community partners.</b></li> </ol>

The overall steering committee wasn't formed partly because integral participant Tom Hutchings was honeymooning in Europe but also because who to include is not a simple decision. The current discussion centres around whether to use a streamlined group of people who understand the process and will get things done or to try to ensure representative participation. If we go for representation, then we can't form a steering committee until supporting and community partners are in place.

The initiation of the participatory evaluation process was to be a responsibility of the steering committee but now it seems to make more sense for the consultant to begin the process with suggested goals and objectives for partners to consider as they come on board.

The Stephenville community communications needs, skills and resources assessment is being updated.

The Sharing Our Future web site is established with a private web board. A public web board will be set up in October.

Video conferencing software is installed on the Community Education Network computer and the zone board has a web cam. In October Ryakuga will loan CEN a web cam and set up software on the zone board computer.

CEN has initiated contact with partners through the zone board. In addition Bev spoke to Sam Fiander of Ramea Broadcasting who supports Sharing Our Future.

**New Threads**

1. During September community economic development professionals in the area have focused on the need for better communication with their peers. It seems self-evident that the tools described in Sharing Our Future could alleviate the problem. It's also probably the level at which contact will be made with other Atlantic communities.

2. We have now identified three (with a part-time fourth) people working in the region who could be described as community communication facilitators. An additional task has been identified as preparing a job description to fit the position of community communication facilitator.

## SIX MONTH DEVELOPMENTAL PHASE TASKS

- 1. Conduct local communication needs, skills and resources assessments in selected communities.**
- 2. Form a steering committee - monthly work meetings.**
- 3. Establish local committees with collaboration agreements.**
- 4. Public community television consultations in selected communities.**
- 5. Set up a participatory evaluation.**
- 6. Training workshops for established communication facilitators and CIS workers.**
- 7. Contact with interested Atlantic groups/communities.**
- 8. National publicity for Sharing Our Future - contact expatriate Newfoundlanders.**
- 9. Research and develop the technologies.**
- 10. Prototype webcast - Stephenville, February 2000.**
- 11. Written and video report on six month developmental phase.**
- 12. Proposal for two year seed pilot project.**

## COMMUNICATION FOR SURVIVAL AND SHARING OUR FUTURE

- 1. CFS used a multiplicity of communication tools (from pop theatre to black and white photography); SOF focuses on community television (or radio) public forums and the internet.**
- 2. CFS was implemented by two outside facilitators rotating through the communities; SOF is designed to be implemented by local communication facilitators assisted by an outside co-ordinators.**
- 3. Both initiatives are designed to be assisted by local committees - whether new or existant.**
- 4. SOF will proceed by local collaboration agreements between partners.**
- 5. SOF must be supported by local school boards.**
- 6. CFS looked to the whole community for volunteers; SOF focuses on youth working in an intergenerational environment.**
- 7. CFS was concerned with any issue arising in the community; SOF focuses on out-migration and the future of youth in the communities.**
- 8. CFS was directed at the group/individual within the communities (with a peripheral effort to bridge communities within the region); SOF is initiated within the local community to network (via the internet) with other rural communities within the region and Atlantic Canada as well**

as expatriate Newfoundlanders across North America.

9. Publicity outside the community was peripheral to CFS; the SOF networking component requires publicity.

10. A participatory evaluation process is integral to SOF.

11. SOF builds incrementally on CFS, as well as other local initiatives, including CEN, LRRREDB and CIS.

### SHARING OUR FUTURE INCREMENTAL EVOLUTION

1984	Community television public forum	Robinson-McKay's
1986	Program director for public TV programs Computer used for news on cable TV	Burgeo Ramea
1988	Community television transmitter	La Grand' Terre
1993	Series of community television forums	Port au Port
1995-97	Communication for Survival community television forums in Cap-St Georges, La Grand' Terre, L'Anse a Canards, Lourdes, Stephenville, Ramea and Burgeo	Sou'west Newfoundland
1995	Volunteer community television on cable channel	Lourdes
1995	Community radio	La Grand' Terre
1996	RED board public consultation on community TV	Zone 9
1997	CFS volunteers participatory communication conference	Stephenville
1997	Ramea broadcasting telethon	North America
1997	8 CIS workers in 7 sites in 4 communities	Sou'west Newfoundland
1997	CIS participatory evaluation	Sou'west Newfoundland
1998	Communication co-ordinator combines community radio and cable TV	La Grand' Terre
1998-99	Youth, the Environment and the Economy conferences use Sharing Our Future communication tools	Stephenville
1988-99	Isle aux Morts CIS FRAM workers teach communication skills to seniors (others do job search and make web sites)	Isle aux Morts
1988-99	CIS worker and Ramea Broadcasting facilitate youth news show	Ramea
1999	High school initiates community communications course	Burgeo

# COMMUNITY COMMUNICATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

## DO-IT-OURSELVES COMMUNICATION

(Note: This is a community needs, skills and resources assessment for Sharing Our Future facilitators ('WE'). Naming of equipment doesn't mean you must have it in order to communicate.)

### 1. To produce community television, we have access to:

\_\_\_ modulator hooked to the cable system

who/where?

\_\_\_ video camcorders

who/where?

\_\_\_ microphones

who/where?

\_\_\_ video lights

who/where?

\_\_\_ television monitors

who/where?

\_\_\_ audio mixer

who/where?

\_\_\_ video mixer

who/where?

\_\_\_ speaker phone

who/where?

\_\_\_ tripods

who/where?

\_\_\_ player VCR

who/where?

\_\_\_ recorder VCR

who/where?

\_\_\_ videotapes

who/where?

### 2. To video conference, we have access to:

\_\_\_ AV computer with software, modem and camera

who/where?

\_\_\_ access to a local internet service provider

who/where?

### 3. To produce a video for community television, we have access to:

\_\_\_ video camcorder

who/where?

\_\_\_ tripod

who/where?

\_\_\_ microphone

who/where?

\_\_\_ television monitor

who/where?

\_\_\_ videotapes

who/where?

**4. To E-Mail, interact on the Sharing Our Future discussion board and visit the CIS web site, we have access to:**

**\_\_\_ computer with software and modem  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ access to a local internet service provider  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ local dial-up numbers  
what are they?**

**\_\_\_ addresses for board and site  
what are they?**

**5. To produce a web site, we have access to:**

**\_\_\_ computer with software and modem  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ access to local internet service provider  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ file transfer protocol software  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ free web site space  
who/where?**

**7. Does your community have a public access internet site?  
Who/where?**

## **COMMUNICATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

### **SECTION TWO**

#### **MAINSTREAM MEDIA**

**The basis of external communication from the group to the community is getting to know your local media conduits. In other words, get to know on a first name basis the people who can help, whether that person be the program manager at the local radio station or the grocery manager who controls the community bulletin board.**

**1. Does your community have community cable television? Are volunteers (groups) allowed to produce programming? (See a recipe for community television.)  
who/where?**

**2. Does your community have a local newspaper? Will they use press releases and photos from your group?  
who/where?**

**3. Who is your local representative for the regional (national) newspaper? Do you know reporters who normally report on events and issues relevant to your group?  
who/where?**

**4. Does your community have a local radio station? What is their policy on public service announcements? Do they have any time slots available for programming from your group?  
who/where?**

**5. Do you have a community or college radio station? Is it possible for your group to produce a**

**program or special?  
who/where?**

**6. Which of these tools of community communications would work for you and be useful in your community?**

**\_\_\_ press release  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ posters  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ public forums (meetings)  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ public service announcements  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ radio programs  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ radio phone-ins  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ interviews with reporters  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ letters to the editor  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ newspaper column  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ newsletter  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ other groups' newsletters  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ community television  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ video productions  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ newspaper wall  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ bulletin boards  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ church bulletins  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ popular theatre  
who/where?**

**\_\_\_ popular songwriting  
who/where?**

**RECIPE FOR COMMUNITY TELEVISION (ryakuga@web.net)**

<b>Contact cable company</b>	<b>Who? Phone number?</b>	
<b>Arrange a site</b>	<b>Where? Contact person?</b>	
<b>Help from schools</b>	<b>Camera people... Switcher, audio mixer (5 or more)</b>	
	<b>News writers and readers (2 or more)</b>	
	<b>Hosts (2)</b>	
	<b>Posters</b>	
	<b>Publicity notices sent home</b>	
<b>Local videotapes</b>	<b>Watch before airing</b>	
<b>Local musicians</b>	<b>As many as possible</b>	
<b>Phone-in panel discussion</b>	<b>Topic?</b>	
	<b>Moderator?</b>	
	<b>Panelists (4)</b>	
	<b>Planning meeting... Where? When?</b>	
	<b>Seeded calls - who?</b>	
<b>Publicize the event</b>	<b>List the ways. Who?</b>	
<b>Prepare a program (make copies)</b>	<b>Format is live segment, then taped segment and so on.</b>	



**From one perspective the developmental phase can be perceived as an opportunity to bring on board supporting and community partners before initiating a pilot project.**

**Trying to enlist bottom-up support for a networking initiative which does not originate on the turf of the group or community is a delicate matter. It is important to publicize the project and form a steering committee but this cannot be accomplished until the bottom-up support has happened.**

**So in October Fred Campbell contacted people who have experience or knowledge of participatory communications to serve as an advisory group while the grassroots work is taking place leading to the formation of a steering committee.**

**The advisory group includes Tom Hutchings (executive director of the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board); Bruce Gilbert (public relations director of the Conservation Corps Newfoundland and Labrador and former facilitator with Communication for Survival); Roger Carter (College of the North Atlantic instructor with experience in community television as a field worker and manager with MUN Extension; Ivan Emke (a professor at Grenfell College who is studying the impact of participatory community television in local communities) and Don Murphy (College of the North Atlantic instructor and formerly with MUN extension's media unit). Fred and Community Education Network executive director Bev Kirby are also on the committee.**

**For the most part, the group will communicate by email and web board.**

**Fred also contacted people in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick who may be interested in Sharing Our Future. These people include Rochelle Owen of the Community Animation Program; Rick Hutchins of Keswick Ridge New Brunswick suggested Rochelle and Mary Simpson of Community Health Promotion Network Atlantic would be good contacts. We also contacted Robert Proctor of the Strait East Nova Community Enterprise Network. Robert and his colleague, John Ouellette, have extensive experience with community information technology initiatives.**

**Fred continued to research web broadcasting developments through list serves and web sites. Ryakuga has purchased recently released web broadcasting software. It has also set up a work space in Stephenville which is intended to take advantage of the telephone company's new high speed (ADSL) modems when they become available in late November. The work space will then be ideal for video conferencing and possibly broadcasting (depending on results of experiments to be carried out later in the fall.)**

**On October 27 Fred and Bev met to discuss the progress of the developmental phase and focusing on the need to establish personal contact with people on supporting groups and in the communities.**

**Fred set up the Community Education Network computer with a Ryakuga webcam for video conferencing and more efficient email software. It was discussed how community development professionals will probably need to demonstrate the benefits of information technology in their own work.**

**On October 28 Fred met with Tom Hutchings and Don Murphy to discuss the project. Tom suggested contact with his zone board colleagues in Port aux Basques may be of benefit.**

**Mary Barter has been hired under a short term program to rejuvenate the Lourdes**

community television group. Fred met with her and Vanessa Glasgow, zone board economic development officer, on Oct. 29 to discuss what needs to be done and how it can fit with the Sharing Our Future initiative.

It was decided Mary will meet with community representatives to find a new site for the community television studio; contact teachers to meet with interested youth, and produce video interviews with older members of the community. Vanessa suggested a Port au Port sharing committee could include both the francophone and anglophone communities as well as representatives from the development association and the library board.

They also discussed CAP site proposals on the peninsula.

Also on Oct. 29 Fred met with Sandy Barter, agente de communication with L'Association Régionale de la côte ouest. Sandy was enthusiastic in her support for the initiative and suggested the initiative should also be known as "Partagez notre avenir."

They tentatively agreed to publicize the event in the francophone community with a community television event in November.

Bev, Fred and CIS regional co-ordinator Tracy Snow will visit the communities of Burgeo and Ramea during the first week of November. Transportation, of course, becomes very difficult in rural Newfoundland in the winter which is one reason why internet networking has such potential.

<b>What we said we would do</b>
<b>CEN representative and consultant visit communities of Cap-St. Georges; La Grand' Terre; Lourdes; Burgeo; Ramea; McKay's; Port aux Basques and Isle aux Morts to meet with local residents and conduct community communication needs, skills and resources assessments.</b>
<b>1. Consultant develops prototype training guides for the community facilitators.</b>
<b>2. Consultant begins webcast experiments.</b>
<b>3. Consultant produces prototype collaboration agreements.</b>
<b>4. CEN representative initiates discussions with Communities in Schools co-ordinators.</b>
<b>5. CEN representative identifies and negotiates with participating communities for community television public consultations.</b>

We have visited the communities of the Port au Port and plan to be on the sou'west coast the first week of November. John MacPherson, zone board economic development officer has the communities "out west" well in hand.

Progress in Port aux Basques probably requires the blessing of the local zone board and Fred will follow up on meetings with CIS co-ordinators to visit the new community television facility in Rose Blanche. Fred discussed the sharing initiative with CIS co-ordinators from Codroy,

**Port aux Basques, Isle aux Morts and Rose Blanche.**

**Community television public consultations are still planned in November and December. Community intervention dates are Nov. 19 to 25; Dec. 6 to 10; Jan. 10 to 14 and Feb. 10 to 16.**

**It has been decided to prepare community facilitator job descriptions before producing prototype training guides.**

### **New Threads**

**When discussing the role of the new community facilitator in Lourdes, the need for a detailed job description was readily apparent. We intend to prepare a generic job description which must, of course, be customized to meet the needs of each host community.**

**Resource material for the job descriptions will be Ryakuga training guides prepared for people doing similar work; CIS co-ordinator training guides, and the actual work performed by “communication facilitators” in La Grand’ Terre, Lourdes, Burgeo, Ramea and Rose Blanche.**

## **NOVEMBER**

**It is apparent that the Sharing Our Future initiative will be enhanced by an active partnership between the Community Education Network and the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board.**

**In November CEN director Bev Kirby consulted with zone development officer John MacPherson who informed her the Bay St. George South Area Development Association is ready to sponsor a full development project. The Bay St. George South Sharing Our Future local committee will be a committee of the development association.**

**Bev also attended a meeting of the Port au Port Sharing Out Future committee organized by zone development officer Vanessa Glasgow. At present the committee includes Lourdes library board representative Shirley Snook (also school vice principal); Association Regionale de la Cote Ouest communications officer Sandy Barter; Lourdes Sharing Our Future community communications facilitator Mary Barter; Vanessa and Bev. They discussed plans for a Lourdes Community Access Program site and Mary’s role with assistance offered by ARCO. They also made plans for a Sharing Our Future community television event in Lourdes in December.**

**On November 1 and 2, Bev, SOF consultant Fred Campbell and Communities In Schools district coordinator Tracy Snow made community visits to Burgeo and the island of Ramea. In Burgeo they met with zone development officer Greg Hillier; Burgeo Broadcasting System administrator Claude Strickland, and school principal Scott Linehan.**

**In Ramea they met with CIS coordinator Sherry Lee Vallis, school principal Leo Freebourne and Ramea Broadcasting Corporation director Sam Fiander.**

**Sam re-emphasized RBC support for the initiative and described the 1997 RBC Telethon which was promoted with Christmas cards and raised money from expatriate Rameans from across North America (although the program could only be seen on the island of Ramea). The telethon is considered to be a step in the incremental evolution of SOF. Leo, representing the staff and students of the school, asked for SOF support in organizing a**

youth issues conference at the school. It was decided to call the event Sharing Our Future. In deciding to sponsor such an event, the staff and students were influenced by their experience at the 1998 Youth, the Environment and the Economy conference in Stephenville. That conference, another step in the incremental evolution of SOF, was supported by SOF partners, including CEN, the zone board, CIS, Ryakuga and the Conservation Corps Newfoundland and Labrador.

During the month of November there were several teleconferences to plan the conference including representatives of the staff and students at the school; CIS; the zone board and Ryakuga. It was decided to sponsor the event in December preceded by a Respect Day organized by Stephenville CIS Teen Help Corps coordinator Cindy O'Neill and District 4 school board intermediate program specialist Nick White.

Planning for the event included facilitation by Cindy, Tracy and zone board executive director Tom Hutchings. Ryakuga and Fred Campbell agreed to facilitate student videotaping/webcam of the event using the Ryakuga POP VDO portable television studio. Following the event, the students would produce an SOF community television program (the school isn't wired to the community owned cable system). Students would also be trained as facilitators. It was planned to bring members of the Teen Help Corps and the zone board youth group, Youth Power 9, to the event.

On November 4 Fred visited Terry Hardy, coordinator of the Kinsmen sponsored community television in Rose Blanche. Terry broadcasts still photos, music and ads from the community. Local residents pay to have their photos shown on TV.

During November Bev and Fred also consulted with Burgeo school teacher Wayne Vivian concerning support for a communications course. Fred agreed to facilitate a community television workshop for the course. Wayne approached the Burgeo Broadcasting System for support as well.

At the request of the SOF initiative, Mary got an email account which she accessed from the French centre in L'Anse a Canards. Mary and Fred communicated by email, fax and phone during the planning for the Lourdes SOF event. Fred supplied Mary with Ryakuga community television training and production materials. Mary met with the Duane Snow's Grade 8 students who agreed to produce the event.

CIS district coordinator Tracy Snow and Brian Foley, College of the North Atlantic administrator joined the SOF advisory group.

Fred developed a generic job description for an SOF community communications facilitator (with input from Bev). He also worked on the participatory evaluation proposal using the CIS experience as a model. Accordingly he produced SOF goals and objectives and a participatory evaluation guide.

Fred also continued to develop the SOF website with the addition of a public web board. He contacted southwest Newfoundland expatriate and genealogist Bill Crant who supported Ramea's 1999 Rock Island festival with promotion on his website. Bill agreed to link his pages to Sharing Our Future and to contact other expatriate webmasters.

At the end of November the workshop in Burgeo was postponed because of a change in BBS policy which means all decisions about community programming are referred to its board of directors. (BBS has a new program director with Dave Cooper taking up a newspaper job in

Lewisporte.) On the last day of the month, the youth conference in Ramea was also postponed when the school unexpectedly found itself involved in provincial sports championships in St. John's.

Fred met with Peter Gnemmi (a local Apple reseller) who demonstrated a video broadcast with new Quicktime technology. Ryakuga has the software and arranged to purchase a new "broadcasting" computer - not yet available. Ryakuga also purchased Real Video production software - another technology which provides extra options for SOF web broadcasting. Ryakuga continues its research through journals; websites, and list serves.

Fred offered technical support to the Stephenville Lion's Club with the loan of equipment and advice on equipment purchase. The Lion's Club is one of two community television broadcasting "studios" in Stephenville (the other is the college journalism program - currently under review and cut to a one year course). The Lions agreed to hosting a Sharing Our Future community television event in December.

Fred met with Bev, Tracy, Cindy, Jack Cook of the Lions and journalism instructor Don Murphy (also SOF advisor) to discuss the event. Cindy and local musician Ken Meade (also Stephenville Festival vice-president) agreed to host the event. The Teen Help Corps will handle production as well as videotape scenes from Seniors Appreciation Day, which they are hosting at the school the same day as the CTV event.

**WHAT DID WE SAY WE WOULD DO ?**

Activity	Participants
CEN representative, consultant (and potentially other steering committee members) consult with the public using community television and/or community radio.	CEN representative, consultant (and potentially other steering committee members), local partners and members of the public.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prototype training workshops for existing community communications facilitators.</li> <li>2. Prototype training workshop for interested Communities In Schools coordinators.</li> </ol>	Consultant, community communication facilitators, CIS coordinators
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant produces community communications needs, skills and resources assessments.</li> <li>2. Consultant continues webcasting experiments.</li> <li>3. CEN representative gets community feedback on proposed collaborative agreements.</li> <li>4. CEN representative identifies and assesses the development of local steering committee.</li> </ol>	CEN representative, consultant (and potentially other steering committee members)

Sharing Our Future community television public consultations were planned for December in Ramea, Burgeo, La Grand' Terre, Lourdes and Stephenville.

Ryakuga provided training materials for the SOF community communications faciliator in Lourdes and consulted with the community television co-ordinators in La Grand' Terre and Rose Blanche.

Assessments have been distributed to the communities of Bay St. George South; the francophone communities of the Port au Port, and Lourdes.

Ryakuga is now researching more alternatives for Sharing Our Future webcasting.

It has been decided (as described in last month's report) to wait for local input before establishing an overall steering committee and to work with an advisory group during this stage instead. More members were added to the advisory group. Similarly, we decided to wait for the steering committee before writing collaborative agreements.

## **NEW THREADS**

- 1. We continue to be sensitive to local requests for Sharing Our Future support. These requests seem to be triggered by the perception that SOF builds on earlier initiatives in the region (for example, Communication for Survival local communications training and the Youth, the Environment and the Economy conferences.) This will help to ensure that SOF is locally driven.**
- 2. It has become more apparent that the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board development officers can play a key role in liaison/facilitation with their communities.**
- 3. Hiring Mary Barter as short term Sharing Our Future community communications facilitator in the Lourdes area means we can model SOF even before the implementation of a SOF pilot project.**
- 4. Discussions in the SOF local Port au Port committee makes the point that the SOF community communications facilitators' job description should include support for Community Access Program sites.**

## **COMMUNITY COMMUNICATIONS FACILITATOR** **GENERIC JOB DESCRIPTION**

**(It's important to note that this is a generic job description written in November, 1999, during the developmental phase of the Sharing Our Future Community Learning Project. Each community will tailor its own job description according to its need skills and resources.)**

### **1. PURPOSE:**

**The job description of community communications facilitator focuses on the importance in our communities of dialogue on local issues and cultural celebration. It reaffirms the inter-generational relationships which are an essential component of our way of life. It recognizes that there must be communication between rural communities, locally and throughout the Atlantic region, so we can share strategies of survival and development in the new global economy.**

### **2. DEFINITION:**

**Community communications is defined as dialogue on local issues and cultural celebration. The two are intertwined. It is important to have our way of life positively mirrored so we can affirm our self identity and feel empowered to speak out on local issues and plan together for the future.**

### **3. GOALS:**

**The goal of the facilitator is first to develop an interest and awareness of community communications in the local area. The second step is to work with community members, principally youth, to produce communication on community television and/or radio. The third**

step is to use internet technologies to communicate with groups and communities locally and throughout the Atlantic region. The fourth step is to be a contact for expatriate Newfoundlanders wanting to re-establish contact with their home communities.

#### **4. FOCUS:**

The community communications facilitator is a people job; its primary focus is to motivate and liaison. It will be necessary for the facilitator to learn basic technical skills and to conduct training workshops but it is more important to be able to identify support agencies rather than take full responsibility for the technical aspects.

#### **5. LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES:**

(A) Conduct and update monthly a community communications needs, skills and resources assessment (see attached assessment form).

(B) Help establish, maintain and coordinate regular meetings of a local community communications committee.

(C) Motivate and involve the youth of the area in community communications production.

(D) Coordinate community communications training workshops.

(E) Organize regular community television public consultations and events (see attached community television “recipe”).

(F) Develop public awareness of community communications and publicize events.

(G) Co-ordinate and help produce local programming (community based videos) for community television and/or radio.

(H) If there isn’t a local Community Access program Centre, support local agencies in their efforts to establish a CAP Centre.

(I) If there is a local Community Access Program Centre:

(I) Help publicize the CAP Centre.

(II) Help organize general public and targeted interest group training on basic computer and internet use.

(III) Promote and help organize training for the production of local web pages.

(IV) Utilize the CAP Centre for Sharing Our Future liaison purposes including video conferencing, email and web board participation.

#### **6. RESPONSIBILITIES OUTSIDE THE LOCAL AREA:**

(A) Network with the Sharing Our Future overall steering committee.

(B) Share ideas and experiences with other community communications facilitators in the region by email and weekly participation in the Sharing Our Future web board discussions.

(C) Share video and/or audio tapes with other community communications facilitators.

**(D) Use the internet - email, web boards and video conferencing - for communication.**

**(E) Participate in networking with other Atlantic communities on the internet.**

**(F) Help coordinate local internet television and/or radio special event broadcasts (one per year).**

## **7. REPORTING:**

**(A) Verbal progress reports to meetings of the local community communications committee.**

**(B) Monthly written reports to the Sharing Our Future overall steering committee.**

**(C) Weekly reports on the Sharing Our Future web board.**

## **SHARING OUR FUTURE GOALS**

**1. To promote public awareness and participation in community communications.**

**2. To establish and to legitimize the job description of community communications facilitator.**

**3. To promote internet technologies as a tool of communication for community development facilitators (community economic development; community education and community communications) working in the region.**

**4. To network by means of internet technologies with other community development facilitators working in rural communities of Atlantic Canada.**

**5. To use internet technologies to make contact with expatriate Newfoundlanders who are interested in news from communities back home.**

## **NOTE:**

**(A) Community communications is defined as using the tools of community television and/or radio to promote dialogue about local issues and cultural celebration.**

**(B) Internet technologies include email; web boards; video conferencing and internet television.**

## **SHARING OUR FUTURE OBJECTIVES**

**1. By April 2000, the Sharing Our Future overall steering committee will meet to establish a meeting schedule and approve collaboration agreements with local committees as well as the hiring of local community communication facilitators.**

**2. By April 2000, the Sharing Our Future local steering committees will meet to establish a meeting schedule and approve collaboration agreements with the overall steering committee as well as the hiring of a local community communication facilitator.**

**3. By April 2000, the Sharing Our Future community communication facilitators will begin working in the designated communities.**

- 4. By May 2000, the new and established community communication facilitators will have been offered training programs.**
- 5. By May 2000, the participatory evaluation team will have been formed with local representation.**
- 6. By May 2000, the participatory evaluation process, utilizing video as a data collection tool, will begin.**
- 7. By September 2000, the community communication facilitators will have recruited and trained teams of active community communication volunteers. This process will be ongoing.**
- 8. By September 2000, Sharing Our Future will reach out to expatriate Newfoundlanders by means of advertising in provincial and national media - and internet communication, principally internet broadcasting of local community television events.**
- 9. By October 2000, the community communication facilitators will have initiated regular weekly programming on community television and/or radio.**
- 10. By October 2000, the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board and the Community Education Network (with the support of Sharing Our Future) will have initiated a program of networking (utilizing internet communication tools such as video conferencing, list serves and web boards) with professionals and groups in Atlantic Canada. The networking will focus on community economic development, community education and participatory community communication.**
- 11. By November 2000, community communication facilitators will be working:**
  - (A) To help promote existing community access program centres.**
  - (B) To help organize community access program centres where they don't exist.**
- 12. By June 2001, each of the partner communities will have produced an internet broadcast community television event.**
- 13. By March 2002, the overall steering committee will have found alternate sources (including local support) to funding the community communication facilitator positions.**
- 14. By March 2002, Sharing Our Future will have produced a replication video/guide and written report on the project.**

## DECEMBER

**In December, it became apparent that modelling is an important strategy in the building of a sustainable Sharing Our Future process.**

**Successful demonstrations of a model can stimulate positive development at the local level. Modelling also fits the strategy of conscious incremental change.**

**Mary Barter working as Sharing Our Future community communications facilitator in the Lourdes area is a case in point. A former journalism student, Mary had already worked as a community television coordinator in Lourdes.**

**Support for positive change is a web which can only remain in place if it is kept in tension with forces acting through it and between each human contact.**

**For example, the proponents of Sharing Our Future (the Community Education Network and partners) from experience and research see the importance of communities developing capacity in community communications (focusing on discussion of issues and cultural celebration). They realize technology is a tool in a process which is people and community based.**

**However, people who are not experienced in participatory community communications tend to over-emphasize the technical issues and ignore the people/community process.**

**Mary, with her experience, had no problem understanding the Sharing Our Future concept including the benefits of networking among communications facilitators and the communication needs, skills and resources assessment. (In December Mary completed an assessment for the Lourdes area.)**

**Fred was able to provide support for Mary (by email, fax and phone - Ryakuga provides recipes for community television events) as she planned the first Sharing Our Future event. She publicized throughout the community with posters, word-of-mouth and church/bingo announcements. She contacted the cable company to have the wires reconnected in the renovated school library. She interviewed the local MHA. She contacted community groups, such as the cadets, offering the chance to participate. She met with the Grade 8 students who became the crew for the event.**

**We had originally planned this event as a public consultation for Sharing Our Future. However, it became apparent that the best strategy was to model what Sharing Our Future is all about rather than take over the show.**

**The event took place on December 5 using Ryakuga equipment which is designed to give a user-friendly experience to the maximum number of people. Mary and Fred, along with Tracy Snow (Communities In Schools district coordinator) and Grade 8 teacher Duane Snow, supervised an impromptu practice with the students before the show. Tracy, Fred and Community Education Network director Bev Kirby participated in a discussion about Sharing Our Future and Communities In Schools. Other live components included hosting and news from the students; music by the cadet band, and an address by the priest.**

**The second Sharing Our Future live event took place at the Lion's Club in Stephenville on December 9. Learning from the Lourdes experience, it was decided the best strategy was to model what SOF is intended to be all about.**

The show was to be hosted by Cindy O'Neill (a popular theatre facilitator, actress and CIS Teen Corps coordinator) and Ken Meade (local entertainer and youth worker). Fred met with the Teen Corps on Dec. 7 and on Dec. 9 he loaned the students a camcorder and demonstrated interviewing techniques. The Teen Corps was sponsoring Seniors Appreciation Day at the middle school and they wanted to interview some of their guests (intergenerational support and respect is an essential component of SOF). Their tape (unedited) was shown on television later in the day.

Again Ryakuga equipment was used for the community television event after school. The schedule was impromptu to get as many students as possible in front of camera. Local musicians Jerry and Ron Formager (a senior) sang songs for and with the students. The rest of the show included popular theatre and news by journalism students (entering the broadcast from the college). It was decided not to discuss Sharing Our Future in a panel discussion but rather let the community experience the event (The Sharing Our Future home page was broadcast throughout the event and people were invited to call CEN after the show; the journalism students described Sharing Our Future as a news story.)

Bev, Tracey and Fred met to discuss the events; it would seem at this point that the roles of Sharing Our Future community communications facilitator and Communities In Schools coordinator could be a natural fit and perhaps a shared responsibility.

Fred met with Tracey on Dec. 1 and then on Dec 2 with College of the North Atlantic administrator Brian Foley; both are new members of the SOF advisory group. On Dec. 3, Fred met with Mary In Lourdes and Sandy Barter, L'Association Regionale de la Cote Ouest agente de communication, in La Grand' Terre. He also presented an SOF press release to Georgian reporter Stephen Lee.

Fred continued email contact with Newfoundland expatriate and genealogist Bill Crant; he linked Bill's pages to the SOF site.

On Dec. 6, Fred met with Don Murphy, college journalism instructor and a member of the SOF advisory group, and the journalism students to discuss SOF events.

On Dec. 7, Bev, Fred and Long Range Regional Economic Development Board director Tom Hutchings met to discuss the development stage and a proposal for a Sharing Our Future. The participation of the zone board and its field officers is seen to be an important component of a Sharing Our Future implementation. Fred prepared an SOF fact sheet and a letter to send to prospective partners.

Fred, Tracy and Bev discussed SOF in phone conferences on December 14 and 15. Bev spoke to Grenfell College president Adrian to invite the college to become a partner; the reception was favorable. The college is in Cornerbrook and Professor Ivan Emke is on the SOF advisory board. He and Fred have already discussed the college partnering in SOF events. The college also has a streaming video server which could be potentially used by SOF.

On Dec. 29 Fred met with Bruce Gilbert of the Conservation Corps Newfoundland and Labrador to discuss corps participation in Sharing Our Future. On Dec. 31 he visited the Down Homer (the magazine for expatriate Newfoundlanders) offices in St. John's to place an ad for Sharing Our Future. He met with the magazine's sub-editor, Paula Gale, to discuss stories about Sharing Our Future. The magazine plans a special supplement on sou'west Newfoundland in June. Paula is receptive to devoting space to participatory communications activity in the region.

## WHAT WE SAID WE WOULD DO

Activity	Participants
Meetings of the overall steering committee to review for approval communication assessments; participatory evaluation process; collaboration agreements and analysis of public consultations.	CEN representative, consultant and members of the overall steering committee.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant incorporates suggestions of the overall steering committee.</li> <li>2. Consultant researches and develops a proposed publicity strategy.</li> <li>3. Consultant researches and initiates contact with expatriates through email and personal websites.</li> <li>4. CEN representative contacts potential Atlantic partners.</li> </ol>	CEN representative, consultant (and potentially other steering committee members as well as representatives of targeted supporting and community partners).

During the developmental stage, an advisory group has taken the place of an overall steering committee. Mary Barter completed an assessment for the Lourdes area (assessments are also out in La Grand' Terre; Stephenville; McKay's and Ramea.) The participatory evaluation process has been discussed by representatives of the Community Education Initiative; Communities In Schools and the zone board. The agreement is to base the Sharing Our Future participatory evaluation upon the methodology of the CIS evaluation. Subsequently the consultant prepared documents for the participatory evaluation process (attached).

The consultant has been in regular contact with the advisory group in person and by phone and email. A publicity strategy has been researched and discussed. A press release was prepared for The Georgian and an ad was placed in the Down Homer. The consultant discussed having stories and photos placed in the Down Homer. A web site and web board are in operation. The consultant has been researching contact with expatriates; an ad has been placed in the Down Homer.

We haven't made a lot of headway making contact with other Atlantic groups. One problem is that we are only in a developmental stage; it's difficult to propose long term participation.

### NEW THREADS

1. We have decided to place modelling before public consultation. This is partially because it's easier to demonstrate participatory communications than it is to talk about it. People then will find it easier to discuss the initiative based on their own experience.
2. The decision to seek partnership with Grenfell College (a branch of Memorial University) has some implications. It slightly enlarges our initial geographic scope and hopefully brings us access to more technical resources. It also puts us in contact with two large institutions, which should lessen the chance of a community based initiative being dominated by the administration of a particular institution.



**Community Education Network**  
P.O. Box #5600  
Stephenville, Newfoundland A2N 3P5  
Tel: (709) 643-4891 \* Fax: (709) 643-9235  
email: bkirby@nf.sympatico.ca

*Originally founded as the Port au Port  
Community Education Initiative*

Wayne Young,  
Port au Port Economic Development Association,  
Piccadilly, NF.

Dear Mr. Young:

Since 1993 the Community Education Network (formerly the Port au Port Community Education Initiative) has been promoting the use of community communication tools to facilitate public awareness about local issues and opportunities, as well as to promote regional culture.

In 1993 we sponsored a series of community television forums on the Port au Port Peninsula and in Stephenville. Since 1995 we have been a supporter of Communication for Survival/Communiquer Pour Survivre, working in partnership with groups in Ramea, Burgeo, Stephenville and the Port au Port Peninsula.

The Community Education Network is also the founding sponsor of the Community Education Initiative, which has been working throughout the region since 1996.

We are currently helping to develop a foundation for a new initiative, Sharing Our Future. The broad goal of this initiative is to establish a network of community-based communication facilitators who would work with local people, principally youth, to catalyze awareness and discussion of local issues and opportunities, and to foster local culture.

In addition we would utilize emerging internet technologies, such as internet television or radio, to make contact with other rural communities in Atlantic Canada, as well as Newfoundlanders living across North America.

Locally our communication tools will be community television/radio and public access sites to the internet.

We are now in the process of getting local input and forming community partnerships. Our plan would be to next year begin a pilot program to implement Sharing Our Future for two years.

The Port au Port Economic Development Association has been recognized for its role in helping to develop public participatory communication in this region.

We would like to invite the Port au Port Economic Development Association to become a partner in Sharing Our Future.

I look forward to your response to this letter.

Sincerely,

## *SHARING OUR FUTURE*



Sharing Our Future will utilize relatively inexpensive microtechnology - grassroots communications tools already in the community in most cases and readily affordable in others. The purpose of the tools is to share learning and promote networking within the community, between communities locally and within the Atlantic region, as well as establishing communication with expatriate Newfoundlanders.

The tools are small format video and community television; community radio; computer communications using e-mail; web sites; web discussion boards; video conferencing, and webcasts - television and radio.

The project is to be implemented by local facilitators working with teams of youth (or any interested community members). Each community project is controlled by a local committee.

The design promotes peer learning at the local, regional and national levels. It utilizes technological skill development to further the ability of ordinary people to reflect, analyze and plan for the future of their communities.

The proposed partners have been using local grassroots communications (principally community television forums) both to inform and discuss for more than a decade. We want to increase the geographic parameters of the discussion using internet tools such as discussion boards and webcasts.

We will use and further develop a popular education/experiential approach to learning participatory communication skills in television, radio and computer communications. This is enhanced by the personal development which occurs when ordinary people take control of communications technology and find a voice. Integral to the initiative is the sharing of information on sustainable rural communities as well as developing the survival skills of people who are forced to leave.

As exemplified in the history of the Community Education Network, sou'west Newfoundland has a long history of communities and groups working together for development. This initiative builds on prior experiences, such as the 1993 Port au Port forums, Communication for Survival, Communities in Schools and Long Range Regional Economic Development Board's public consultation.

The community development model of local sharing, discussing and learning through community television forums has proven successful in sou'west Newfoundland. We are now seeking to use emerging internet technology to increase the geographic scope of the model.

[www.glinx.com/~ryakuga/sharing/sharing.html](http://www.glinx.com/~ryakuga/sharing/sharing.html)  
709-643-4891

## Press Release

*The first Sharing Our Future television event is scheduled for Thursday night right after Lions Bingo on Channel 9, says Beverley Kirby, director of the Community Education Network (CEN).*

*Sharing Our Future is a new CEN initiative which focuses on discussing local issues and promoting local culture on community television, as well as internet networking with other Atlantic communities and Newfoundlanders on the mainland.*

*The television event will be hosted by Cindy O'Neill and Ken Meade. O'Neill is co-ordinator of the Communities In Schools (CIS) Teen Help Corps who will be running all the equipment and producing the show.*

*O'Neill says the event will feature local music as well as video clips from Seniors Appreciation Day which also happens next Thursday at Stephenville Middle School.*

*Sharing Our Future was first kicked off in the region with a community television event at the high school in Lourdes. Mary Barter, Sharing Our Future community communications facilitator in the area, coordinated the event which was the first since the school has been renovated.*

*Students from Duane Snow's class produced the event which featured local music, storytime and even a visit from Santa Claus.*

*Tracey Snow, district coordinator of CIS, says Sharing Our Future is a natural spinoff from CIS activities which have been happening locally for the past four years. Both CIS and Sharing Our Future are sponsored by the Community Education Network.*

*She says both programs focus on local coordinators working with youth and drawing on the resources of the whole community.*

*Tom Hutchings, executive director of the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board, says Sharing Our Future also is a development of the Communication For Survival initiative. Communication for Survival hosted a number of community television events (as well as a participatory communication conference) throughout the region.*

*Hutchings says community television events are important to the zone board for public consultation, delivering information and networking with youth.*

*Fred Campbell of Ryakuga, which helped facilitate CEN's 1993 community television events on the Port au Port as well as Communication for Survival and Sharing Our Future, says he's seen big progress in the capacity of local communities to make their own television.*

*In 1984 the university brought out a full crew to produce television in Robinsons, he said, but now Sandy Barter (Association Regionale de la Cote Ouest director of communication) and Mary Barter are working with kids in Mainland and Lourdes to make television all by themselves.*

*Campbell says it's a goal of Sharing Our Future to help spread this same capacity to other interested communities in the region.*

*Community television in Stephenville is supported by the Lions Club and Regional Cable. The developmental stage of Sharing Our Future is funded by the Office of Learning Technologies.*

*Press release from Sharing Our Future  
Contact Bev Kirby (643-4891)  
Co-ordinator, Community Education Network*

*Photo cutline:*

*The Community Education Network (formerly the Port au Port Community Education Initiative) has been sponsoring community television events for discussing issues and celebrating culture since 1993. This is one of the first events at the high school in Lourdes.*

*(Ryakuga photo)*

### **DOWNHOMER ADVERTISEMENT**

<p><b><i>SHARING OUR FUTURE</i></b></p> <p>NFLD community partnership wants to link to web pages about sou'west NFLD.</p> <p><a href="http://www.web.net/~ryakuga/share.html">www.web.net/~ryakuga/share.html</a> ryakuga@web.net</p> <p>Thanks to the OLT <span style="float: right;">709-643-4891</span></p>
--

### **INTRODUCTION TO PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION USING VIDEO FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**The participatory evaluation process belongs to everybody involved in the Sharing Our Future initiative. Its purpose is to help us develop what we are doing and to provide tools for people in other places who want to implement a similar process in their communities.**

**Using video as a means to share our experiences works a lot better if it is controlled by the people involved in the process, rather than being brought in from outside.**

**Whatever video is collected each month can be given to the Community Education Network director as part of the regular report.  
So what are we talking about?**

**1. Short scenes of Sharing Our Future activities. Either put the camcorder on a tripod or hold it steady for 30 second "snapshots".**

2. Your answers to the questions outlined in this guide. But basically you can share your experiences; describe what really worked; what barriers you met, and what you would do differently.

3. Comments from anybody else who participates in the initiative, including youth, parents, community people; staff, and administrators. There are questions in this guide but what is important is simply to hear what these people have to say about their experience of Sharing Our Future. Please identify the speakers on paper.

It's not necessary to record miles of tape. Try making it a regular part of your activities at a certain time each week.

## BACKGROUND

In the participatory evaluation process, the interview guide is basically a few pages of questions designed to stimulate people to talk about their own experience and opinions of Sharing Our Future.

We are using video as our main tool to collect data, so the guide also includes a few tips on using this medium as unobtrusively as possible. Respect for the person being interviewed is a primary principle.

The interview guide is designed to be flexible; it “guides” the interviewer but also permits adaption of questions or even spontaneous chat.

Different questions should be prepared for each category of interviewees.

We utilize both individual and group interviews. In addition, we are interviewing people who may be considered “key informants” having intensive knowledge about participatory community communications in western Newfoundland and/or the Community Education Network (CEN). Our interviewers are the participatory evaluation team and the communication facilitators. It is important that the interviewees feel comfortable with the interviewers. The people asking the questions must be familiar with the program so they interact with the interviewees.

Ask simply-worded, open-ended questions. They should stimulate people to speak (use describe, tell us about...) Don't use close-ended questions which can be answered by “yes” or “no”.

Keep each question to one subject. Don't ask two or three questions at once.

Don't ask leading questions such as - “tell us why Sharing Our Future is such a great success in this school.”

Using video in a process like this is a bit of a balancing act. You will be dealing with people who are nervous, worried they are being judged, and probably not used to being on-camera. You want to be as unobtrusive as possible.

However, there is no sense in using video if it isn't of a minimal “technical” standard. You have to be able to see a picture and hear the sound. If possible, use a lavalier (clip-on) microphone and a video light.

The best procedure is to establish an “interview set” and bring your interviewees to it. This saves time and gives you a chance to test your equipment. Interviewees who are nervous become more so if they have to watch equipment being set up.

The camcorder should be placed on a tripod so you shoot over the shoulder of the interviewer.

We must take care to demystify both the video and the participatory evaluation process. Be casual and stress that this is an ongoing process to improve the program and help others who want to initiate a similar program.

The interviewer should facilitate a brief chat to set the interviewee at ease. Check your audio in your headphones and the picture on a TV monitor, if possible. Start recording during the chat.

If the interviewee is really nervous, the camera operator can leave the room. Usually the interviewee forgets about the camera in a few minutes. All concerned should try for a relaxed-as-possible atmosphere.

One of the advantages of using video in an evaluation data collection of a process is that you can capture emotion or feelings as well as words. Also in a discovery process, you can collect much more information than if using say, a questionnaire.

This interview guide is a work-in-progress. The questions should be modified as the process continues - especially as the thematic analysis of content develops.

Please feel free to be spontaneous when asking questions. This is just a guide, not a rule book. After all, the name of this process is Sharing Our Future.

## QUESTIONS FOR COMMUNICATION FACILITATORS

### Part 1:

1. Describe what has worked really well for you in the Sharing Our Future program.
2. Describe barriers that you have come up against.
3. Describe what you would do differently.

### Part Two:

Detailed questions for communication facilitators (if you have time).

1. Describe what you see as your role in the community?
2. Why do you think Sharing Our Future is important?
3. What benefits do you see in having the community more involved in participatory communication?
4. How do you think you are helping kids?

5. What are some of the projects you are working on and how do they fit with the Sharing Our Future philosophy?
6. How do you know that what you're doing is working?
7. Why do you think it's working?
8. Have you come across any barriers?
9. What unique qualities about your community make a process like this work?
10. What unique qualities in people make a process like this work?
11. What is one thing you have learnt since you became a member of the Sharing Our Future team?

### POSSIBLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

#### Part 1 - Some questions for Youth

1. Describe how you got involved in this program.
2. Describe what activities you have participated in...
3. Describe what's worked the best for you.

#### Part 2 - Questions for Community Members

1. What is your role in the community?
2. How did you become involved in this process?
3. Tell us a little bit about your community?
4. How do you think this community is benefiting from this Sharing Our Future program?
5. Describe some of the activities that have taken place as a result of having Sharing Our Future in your community?
6. What would you like to see for the future in regard to the Sharing Our Future program in your community?
7. How do you think other communities could benefit from this program?
8. What are your overall feelings about the Sharing Our Future involvement in your community?
9. Can you point to any specific reasons as to why you think it is or is not working?
10. Have you identified any barriers?

**11. Can you try and point to characteristics within people or within your community that make a process like this succeed or fail?**

### **USING VIDEO FOR SHARING OUR FUTURE PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION**

**The diagram shows four possible user-friendly interview setups. There could be more, such as having a group of four in front of the camera, or one person starting the camcorder recording and then running back to the chair to speak.**

**For best results use a tripod, external microphone, headphones and a television monitor to see the picture. But we make do with what we have. One tip is, if you don't have a tripod, put the camcorder on something steady. Bean bags make great tripods.**

**If you don't have an external mic, choose a quiet place to record and get the camcorder as close to the person speaking as comfortably possible.**

**And - make sure you have enough light. Don't place your interviewees in front of a window or bright, white wall.**

**A1- The camcorder placed close to the interviewer. Start it recording before the interview; have a chat and, when the interviewee has forgotten about the camcorder - start the questions.**

**A2 - The interviewer and interviewee can have a chat while the camcorder operator is setting up. The camcorder is placed behind the shoulder of the interviewer. If the interviewee is nervous, the operator can even leave the room. But make sure you have enough tape and all batteries are charged up.**

**A3 - Sometimes, if the interviewee seems really uncomfortable, it may be necessary for the interviewer to sit real close and hold hands. It's important for the camcorder operator not to fall asleep at the wheel and record a picture only of the person listening.**

**A4 - Holding hands without a camera operator is a bit difficult. Set the camcorder recording a visual of both people and - cross your fingers.**

**Have fun! This is a very useful way to ensure that everybody's voice is being heard but it's not supposed to be too serious.**

### **JANUARY**

**The emphasis of January Sharing Our Future activities has been on modelling the process and networking with potential partners. Strategizing for sustainability is key and to do so means sharing responsibility and ownership as well as developing alternatives to funding.**

**Networking is a primary focus of Sharing Our Future. Developing partnerships or sharing responsibility and ownership can be viewed as another facet of networking. Getting publicity**

for Sharing Our Future is also networking. Both approaches require a concise explanation of a long term community development process. The conundrum is that to stress the technology is the easiest way to explain the process but it can confuse what we are trying to do.

Sharing Our Future is a people process - with a primary goal of helping communities help themselves to develop capacity for participatory grassroots communications to celebrate local ways of doing things and discuss local issues in order to collectively strategize for positive change. Microtechnology provides the tools for the process but the tools are secondary to the interaction of people within the community.

For example, in Sharing Our Future Ryakuga takes the lead in researching and developing user friendly and accessible (relatively inexpensive) emerging microtechnologies. Over the past decade, Ryakuga has assembled a portable television studio which enables ordinary, untrained people to produce live television programming. The design is to provide as many jobs in the process as possible to provide security and a sense of working together collectively. But it's possible to make television with one camcorder.

As described in the December report, Mary Barter is working as a community communications facilitator in Lourdes; she is modelling the Sharing Our Future process. She is supported with print resources and suggestions from Ryakuga; to do so she has activated a free email account and uses the computer in the French Centre in L'Anse a Canards. But Mary is the catalyst for participatory grassroots communications activity - she is the person meeting with and providing training for students. She also has to explain Sharing Our Future to local residents - including the school principal (cable television access is in the library of the school).

There are several points here. One is that the local community communications facilitator is more important to the process than the best of microtechnology. A fundamental belief of Sharing Our Future is that it's essential to promote local ownership of the process; this is best achieved by local facilitators explaining the process to others from the beginning. People from outside the community who are more knowledgeable and experienced with participatory grassroots communications can support but they should not attempt to lead local implementation.

When Bev Kirby (director of the Community Education Network), Tom Hutchings (executive director of the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board) and Fred Campbell (Sharing Our Future consultant) met in December to discuss the future of the process, it was apparent that combining the position of SOF community communications facilitator with Communities In Schools coordinator would be a good fit. CIS coordinators work in local schools to support students with innovative programs and also network to bring together the resources of the entire community.

Combining the two positions would seem to partially address the question of SOF sustainability. CIS has been growing in the region for the past four years. It is also easier to strategize how to raise money for a partial salary rather than the full amount.

Mary Barter is continuing to model the SOF process by working during January-February in the combined role of CIS coordinator and SOF community communications facilitator. (See attached CIS coordinator job description and SOF report from Mary.)

In Stephenville Cindy O'Neill works as the CIS coordinator for the Teen Help Corps - an initiative partially sponsored by local Lions who also host the local venue for community

television. Cindy (who is also a drama teacher, musician and actress) is interested in the possibilities of community television so it seemed a good fit to offer her and the Teen Help Corps support in making programs. With the support of Sharing Our Future and CIS, Cindy and the Teen Help Corps produced a program at the Lion's Club on January 27. Sharing Our Future (Ryakuga) donated the equipment and the Lion's Club donated the space. The program included information about Sharing Our Future and Communities In Schools.

Melinda Rideout, a second year journalism student at College of the North Atlantic, applied to Ryakuga for a part-time work term January to April. It was decided she could assist with Sharing Our Future community television programs; use Ryakuga equipment to facilitate weekly community reporting workshops with the Teen Help Corps (Middle School), and produce a participatory evaluation video with the Teen Help Corps.

Melinda and Fred met with the Teen Help Corps and Cindy on January 25 to plan the Jan. 27 program. Cindy's goal is to engage the students in more planning.

On January 28 Fred met with acting CEN director Mary Bungay Gaultois to help her plan a presentation on CEN activity which includes participatory grassroots communications. An interesting facet of their discussion centred on the role of Communities In Schools and youth in Sharing Our Future. SOF is not designed as a youth initiative although youth are important in the implementation of technology and cross-generational practice. We are trying to facilitate a whole community experience - which includes youth.

On January 26 Ivan Emke - a professor at Sir Wilfred Grenfell (a Memorial University campus) and member of the SOF advisory committee - invited SOF to meet with college administration, technicians and give a presentation to the students.

The outcome is that Sir Wilfred Grenfell has decided to become an SOF partner and offer inkind support to the program. The plan is on February 29 to webcast a Sharing Our Future program produced and processed by Ryakuga.

The SOF process was presented by Sandi Barter, agente de communication with L'Association Regionale de la Cote Ouest (ARCO-an SOF partner), Tom Hutchings of the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board (an SOF partner) and SOF consultant Fred Campbell.

ARCO was especially interested in meeting with Grenfell because as far back as the 1950s university folklorists have been taping interviews with residents on the Port au Port - a unique cultural region of Canada. ARCO would like to gain access to the tapes and have material archived on the west coast. (The reaction of the Grenfell administration is attached in the form of an email to the author from Ivan Emke - used with permission.)

In the developmental stage, explaining the SOF process to potential partners and supporting facilitators implementing the program is a time consuming process. The answer would seem to be to design learning workshops and a networking process for the facilitators. This can be modelled on the CIS Newfoundland program (which uses free email and a Ryakuga web board as tools to keep coordinators in touch - as well as scheduling regular training events.

Ryakuga continues to research emerging technologies in user friendly and accessible computer communications. We are experimenting with CU-SEEME software based web conferencing (although the Cornell freeware is unfortunately no longer available); Real video (Grenfell will make its server available), and QuickTime. Peter Gnemni of Halifax has been offering advice to the project (in January he attended the Mac World Expo in San Francisco where he researched the latest news about QuickTime streaming video serving).

Ryakuga has demonstrated web conferencing and video streaming on a network as well as “live capture” to Real video files.

The Community Education Network application to present at the annual conference of the Canadian Association for Community Education in Montreal, June 12 - 16 has been accepted. The presentation is entitled - Sharing Our Voices and Sharing Our Future.

What did we say we'd do?

Community	Activity
Stephenville; other local communities, Atlantic communities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teleconferences and/or video conferences with potential Atlantic partners</li> <li>2. Overall steering committee reviews for approval the proposed publicity strategy.</li> </ol>
Stephenville	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CEN representative and consultant implement a publicity strategy for a prototype Stephenville community forum/webcast.</li> <li>2. Consultant contacts expatriates.</li> <li>3. CEN representative liaisons with targeted supporting, community and Atlantic partners.</li> </ol>

1. As mentioned in the December report, it's difficult to propose long term participation with other Atlantic groups as we are in a developmental phase. In the advisory group, potential relationships with other Atlantic groups interested in community education, economic development and participatory community development has been discussed. For example, Tom is well informed about Cape Breton initiatives and people involved.

2. The advisory group has discussed a publicity strategy. An ad to contact expatriates has been placed in the DownHomer. Fred has discussed publicity for the initiative with Paula Gale of the DownHomer; Stephen Lee of the Georgian ( a weekly community newspaper of a provincial chain); Frank Gale of The Western Star (a Black daily); Gerry Murphy of CFSX, Jack Cook (publicity chairman of the local Lions) and a CBC reporter in Corner Brook. The group also discussed how presentations at national conferences are also part of a publicity strategy.

3. Our initial plans were to build to a community forum/webcast in Stephenville on February 14. Our approach shifted somewhat to modelling the SOF process in Lourdes and Stephenville. Mary facilitated a community television event in Lourdes in December and is planning another event in February. The Teen Help Corps produced programs in December and January and plan another for February. The Western Star had a reporter cover the January event. We hope to soon reach the point of monthly events and then we'll add more content. (The January event presented Communities In Schools and Sharing Our Future with some community news. The zone board has agreed in the future to present a monthly report on its activities. In Lourdes, on the other hand, the program included detailed community news and commentary by the local priest and the MHA.) Our goal, of course, is to be interactive.

Our webcasting plans have changed somewhat as well. Grenfell is donating the use of its video server so we have decided to edit a program about Sharing Our Future for the initial webcast. We hope Grenfell will webcast a monthly program for us. At the same time we are continuing with development of a design to broadcast live from events in the communities.

### NEW THREADS

1. Our new partnership with Grenfell is interesting. It gives us added technical capability (at no cost) and it also points out that in a widespread partnership there can be spinoff benefits - such as the Port au Port francophones reclaiming their folklore interviews (in effect, their voices).

Another interesting aspect is that throughout the planning stage we have looked to the Port aux Basques region as a place in which to expand participatory communications activities. Now (with Grenfell interested in outreach) we have the possibility of expanding (replicating) in the Corner Brook region. Tom Hutchings (executive director of the local economic development zone) reports his organization is now having less contact with Port aux Basques and more contact with Corner Brook.

The meeting emphasized that the SOF design is for an active partnership - the extent of each partner's participation will be governed by how it can achieve its own goals within the partnership. An important principle was also agreed upon - all Sharing Our Future activities within the community are to be controlled by the community.

2. As previously mentioned, Mary Barter has given us the opportunity to assess the implications of combining the roles of Communities In Schools coordinator and Sharing Our Future community communications facilitator.

### ATTACHMENTS

[Brief Description of Communities In Schools \(CIS\) Newfoundland: Sharing Our Voices and Sharing Our Future - Presentation to the CACE 2000 conference, Montreal](#)

Come participate in Sharing Our Voices and Sharing Our Future, an interactive workshop facilitated in a transported sou'west Newfoundland community television environment. We discuss the learnings of the participatory evaluation of CIS-NFLD and relate these learnings to a new Community Education Network initiative - Sharing Our Future (SOF). The focus of SOF is to share learning and promote networking within the community, between communities locally and in the Atlantic region, as well as establishing communication with

expatriateNewfoundlanders. We also plan to broadcast the entire session live on the internet.

Excerpt from an email sent by Sir Wilfred Grenfell College professor Ivan Emke.

“In my estimation, the partnership has already paid off in the contact with Sandy Barter, and the possibility of archiving some of the tapes from ARCO.”

Dr. Emke went on to say the college administration is excited by working with the “unique socio-cultural milieu” of the Port au Port.

Report from Sharing Our Future community communication coordinator Mary Barter:

This is a list of activities done while working for the Community Education Network under it`s Sharing Our Future Program.

Establish new site for Community Television. Lourdes Primary and Lourdes Elementary schools merged to form one school. Renovations were being made over the last half of 1999 and continued on into my time at the school. Due to these renovations, Community Television lost it`s space at the school. I was able to work with the school and library board to get a small room at the back of the Public Library which was located at the school. This space would have to be shared with storage, but this was acceptable as there was no other room at the school. Moving the community television links to another location in the town was not possible, as it would have incurred a fairly large cost and none of the organizations I approached in Lourdes could commit to this expenditure.

Re-establishment of Community television in Lourdes. It was no longer being used in Lourdes and a number of factors were responsible for this. One major one was the merger of the two schools. Other reasons included volunteer burnout and loss of direction.

Presentation to grade 8`s on video camera use and responsibilities associated with it. (Basically some do`s and don`t`s)

Secured video camera for grade 8 class.

Video taped local community events which included taping Santa at three different locations on three different dates. He visited Lourdes Elementary, Lourdes Auditorium, and Chez les Francais de L`Anse a Canards.

Did a Community Television Needs Assessment.

Did a Christmas theme television show called ``Sharing Our Future``. Guests to speak on the Sharing Our Future initiative included Fred Campbell of Ryakuga, Bev Kirby from the Community Education Network, and Tracy Snow, Regional Director for Communities In Schools.

Inclusion of Grade 8`s to run equipment for the show.

Inclusion of other youth in the community. (ie. Cadet Corp Band)

**Inclusion of organizations in the community. (ie. Lourdes Parish)**

**Use of Community Television for public service announcements.(Read out during show)**

**Encouragement of a local youth, Charlene Benoit, who wants to be an actor. We gave her the opportunity to host the show and to get her ``feet wet``.**

**Sat in on discussions about securing CAP site at Public Library in Lourdes. This was taken on by Vanessa Glasgow, RED board development officer for the area.**

**On January 4th , I was re-hired by the the Community Education Network under it`s Sharing Our Future Program and am working out of the Piccadilly Central High School. My main purpose in this position is to implement Communities In Schools objectives, while still maintaining ties with Community Television in Lourdes and the Sharing Our Future objectives. I am still working with the grade 8`s at Lourdes, who are going to have a television show in February. With an idea from Mr. Snow, grade 8 teacher, I have approached Mrs. Snook, Vice-Principal at the elementary school who also sits on the library board, about moving the cable link-up. She agreed that the cable link- up can be moved from the small shared room at the back of the library, up through the ceiling to Mr. Snow`s grade 8 class which is directly above the library. Having a more hands on responsibility approach in the school will be a major advantage in securing community television`s existence in the Lourdes area. In the first show with the grade 8 class, they filled the positions and used the equipment. This time we are hoping that (with our help) they will put together the show and it`s content, and leave a legacy that will see community television become a major part of the school environment.**

**With this new position, I have also had the opportunity to use e-mail and web board more extensively. Networking this way is a wonderful experience, not to mention how fast needed information and advice gets back to me. It really makes me feel like part of the team.**

### **An abridged version of the Communities In Schools job description.**

#### **CIS Community Resource Worker**

**The CIS Community Resource Worker is a temporary staff person within the CIS organization. Given the time limitations with which this employee is working, their duties will be very specific and in most cases geared toward the length of time this person will be employed with the organization. CIS Community Resource Workers will work directly with schools to research and develop specific CIS programs. CIS Community Resource Workers will be required to work very closely with school administrators to identify specific needs within the school and develop strategies and programming to address those particular needs.**

The following activities are examples of specific responsibilities which the CIS Community Resource Worker assumes:

•Mobilize human resources to support program development by actively seeking out community volunteers to help with program implementation.

Orient and assess interest and supportiveness of the local community by doing presentations on CIS within the community and developing local community awareness about CIS and its programs.

Maintain clear documentation of program development and CIS activities. CIS Community Resource Workers are primarily researchers. They will be responsible for developing "How- to" kits on specific programs. For example, if a CIS Community Resource Worker identifies Homework Haven as a program component for their particular school, it will be their responsibility to clearly document how they got the program up and running.

Report weekly to the CIS Regional Coordinator(Burgeo/Ramea) and CIS District Coordinator

Maintain appropriate linkages with media representatives by publicizing CIS activities on local radio and television and in local newspapers.

### **CIS Fast Track to Entrepreneurship Coordinator**

The CIS Fast Track to Entrepreneurship Coordinator has very specific duties related to the implementation of the Fast Track to Entrepreneurship program. His/her duties are to:

•Facilitate the delivery of the CIS enterprise program - Fast Track to Entrepreneurship.

Co-ordinate providing young people between the ages of 13 and 18 with an opportunity to access loans of up to \$1000 to start up their own business.

Work with local experts to provide youth with an introduction to the business community, six basic skills workshops and guidance in times of need.

Coordinate on-site the participatory evaluation process of the program. Specifically, utilize video for data collection in the participatory evaluation; participate in strategic planning meetings; assist in the thematic analysis of primary and secondary resource data; participate both as an interviewer and key informant in the data collection, and assist in the effective implementation of the evaluation by acting upon what is learned in the process.

Provide the District Coordinator with quantitative or statistical data for report purposes.

### **TIMELINE FOR CIS COORDINATORS**

- I. Participate in CIS Orientation delivered by either the CIS District or Regional Coordinator**
- II. Meeting with CIS District or Regional Coordinator and school administrator to go over roles and responsibilities**
- III. Orientation to the school by school administrator**
- IV. Introduction to school staff by school administrator**
- V. Introduction to students by school administrator**

- VI. Meeting with school based advisory committee
- VII. Begin a school needs assessment, if one is not already available
- VIII. Begin generating awareness about CIS with students, staff, parents and the community
- IX. Establish a time for weekly meetings with the school administrator
- X. Establish a time for monthly meetings with the school based advisory committee
- XI. Participate in training about the participatory evaluation process
- XII. Begin the participatory evaluation process
- XIII. Begin program development and implementation to address identified needs
- XIV. Weekly reporting to CIS District or Regional Coordinator
- XV. Participate in any additional CIS training offered
- XVI. Document all CIS activity for final report purposes
- XVII. Utilize e-mail and CIS discussion boards on the Internet to liaise with other CIS staff

## REPORTING

### Weekly Report

It is the responsibility of the CIS Coordinator to provide a weekly report to the CIS District or Regional Coordinator. All CIS Coordinators will be provided with a weekly report form and will be required to fax the form on Friday of each week. Weekly reports should include a brief description of daily activities, as well as, weekly highlights, problems, community awareness generated and any other additional comments related to CIS activity. It will be the responsibility of the CIS District or Regional Coordinator to address any issues that are mentioned in these weekly reports. A copy of the completed weekly report could be also given to school administrators on Friday of every week.

### Final Report

All CIS staff will be required to produce a final report which should be presented to the CIS District or Regional Coordinator on the last day of work. Final reports should include:

- detailed descriptions of all CIS programming including:
  - stages of development
  - stages of implementation
  - program evaluation
- letters of support from students, parents, teachers, administrators and community members involved in CIS programming
- public awareness generated (including newsletters, newspaper articles, brochures, press releases, etc.)
- photos

COMMUNITY CO-ORDINATOR ASSESSMENT	YES	NO
<p data-bbox="196 159 1214 296"><b>There are identifiable characteristics of a community co-ordinator who can work well in a CIS whole school program. However, each CIS program uniquely meets the needs of its school and community. So it's not necessary to check every "yes".</b></p> <p data-bbox="196 331 1073 432"><b>Please note: CIS co-ordinators should be familiar with the job descriptions and policy manual included in the Community Co-ordinator's Guide.</b></p> <p data-bbox="618 470 813 501" style="text-align: center;"><b>WITHIN CIS</b></p> <ol data-bbox="196 573 1219 1465" style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Participate in training necessary for implementation of the CIS program.</b></li> <li><b>2. Learn facilitation skills in order to deliver CIS workshops.</b></li> <li><b>3. Write weekly reports for the CIS regional co-ordinator.</b></li> <li><b>4. Write progress reports throughout the year.</b></li> <li><b>5. Write a year-end report.</b></li> <li><b>6. Communicate by e-mail with the CIS district and regional co-ordinators.</b></li> <li><b>7. Participate in weekly, web board discussions with CIS co-ordinators.</b></li> <li><b>8. Willing to work with, and take advice from, CIS regional and district co-ordinators, the school-based advisory committee and the regional advisory group.</b></li> <li><b>9. Follow procedures in the CIS Policy Manual.</b></li> <li><b>10. Implement the participatory evaluation including the use of video for data collection.</b></li> <li><b>11. Make presentations at conferences.</b></li> </ol>		

**WITHIN THE COMMUNITY**

- 1. Develop community awareness for CIS.**
- 2. Highlight youth achievement for the community.**
- 3. Help facilitate events for youth in community.**
- 4. Speak at meetings of service clubs and community groups about CIS.**
- 5. Learn skills to make presentations on local community television.**
- 6. Be prepared to be interviewed by radio and newspaper reporters.**
- 7. Learn skills to write press releases.**
- 8. Learn skills to make posters for CIS events.**
- 9. Learn skills to produce a CIS newsletter.**
- 10. Implement local fundraising for a specific program, such as the Breakfast Club.**
- 11. Initiate programs in the school in which the public can be involved.**
- 12. Invite the public to participate.**
- 13. Keep the parents informed.**
- 14. Involve the parents in programs.**
- 15. Introduce parents to training programs.**
- 16. Make the parents welcome in the school.**
- 17. Provide positive opportunities for parents to come to the school.**
- 18. Facilitate a positive attitude about the school in the community.**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Co-ordinator Assessment- page 3</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>IN THE SCHOOL</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Willing to work after school and on weekends.</li> <li>2. Make presentations to school staff and students.</li> <li>3. Inform the students about CIS programs.</li> <li>4. Help the students develop positive attitudes about school.</li> <li>5. Involve the students in CIS programs.</li> <li>6. Develop after-school programs for the students.</li> <li>7. Develop programs which help students with academics.</li> <li>8. Participate in a one-to-one relationship with students.</li> <li>9. Facilitate social activities for students.</li> <li>10. Provide the students with opportunities for community service.</li> <li>11. Develop programs which provide students with marketable skills.</li> <li>12. Develop programs which build relationships.</li> <li>13. Develop programs which provide "safe places."</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>YES</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>NO</b></p>

**FEBRUARY/MARCH**

Although the developmental stage of Sharing Our Future (SOF) terminated February 29, it should still be perceived as an incremental phase of a long term process which began in the region almost two decades ago.

Since the “end” of the developmental stage we have signed on two new partners - the Ramea Economic Development Corporation and the Burgeo Broadcasting System. Mary Barter, whose paid position as SOF community communications facilitator/Communities In Schools coordinator ended Feb. 29, facilitated a community television forum in Lourdes on March 2 and she will provide support for a fund raising telethon for sick children scheduled for March 26.

Ivan Emke, a professor at Sir Wilfred Grenfell and advisor for SOF, accompanied Fred Campbell on the Port au Port March 2; they visited Sandi Barter, agente de communication for L'Association Regionale de la Cote Ouest in La Grand' Terre, and provided support for the Lourdes community forum. They also participated in a panel discussion in Lourdes. On March 5 the Teen Help Corps (a CIS program) produced a Sharing Our Future community television event in Stephenville. (Ryakuga provides equipment for these events as an inkind contribution to Sharing Our Future). The event can be seen as an incremental

evolution because of the effort to increase participation from other community groups - including Youth Power 9; the Conservation Corps Eco-Action team; the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board; Earth Matters, Communities In Schools, and the Anglican Church choir. Also videotape from the Lourdes event was played.

On March 28 Fred is scheduled to meet in Corner Brook with Ivan, technicians from Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, and Bruce Gilbert, of the Conservation Corps Newfoundland and Labrador. Bruce has been encouraging the Eco-Action teams to participate in community communications (the Stephenville area team presented on both the March Lourdes and Stephenville programs.)

Ivan also plans for Sharing Our Future to make contact with residents of Lark Harbour - a rural community outside of Corner Brook. (The strategy is to use the second year of the SOF pilot program to replicate the process outside of Zone 9.)

On March 7 Fred met with Bev Kirby (director of the Community Education Network) in Antigonish; they discussed the importance of community development (economic, education or communications) professionals participating in participatory, grassroots communications processes. It's not only the ability to increase awareness and learn what the people actually think, but also it seems to "rejuvenate" professionals who spend so much of their time in meeting "loops" with their peers.

The communication needs of community development professionals is a focus area of Sharing Our Future which was not anticipated in the original concept but which has surfaced during the developmental stage.

Another theme which has emerged is the nature of the Sharing Our Future partnership which is based on the principle of local ownership. This means each partner participates according to its own mandate - it has to benefit from the partnership. For example, Sir Wilfred Grenfell has already dedicated two streaming servers and technical support to SOF - but the college wants to commit to more outreach in rural communities. The College of the North Atlantic wants to promote community leadership. Burgeo Broadcasting wants more publicity for its Information Technology Strategy on the south coast.

Also implied in the concept of local ownership is that SOF will be implemented by committees (or subcommittees thereof) already in the communities. Communication for Survival/Communiquer Pour Survivre facilitators put a lot of effort into establishing stringent guidelines (to ensure democratic representation) for local committees which were conceived, for the most part, as being new.

According to SOF strategy, the local committee is the business of the local community. If there are local problems with that committee, it will surface in the process of SOF participatory community discussion.

Again, we see ourselves as participants in an evolutionary process. Such processes take time. In earlier attempts at facilitating community dialogue, we have relied more on outside intervention so we moved directly to community television forums with all components more or less ensured because we were producing special events (According to Ryakuga, this meant the danger of completely outside intervenors pulling off "flying saucer events" always to be remembered but never duplicated. Roger Carter, an SOF advisor and instructor at College of the North Atlantic has described them as "travelling road shows.")

**During the SOF developmental stage, an evolutionary process of local implementation has emerged. It may be described as “facilitating the formation of local habits” or developing local capacity for participatory community communications. First we find a community communications facilitator and youth who are interested in making community television happen (In this process the Ryakuga POP VDO - portable community television studio - environment is important because it’s designed to provide a wide variety of things to do and, as well, promotes sharing and no possibility of failure. It’s a group activity.) The goal is to first make this fun and “habit-forming” for youth so the event can become a regular occurrence in the community.**

**The next step is to recruit greater participation from community groups - from community development professionals to service clubs and cultural organizations. Cultural celebration is an essential component of local television. It helps to build the self identity, pride of place and positive mirroring which must happen before meaningful community dialogue can take place.**

**The goal of this process is to promote interactive, community discussion of local issues in a process of reflection, analysis and positive strategizing for the future. But this has to become a regular feature of community communications and not just an emergency or special event facilitated by outside intervenors.**

**The final step is to gradually remove outside facilitation of the process to ensure sustainability. For example, local television can be produced with a camcorder, light and modulator. You’re unlikely initially to get a group interested with such a simple setup; but once the process becomes engrained in the community, you can remove the “toys” of the POP VDO environment.**

**Sir Wilfred Grenfell has agreed to broadcast SOF video on the internet. The process of development is still taking place. Fred encoded a video report entitled “Waves: Clips of the Evolution of Participatory Communications as a Tool for Community Learning in Newfoundland and Labrador” (this report was originally produced to accompany Bev’s report to the OLT forum in 1998).**

**This video was made available on Feb. 29 - the last day of the developmental stage. It may be accessed by downloading Real Video player (G2 or 7 - make sure you get the free one :)> at [www.real.com](http://www.real.com)).**

**Launch Real player and under File in the menu bar, click Open Location. Type in <rtsp://198.165.60.132.554/waves56.rm>**

**This process will of course be simplified. The video now targets 56k modems. In March Fred has encoded the video to automatically detect 28k, 56k or high speed modems. He has also produced files which will enable the video to be accessed from a browser click on the Sharing Our Future web site.**

**In March Ryakuga also set up a Sharing Our Future web server in Stephenville. This server is also under development but it will be dedicated to Sharing Our Future related activities. Later this month Fred and Bruce will meet with the Eco-Action team to see how they can utilize the server for local environmental awareness. Professor Ivan Emke has agreed to place his research in local participatory communications on the server. The current url of the server is <http://145warp76.newtel.com>**

**During February Fred maintained constant contact with Mary Barter (working as a SOF/CIS**

facilitator on the Port au Port) and Cindy O'Neill (working with the CIS Teen Help Corps in Stephenville), either in person or by phone and email. He also brought Melinda Rideout ( a College of the North Atlantic journalism student completing a special work project with Ryakuga) into the process. Ryakuga loaned a video camcorder and accessories (an inkind contribution) to Melinda so she could facilitate a weekly community reporting workshop with the students. Melinda is helping to implement a Teen Help Corps/Sharing Our Future video evaluation. (Mary's report on her January/February activities is attached).

Melinda assisted the Teen Help Corps with a leadership conference at the middle school on March 4/5. Fred also presented at the conference.

On Feb. 23 and 24, Fred met with the CIS coordinators in Stephenville for training. They discussed SOF; strategies for community awareness of CIS activities, and the participatory evaluation.

During February Fred also discussed the SOF proposal with Mary Bungay Gaultois, acting CEN director; Robert Cormier, director of ARCO; Claude Strickland, manager of BBS; Sam Fiander, president of RBC; Reg MacDonald, president of the Ramea Economic Development Association, and Eric Nippard and Jack Cook, both of the Stephenville Lions.

Members of the SOF advisory committee - Ivan from Grenfell; Bruce from the conservation corps; Brian Foley, Roger Carter, Don Murphy - all from College of the North Atlantic; Bev ; Bruce; Tom Hutchings of the RED board, and Tracy Snow, CIS regional coordinator, also discussed the project. Strategies for publicity, sustainability, job descriptions and evaluation are included in the proposal for a full pilot project. The proposal was submitted by fax on March 6 and mailed on March 17.

#### WHAT WE SAID WE WOULD DO

Activity	Participants
1. Implementation of prototype Stephenville community forum/webcast. 2. Overall steering committee meets to agree on details of pilot project proposal.	CEN representative, consultant (and potentially other steering committee members as well as representatives of targeted supporting and community partners).
CEN representative and consultant prepare video and written report on the developmental stage.	CEN representative, consultant

1. The change in strategy from external intervention to modelling a local incremental evolutionary process has been described in earlier reports (and in the initial paragraphs of this report). Instead of implementing a "big" forum, we worked with local facilitators to implement a series of smaller community television events. The webcast is a video accessed from Sir Wilfred Grenfell College.

2. In keeping with the principle of local ownership, we postponed the formation of a steering committee until the pilot project when all partners are "on board". The proposal has been developed with the support of the advisory group.

3. The written report is the responsibility of the consultant while the financial report will be submitted from the Community Education Initiative. The video production is underway and it will be webcast.

## REPORT OF ACTIVITIES: JANUARY/FEBRUARY, 2000

Prepared by Mary Barter

This is a list of activities done while working for the Community Education Network under its Sharing Our Future Program.

- Presentation to grade 8 class on running community television. Including them in the production and implementation of a show.
- Negotiations with Principal, teachers, library board, cable company and other concerned groups in relation to setting up community television at another location at the school. Nothing has been determined as yet.
- Extensive use of e-mail and web board for information and networking with other C.I.S/S.O.F workers, supervisors, Ryakuga and Regional Cable.
- Video taping of Wrestling Tournament at High School.
- Participated in a television show at Lion's Club in Stephenville.
- Presentations to grade 11 and 12 students on interviewing skills.
- Presentations to grade 11 and 12 enterprise students on media questions and press releases.
- One on one taped interviews with grade 11 and 12 enterprise student. Included scheduling and re-scheduling of 10 minute interviews.
- Compiled a list of contacts for the Port-au-Port Peninsula including government agencies, businesses, local service districts and councils, and other support agencies.
- Wrote a story for the Georgian (local newspaper) and made contact with local reporters.
- Video taping of ``Take a Student to Work`` in Stephenville.
- Preparations for community television show on Thursday, March 2nd, 2000

Although I was funded through the Sharing Our Future Program, part of my time was devoted to Communities In Schools objectives which contain a different list of activities. Along with another C.I.S. worker some projects we did were to:

- Conduct a youth registry (which involves quite a bit of work and is not finished as yet).
- Started a breakfast program.
- Set up a homework haven.

- Did a parent questionnaire which included compiling a list of people interested in donating to the school Scholarship Trust Fund, finding out if students have allergies to foods in the breakfast program, if parents want to volunteer for the breakfast program, and looking for names to include in the youth registry.
- Getting a walking program up and going in the gymnasium.
- Finding a student volunteer to put lessons and notes on audio tape for a high needs student.
- C.I.S. Training and Orientation on January 5th and 6th, 2000.
- Made available computer room and library in the morning when myself or the other C.I.S. worker, Florence, were at the school and available.
- Attending training and workshops including Mentorship Training on February 22nd to February 26th.

Note: Mary facilitated a community television event in Lourdes on March 2 and she will be supporting a telethon for sick children on March 26.

### STRATEGIES (EXCERPTS FROM THE FULL PILOT PROPOSAL)

#### PUBLICITY:

Because the project is media-based on community television/radio and webcasts, it publicizes itself by what it does, Local publicity is driven by information derived from the monthly updated community needs, skills and resources assessments (the section devoted to local media). Part of the training of local community communications facilitators includes an introduction to raising community awareness through the mainstream media and do-it-yourself publicity (training modules have already been developed for CIS coordinators).

We have budgeted for monthly ads in the Newfoundland Herald (provincial) and the DOWNHOMER (national). The DOWNHOMER is focusing on the region in a special supplement in the summer of 2000 and is receptive to stories about the project.

A website and web board have been set up for the project. In addition we have begun to reach out to expatriate Newfoundlanders who have produced web sites on the region.

We plan to produce web pages for partners which have not already designed home sites.

We have already recognized that presentations at conferences also contribute to publicity. The Community Education Network will be presenting on the incremental evolution of its participatory grassroots communication strategy - Sharing Our Voices and Sharing Our Future - at the national conference of the Canadian Association for Community Education in Montreal in June, 2000.

#### SUCCESS INDICATORS

##### 6.1.5

Sustainability is the central aim of this project. We have dated our success indicators for March, 2002, the completion date of the pilot project. But we are essentially looking ahead to October, 2002.

## Goals

### 1. To promote public awareness and participation in community communications.

Community communications is defined as using the tools of community television and/or radio to promote dialogue about local issues and cultural celebration. The pilot project itself, with trained community communication facilitators working with volunteers in designated communities, should achieve this goal. The success indicators would be by March 2001 each designated community has enough volunteers to carry out a community television forum each month and each forum has at least one public interaction (call in/out discussion of local issues.).

### 2. To establish and to legitimize the job description of community communications facilitator.

We will develop a job description to be approved by the steering committee and local committees. It is expected the job description will evolve during the pilot project. Each community communications facilitator will receive two periods of training each year. Initially the training will be based on the CIS model. Additional modules will be based on modified Ryakuga community communications learning guides. The success indicator is by March 2002, a community communications facilitator will be working in each of our five designated communities and be replicated in two communities outside the immediate region.

### 3. To promote internet technologies as a tool of communication for community development facilitators (community economic development; community education and community communications) working in the region.

Internet technologies include email; web boards; video conferencing and internet television.

Ryakuga has produced web boards as a free service for community groups. The most successful model is the CIS board which is moderated by the regional coordinator. Ryakuga is in the process of establishing a webcasting/video conferencing studio in Stephenville. Our success indicator would be to have a network established in the region whereby identified professionals in community development utilize internet technologies at least once a week by March, 2001.

### 4. To network by means of internet technologies with other community development facilitators working in rural communities of Atlantic Canada.

Representatives of the Community Education Network and the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board have agreed to take the lead on this goal. A success indicator would be by March, 2001, Stephenville based community development facilitators establish contact with other facilitators by video conference at least once a month.

### 5. To use internet technologies to make contact with expatriate Newfoundlanders who are interested in news from communities back home.

We are placing a monthly ad in a national magazine, The DOWNHOMER. We are also in contact with developers of local homepages and community television organizations to monitor requests and email contacts. The Sharing Our Future web page includes links to web pages concerning the region and a web board; it will also include a counter to monitor "hits". We will also monitor requests for our webcast. A success indicator would be by March, 2001, a

monthly webcast is produced by community television/radio groups in the region and each month the groups receive feedback from expatriates.

6. To replicate the Sharing Our Future process outside our immediate region (Zone 9).

Our publicity strategy will disseminate information about the project. In addition we are soliciting partnerships outside the region. Also we are developing job descriptions and learning guides for community communications facilitators. A success indicator would be by April, 2001, we have replicated the project in two communities outside Zone 9.

7. To strategize ways to continue to fund the program beyond the completion date of the project.

Initially this strategy would seem to include developing partnerships to access inkind support and to share the community communications facilitator job description with an ongoing program - specifically Communities In Schools. In addition, the consultant has worked with a number of community communication groups which have managed to raise fund locally by such means as videotape duplication; charging for videotaping some local events; producing and selling a TV guide; training, and creative local fundraising. Communities In Schools has been successful in gaining local backing to enhance its programs. A success indicator would be by March, 2002, the overall steering committee has managed to strategize a funding mechanism to keep the project going for another year.

Note: Also built into the project design is an effort to reduce dependency on an outside intervenor by reducing the role of the consultant from two weeks a month in the first year to one week a month in the second year. We have also reduced funding for the fulltime community communications coordinator (Stephenville) from full funding in the first year to half funding in the second (this means the overall steering committee will have to find alternative funding for the second half in the second year.)

## EVALUATION:

### 8.1

The evaluation design is both quantitative and qualitative.

Qualitative data will be acquired in a participatory evaluation. Implementation of the evaluation will be based on lessons learned from the Communities In Schools participatory evaluation underway since 1997. The evaluation has already begun with the development of goals, objectives and success indicators for the program.

The purpose of the participatory evaluation is to improve the implementation of this project and to provide information for others who might want to replicate this process.

#### 8.1.2

The projected evaluation committee is the director of the Community Education Network; the chair of the Community Studies department at the College of the North Atlantic; the regional director of Communities In Schools; the executive director of the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board, and the consultant.

Reporting and facilitating the evaluation is the responsibility of the consultant. However, as a

participatory evaluation reflects the observations and opinions of all stakeholders, each community also has responsibility for implementation.

As in the CIS evaluation, we use video for data collection so our resource requirements are videotapes (as well as ENG and editing equipment supplied by Ryakuga).

### 8.1.3

During the CIS evaluation, it was found that the video data collection process surfaced issues which did not arise in the normal reporting process. It was possible to respond immediately with the implementation of positive change in the process. The evaluation committee, in its monthly meeting, references the data collected to the established goals, objectives and success indicators of the project.

### 8.1.4

1. By April 2000, the Sharing Our Future overall steering committee will meet to establish a meeting schedule and approve collaboration agreements with local committees as well as the hiring of local community communication facilitators.
2. By April 2000, the Sharing Our Future local steering committees will meet to establish a meeting schedule and approve collaboration agreements with the overall steering committee as well as the hiring of a local community communication facilitator.
3. By May 2000, the Sharing Our Future community communication facilitators will begin working in the designated communities.
4. By May 2000, the new and established community communication facilitators will have been offered training programs.
5. By May 2000, the participatory evaluation team will have been formed with local representation.
6. By May 2000, the participatory evaluation process, utilizing video as a data collection tool, will begin.
7. By July 2000, the SOF summer program will begin.
8. By September 2000, the community communication facilitators will have recruited and trained teams of active community communication volunteers. This process will be ongoing.
9. By September 2000, Sharing Our Future will reach out to expatriate Newfoundlanders by means of advertising in provincial and national media - and internet communication, principally internet broadcasting of local community television events.
10. By October 2000, the community communication facilitators will have initiated regular weekly programming on community television and/or radio.
11. By October 2000, the Long Range Regional Economic Development Board and the Community Education Network (with the support of Sharing Our Future) will have initiated a program of networking (utilizing internet communication tools such as video conferencing, list serves and web boards) with professionals and groups in Atlantic Canada. The networking will

focus on community economic development, community education and participatory community communication.

12. By November 2000, community communication facilitators will be working:
  - (A) To help promote existing community access program centres.
  - (B) To help organize community access program centres where they don't exist.
13. By March, 2001, the overall steering committee will have identified three other communities which want to replicate the Sharing Our Future process.
14. By April 2001, collaboration agreements will have been signed between the overall steering committee and the local committees of the replication communities.
15. By May 2001, community communication facilitators will be working in the replication communities.
16. By June 2001, each of the original partner communities will have produced an internet broadcast community television event.
17. By July 2001, the Sharing Our Future summer programs will begin in the communities.
18. By September 2001, prototype learning guides will be available.
19. By December 2000, the replicant communitiies will have all produced community forum/webcasts.
20. By March 2002, the overall steering committee will have found alternate sources (including local support) to funding the community communication facilitator positions.
21. By March 2002, Sharing Our Future will have produced a replication video/guide and written report on the project.

#### 8.1.5

Quantitative data will be presented in the monthly reports of the facilitators and the consultant.

Facilitators' reports will include hours devoted to Sharing Our Future activities; number of active volunteers ; number of interactions on community forums (and issues raised); descriptions of emails/requests from expatriates (and questions asked); meetings of local committees. Another data source is the community forum program log (see attached) which is included with the facilitator's monthly report. Finally the facilitator is requested to each month update the community communications needs, skills and resources assessment. Further quantitative data (number of interactions, issues discussed) will be available from the web board set up for facilitator networking. The board is moderated by CEN representatives and the consultant with results included in the consultant's monthly report. Other data which may be extrapolated from the consultant's report include number of meetings of the overall steering committee and the evaluation committee; number of video conferences with Atlantic communities; advertising; webcasts; training events, and community visits.

The actual quantitative requirements will have to be worked out in initial meetings of the overall steering committee and the evaluation committee. But it would seem reasonable to project - the facilitators will devote 20 hours a week to SOF activities; a community forum will

be held once a month in each community; there will be one nationally advertised webcast each month; the local committees and the evaluation committee will meet monthly and the overall steering committee will meet twice a year; facilitators and the consultant will report monthly; the evaluation committee will report twice a year; facilitators will be required to post to the web board each week, and there will be two training events each year.

(At the time of this writing, we are discussing the participation of Sir Wilfred Grenfell College in coordinating surveys of the public to assess the effectiveness of the project. Dr. Ivan Emke - a professor at the college and member of the SOF developmental stage advisory group - has already surveyed the public in Burgeo and Ramea concerning community television programming.)

Qualitative data is collected on videotape during interviews with the stakeholders. In this project, potential stakeholders include the community communication facilitators, volunteers, members of local committees and the community at large.

The interviews are recorded on digital videotape; dubbed to Hi-8 for offline viewing and then to VHS with visible timecode for analysis by the evaluation committee.

#### 8.1.6

During the CIS evaluation process, the interviews surfaced information which allowed coordinators to make immediate changes to the implementation of the program in the community. Also in the SOF evaluation process, it is the responsibility of the evaluation committee to meet monthly to analyse the data with reference to the success indicators of the project.

And, of course, the standard evaluation questions of - What worked best for you? What should be done differently? What advice would you have for others wishing to implement a similar program? - produces information which demands adjustments to be made.

#### 8.2

The evaluation is designed to allow for continuous and incremental change in the program.

This participatory, grassroots evaluation process typically includes two reports annually - in writing and on video. The video report in itself is a useful method of letting others see how the project is viewed by its stakeholders. It becomes a tool for replication in the second year. Again modelled on the Community In Schools Newfoundland process, the evaluation findings of the Sharing Our Future participatory evaluation will be used as the basis of a series of learning guides designed to improve and further replicate the program.