

**DSIP
REPORT**

**DATA SERVICES
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

CONNECTING RURAL ONTARIO

October, 2000



Regional Networks for Ontario



The Ontario Rural Council

Foreword From The DSIP Partners

The Data Services Improvement Program: Connecting Rural Ontario has been deemed a success as a partnership model involving the private sector, public sector, not-for-profit and local sectors. This initiative has demonstrated that sectors with varying, sometimes competing interests can come together through a partnership based on mutual respect and acknowledgement of those vested interests, and shape a project which can benefit all.

In the case of DSIP, the telecommunication upgrades made possible to rural communities simply would not have occurred in a systematic, mutually beneficial and community-building manner had all partners not been involved.

The **corporate sector partners**, Bell Canada and Ontario Telecommunications Association were able to enhance the offerings to rural communities through a cost sharing arrangement with the Province of Ontario thereby positioning them to meet the basic digital infrastructure demands and future needs of the rural markets in the new rural economy. Without a viable business case to support this investment, these corporate partners required the involvement of the public sector.

The **public sector partner**, Ministry of Energy, Science and Technology (MEST) were able to meet their goals of providing the information technology infrastructure as an economic enabler to all sectors of the province including the smallest of rural communities. MEST is not a provider of telecommunications applications or services but rather acts as a facilitator and funder. Therefore the involvement of both the telecommunications providers and external and local organizations to administer the public funds was required. MEST was able to use the DSIP meetings in their latter stages as a platform to promote a new related funding program to support telecommunications applications. The new program built upon the learning and successes of the community engagement component of the DSIP program. The timing was ideal.

The **organizational partners**, Regional Networks for Ontario (RNO) and the Ontario Rural Council (TORC) have focused interests in ensuring the community mobilization, planning and community-building processes are at the centre as rural communities become engaged in this new technology and the new economy it supports. These partners are concerned with effective community development principles as they apply to emerging area areas such as e-commerce, tele-health, tele-education which link small communities with the global world ...as well as the increasing of networks and linkages within communities.

This is truly the unique aspect of the DSIP partnership. Without the involvement of the organizational partners, community champions would not have been identified and mobilized, nor would the community-building aspects have had such a priority. A comprehensive list of rural community leaders interested in telecommunications has been compiled to be tapped as new issues and opportunities arise.

For all of the administrating partners - Bell Canada, OTA, MEST, RNO and TORC their profiles have been increased at a provincial level for the work done in conjunction with DSIP as well as presence enhanced at the community level.

The **local partners** were those champions mobilized to organize and present the community events held in conjunction with DSIP. Their involvement ensured that local interests and needs were met. Benefits for these volunteers and their communities directly relate to the identification of local needs, available local and external resources, formation of new networks and potential local partners and

increased capacity within the community. These benefits to be of a long-term nature are dependent upon local communities continuing to work together in the planning process. For many communities, the DSIP process positioned them well to take advantage of the newly announced provincial funding program, Connect Ontario, which requires a community-based sponsor similar to that required for the DSIP meetings.

While the partners came together through DSIP for an intensive and focussed purpose, the individual partners remain committed to rural communities and will continue to work directly with local leaders on meeting future challenges.

Bell Canada
Ontario Telecommunications Association
Ministry of Energy Science and Technology
Regional Networks for Ontario
Ontario Rural Council

Table of Contents

	Page
Foreword From DSIP Partners	1
I. Executive Summary	
A. Background	4
B. Connecting Rural Ontario	
1. The Strategy	7
2. The Investment	7
3. Technology Upgrade	7
4. Community Process	7
C. Outcomes	9
D. Recommendations	10
II. A Detailed Report of the DSIP Process	
A. Regional Meetings	
1. Engagement of Community Champions	12
2. Purpose	12
3. Locations	12
4. Observations	12
B. Community Workshops	
1. The Meetings	13
2. The Goals of the Workshops	13
3. Workshop Roles and Responsibilities	13
4. The Agenda	13
5. Workshop Format	14
6. Observations	14
7. Local Convenors / Local Champions Who Achieved Success	15
8. Then There Were the Challenges	15
9. Community Benefits of the Workshops	16
C. Wrap Up Meetings	
1. The Meetings	17
2. Comments From the Community	17
3. From the DSIP Partners' Perspective	18
D. Communication Tools	19
E. Participant Survey	
1. The Survey	20
2. The Questions and Answers	20
F. Steering Committee	24
III. Appendixes	25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Background

In 1998, the Ontario Ministry of Energy, Science and Technology commissioned a study of Ontario's telecommunications. The overall purpose of the project was to examine the existing state of telecommunications and information services available throughout Ontario and to present a snapshot of what currently existed. A study was conducted by D.A. Ford and Associates Ltd who submitted a report entitled: *Development of a Roadmap and Data Inventory of Ontario's Information Highway*. The report identified gaps in telecommunications and information infrastructure, particularly in the more rural areas of the province.

At that time, as is the case now, it was recognized that the development of an advanced telecommunications and information infrastructure is a critical component to both community and economic development in Ontario. Such infrastructure would enable the future delivery of information and services to residents of the province. The availability of high-speed communications networks and increased public access to the Internet are essential to facilitate research and development activities in both the private and public sectors, for core business activities, for the expansion of electronic commerce activities, and for the delivery of government services at all levels.

The Province strives to maintain its position in the forefront of advancing communications infrastructures to stay competitive both nationally and internationally and to enable the more cost-efficient delivery of services to residents.

While the provision of basic telephone infrastructure has occurred without a direct requirement for a return on investment, the case has not been the same for competitive telecommunications services. Suppliers of competitive telecommunications infrastructure and services traditionally provide these in areas where there is the best opportunity to realize a return on investment. Not surprisingly, this is generally in areas with larger population densities and not in the significant rural and small town areas of Ontario where anticipated revenues would not cover investment costs. This reality was reflected in the findings of the DA Ford Report, indicating the presence of a digital divide in Ontario between urban and small town/rural areas.

The effect of this digital divide is that, with the growing business requirements for digital network access and the increased importance of the Internet as a powerful means of communications, not all residents, organizations and businesses in Ontario have the same access to what are often now regarded as essential information-age services.

High cost or lack of access to high-speed data networks can be a major impediment to businesses seeking to establish in areas outside the larger towns and cities. High costs (i.e. special assemblies) or lack of access to Internet services in rural, semi-rural or remote regions of Ontario seriously disadvantage residents of those regions, and limit the Government's ability to electronically deliver services in areas such as education, health care, issuance of permits, tax remittance, or provision of basic government information.

The D.A Ford Study was an important step in to the Ministry developing a strategy to begin to address this requirement for equitable access to telecommunications infrastructure and services. At the same time the Ministry was looking at this situation, so too were other organizations, communities and vendors across Ontario.

The Ontario Rural Council (TORC) is an organization committed to supporting Ontario's rural communities and organizations. Through a diverse, multi-sector membership, it works collaboratively to identify issues and develop strategies and programs to address them. TORC's Infrastructure Working Group identified telecommunications including access to data services and broadband networks as a priority issue currently facing rural Ontario. TORC was actively involved in looking at strategies and possible program initiatives to make telecommunications infrastructure more accessible and affordable to rural communities in Ontario. In early/mid 1999, the Ontario Rural Council's (TORC) 'Infrastructure Working Group', whose members include Bell Canada, Ontario Telecommunications Association (OTA), and the Regional Networks for Ontario (RNO), identified telecommunications, including access to data services and broad band networks, as the priority issue currently facing rural Ontario. The DSIP initiative provided the opportunity to promote community building as an integral part of this rural infrastructure upgrade.

The Regional Networks for Ontario is a provincial organization representing communities that want to enhance the quality, cost and availability of telecommunications and applications services in Ontario. By working together, the RNO's members extend their reach and share their ideas and experiences more effectively. The RNO was created to help Ontario's municipalities become "smart communities". In their view, a smart community is one, which is able to think about telecommunications not as a cost of doing business, but as a strategic asset.

The community representatives that make up the membership of the RNO had already been working within their own areas, using information and communication technology applications (ICT) to build sufficient demand to attract the suppliers of telecommunications infrastructure. It is the RNO's belief that communities need to get organized, identify broad community needs and ICT applications to address those needs. By doing this across all sectors of their community, demand for telecommunications services can be aggregated and thus build a business case that will demonstrate a return on investment to the private sector suppliers of the enabling infrastructure.

While actively supporting the adoption of this process, the RNO was also acting as a single voice provincially to articulate the gaps that were present in the small town and rural areas of Ontario. This organization too, was looking to encourage a strategy to address this inequity, particularly one that would be supported by the Ministry and by the private sector suppliers.

Bell Canada, Ontario's largest single supplier of telecommunications infrastructure also recognized that there was often no immediate business case to justify them investing in infrastructure in small town and rural Ontario. With the deregulation of this industry, competition required a demonstration of a return on investments made. Bell had been instrumental in a project in Northern Ontario that was created to help address the gaps in access to data services that existed in rural and remote communities. Through a partnership with FedNor, and Human Resources Development Canada, Bell upgraded digital telecommunications services, first in 16 Northern communities, later expanded the upgrades to service approximately 80 communities. Bell was keenly interested in modelling a program in the Southern regions of Ontario (south of Parry Sound) to bring similar digital services to rural and small town communities.

At this time Bell Canada and the Province of Ontario commenced discussions on a partnership that would achieve these objectives.

Data Services Improvement Program: *Connecting Rural Ontario*

In Ontario, many communities are serviced by independent local exchange telephone companies, which are represented provincially through the Ontario Telephone Association. These independent telcos provide advanced telecommunications services to both residential and business customers in rural Ontario. Many have already assisted in the various CAP initiatives in their areas and were pleased to be included in the DSIP program.

Bell, the Ontario Ministry of Energy Science and Technology, RNO and TORC became partners in DSIP. The Ontario Telephone Association joined the partnership subsequently, to further ensure that there would not be gaps in the availability of digital telecommunications services across Ontario.

B. Connecting Rural Ontario

1. The Strategy

The purpose of the Data Services Improvement Program, *Connecting Rural Ontario* was two-fold:

- a) To provide common **data services capability** to all communities in Ontario located south of Parry Sound
- b) To **increase the awareness** and acceptance of community stakeholders to the benefits of information technology and engage community.

In the long term it was intended that the initiative provide a necessary enabler to public and private sector groups for the advancement of data-dependent applications and to ensure a sustainable economic development and improved quality of life in rural Ontario.

2. The Investment

Investments in the program included \$8 million from Bell Canada, \$1.7 million from the members of the Ontario Telecommunications Association and \$3.5 million from the Ministry of Energy, Science and Technology for a total investment in small town/rural Ontario of nearly \$13 million! Funding from MEST was via the Telecommunications Access Partnerships (TAP) program.

3. Technology Upgrade

The program included the necessary network builds to 270 Bell and 36 OTA central offices to enable dedicated private line and shared frame relay data services at regular tariff rates, available at line speeds of DS-0 (56/64 Kbps) up to DS-1 (1.536/1.54 Mbps). Because the Ministry wanted to see a levelling of the playing field with respect to access to data services, the 306 central office upgrades were to occur in under one year.

Prior to DSIP, these services were not available to many of the locations. In some cases, it was possible to provide an "off-net" extension or remoting configuration beyond a data-equipped office. These situations provided a lower service level at a higher cost than standardized "on-net" configurations and consequently very few customers subscribed to this service.

4. Community Process

The partners of DSIP believed that for communities to truly recognize the potential of these new services, a community process needed to be an integral component of this program.

Communities often do not have an IT literate population, ready to adopt new technologies and applications, nor do they necessarily have resources locally to begin a process to engage and raise the awareness of their citizens. A process to offer this support was developed by the Ontario Rural Council and the Regional Networks for Ontario and approved by the DSIP steering committee (including representatives from Ministry of Science, Energy & Technology; Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs; Bell Canada: Regional Networks for Ontario and the Ontario Rural Council.

Data Services Improvement Program: *Connecting Rural Ontario*

This process extended from Nov 1999 to September 2000. The process involved:

- the identification of potential meeting locations across Southern Ontario by the steering committee
- the hiring of two coordinators to administer the program. The responsibilities were identical although one coordinator reported to the RNO, the other reported to TORC, but acted as a team in coordinating the program
- the identification of local champions by the DSIP partners
- holding 4 regional meetings to brief the local champions on the DSIP program and the expectations regarding the community events (or workshops)
- conducting 28 community events (or workshops), with the assistance of the local champions, utilizing grants
- holding four regional wrap up meetings to debrief champions

C. Outcomes

Through a survey conducted at the workshops, we heard that the DSIP project was a success. It was clear the DSIP process did help in creating & building networks as well as identifying & mobilizing community champions within and among communities.

A range of recommendations was made from the individuals involved. Please refer to the next section, titled "Recommendations".

Awareness of IT was raised and interest in continuing to work at the community level was stimulated.

TORC's Rural Infrastructure Working Group is evaluating potential future activities and programs that address the telecommunications disparities rural Ontario communities often face.

This group will review recommendations through the DSIP process to determine where TORC might effectively respond.

Bell Canada has been able to further leverage the investments made through the DSIP program by identifying many communities that will now not only be able to access the frame relay and hyperstream technologies of DSIP but now also ISDN services. In addition to this enhancement of infrastructure in the Province, Bell recently announced an investment to bring ADSL services to 85% of residents and businesses by 2002.

Many of the independent telcos of the OTA also continue to enhance their local infrastructure to extend service areas and bring new data services and technologies

The RNO continues to be committed to supporting communities who want to become Ontario's smart communities. Activities in this regard have now moved from DSIP into MEST's new initiative, Connect Ontario, where they are facilitating a collaborative approach among communities applying for this funding opportunity. The RNO members from Northern Ontario have expressed interest in adopting a similar program of community workshops.

D. Recommendations

The following recommendations were derived from a number of sources, including the discussions at the Workshop and Wrap Up meetings.

- Communities **continue their efforts to work together** to identify IT related needs -- engaging representatives from across all sectors of their community and exploring applications, which will address community needs. Build an atmosphere of trust and sharing within and among communities to eliminate duplication of efforts and to maximize resources. There is a recognition of the value of collaboration among communities to: share experiences and best practices, share development and solution costs, leverage extent of investments from government funding sources, and to achieve economies of scale with purchasing of common solutions.
- Target the **municipal sector and local media** in the community process. Politicians and municipal administrators need to be aware of IT. Municipal organizations should be approached for their support. There exists a demonstrated need to provide ICT related backgrounders / other resources to local councillors/staff. The local media is an important group that can help to raise awareness. This may be accomplished by submission to local newspapers of IT stories from a pool of stories which have been developed collaboratively by communities; and / or encouraging the assistance of the Association of Community Newspapers.
- Explore opportunities for focussed and in-depth collaborations within **communities of interest**. The DSIP community workshops were based on geographic locations. Consideration for any next stage of workshops should be among individuals from the same sector. This allows the sharing of ideas, solutions amongst individuals with the same interests.
- **Increase human resources** at the community level who have specialized expertise in IT. Communities themselves should recognize the importance of community information officers – the logic of legislating Road Superintendents in each municipality 40 years ago holds true now for the new information highway infrastructure. Similar to the Export Development Officers shared amongst several Community Development Corporations, an individual for IT would be beneficial. The Community Access Program (CAP) Regional Specialists have demonstrated that assistance with CAP funding has provided a better calibre of applications.
- Increase awareness within rural communities regarding **e-commerce processes** and benefits. There is a need to overcome the ‘fear factor’ in local businesses through education, awareness and support in the adoption of e-commerce strategies. Further support on how to take advantage of e-commerce is required.
- Establish a **clearinghouse of resource materials** on IT with a focus on rural applications and their benefits. These resources should be in simple; portable formats (web enabled, video, small Power Points, information kits, business incubator models) including examples of applications – these should focus on the basic awareness level. Francophone materials to support that population in Ontario should also be available.
- Recognize **the integral role of the CAP** program in awareness raising re IT and training and develop mechanisms to sustain these sites as they offer key building blocks for ICT awareness and training

- Consider a **community building process** focussing on raising IT awareness within Northern Ontario and continue assistance for communities in Southern Ontario. There exists the perception that DSIP started something in the communities, then left with out follow up. Many communities continue to need workshop and facilitation support.
- Address rural need for **High Speed Internet Access**. In anticipation of pressures, we need to look at high cost areas and high speed internet access.

Next Steps?

- Distribute final report out to interested organizations, and communities
- Further steps with partnerships including: organization to celebrate official launch of DSIP services
- Examine the partnership and process model for application within other sectors i.e. natural gas
- Maintain and build upon the DSIP website / clearinghouse developed during the DSIP process

A DETAILED REPORT OF THE DSIP PROCESS

A. Regional Meetings

1. Engagement of Community Champions

The DSIP team recognized the need to engage local champions and potential champions. This was accomplished through four regional meetings held in December 1999. Recognizing the value of many current networks of people in these communities, RNO and TORC invited people from existing community organizations; CAP initiatives; public libraries; and RNO and TORC's own province-wide members. We hoped that these champions would be willing to help host the local event and would also continue their participation in the community process following the workshop.

The community champions that were identified began planning for the DSIP workshops that would occur in the coming months.

2. Purpose

The purpose of these meetings were:

- Introduce the DSIP program and its members partners
- Identify local champions
- Gather input from the champions to further define process for community workshops
- Start to share ownership of the program and outcomes with local leaders

3. Locations

These 'Gatherings of Community Champions' meetings were held across the southern half of Ontario, regionally in four central locations:

- Woodstock for the county areas of Oxford; Essex; Niagara; Lambton-Kent; Middlesex, Elgin; Brant-Haldimand-Norfolk, Huron and Perth
- Alliston for Wellington, Dufferin; Muskoka; Grey, Bruce and Simcoe
- Peterborough for Victoria, Peterborough, Northumberland, Durham; Haliburton, Hastings and Prince Edward
- Kemptville for Renfrew; Prescott-Russell; Lennox-Addington, Frontenac; Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry; Lanark and Leeds-Grenville.

4. Observations

We had the misconception that the both community champions and communities generally invited to the initial regional meetings, had a higher level of ICT awareness. That was not always the case.

At these meetings, we received numerous requests for clarification and information on DSIP. There were expectations of some that what DSIP was bringing was high-speed internet and low prices, not the frame relay and point to point broadband services that were in fact being upgraded in their communities. Presentations were adapted between the first and fourth meetings to attempt to address this misconception.

In certain regions, it appeared that the community champions had not yet been identified or cultivated to lead their community into the DSIP workshop and potentially a longer-term local ICT initiative. With the timing of these initial meetings, there was not an opportunity to look further in accurately identifying potential champions for an area. The DSIP partners recognized that some of this activity would become a component of the workshop planning process.

B. Community Workshops

1. The Meetings

We decided that core messages and key presenters would be common to all community workshops, but at the same time recognizing that each community had local considerations including: different levels on the IT continuum; and different levels of available local resources.

We also wanted to ensure that we did not duplicate or compete with existing efforts, but rather we built on any local initiatives. We recognized that building local community capacity is crucial to the community development process. It was our intent, therefore to ensure communities recognized the importance of the resources within their community, but externally as well.

Each community was provided an amount of up to \$4,500 to cover event related expenses including meeting rooms and refreshments; possible administrative costs; equipment rental and other. It was hoped that the community could leverage further support locally.

2. The Goals Of The Workshops

- Community collaborations formed to design, plan and coordinate local workshops which target multi-sector audience;
- Local and regional networks formed to link those interested in information technologies and their applications – opportunities for future collaborations identified;
- Local applications, best practice and resources inventoried, compiled and communicated locally and through the regional network;
- Communities aware of new available data services and potential applications and impacts;
- Community interest in information technologies stimulated and collective energy to work together created;
- Community needs and gaps in information/resources relative to information technology identified;
- A long term process developed to continue community activity regarding information technologies and their applications; and opportunity for community involvement in the process clarified;
- Next steps in the community process outlined and interested participants identified;
- Additional resources leveraged from among participants to expand activity initiated through the workshops.

3. Workshop Roles and Responsibilities

The role of the DSIP coordinators was to assist community champions/committees in the organization of a one-day workshop. General guidelines were provided, however it was incumbent upon the champions to:

- Invite community members
- Arrange all advertising (supported by DSIP supplied generic formats)
- Finalize the agenda
- Assist with acquiring presenters
- Arrange meeting place and refreshments
- Meet event and financial reporting requirements

4. The Agenda

The agenda adopted by the majority of the committees was:

- Introduction of DSIP program and its partner members

- Introduction of the 'Connect Ontario' initiative
- Related presentations by various organizations and interests on ICT applications and local activities
- Discussions on next steps
- Completion of participant survey

5. Workshop Formats

The formats of the meetings varied and included trade shows; panel discussions; and breakout sessions. Meeting times of the meetings also varied: daytime and afternoon / evening; and weekdays and Saturdays

Presentations included:

- E-business// E-commerce
- Local Providers Of Infrastructure (OTA, Bell, Wireless)
- Successful Community Networks; the Lanark Experience
- Connect Ontario - MEST
- Telehealth
- Distance Education
- GIS
- Agricultural Portals
- Municipal Networks & Services

A variety of materials were included in a 'Participant Package'. These documents consisted primarily of:

- Brochures / pamphlets from the DSIP partners and on the local organization/activities
- Connect Ontario Power Point slides/handout
- OTA map
- Participant Survey

6. Observations

A total of 28 meetings were held in the period March to June 2000. Although attendance at meetings varied from less than ten to over a hundred at some meetings, it has been estimated that in all, approximately 1900 attended the meetings. Participants were drawn from all sectors: youth, seniors, agriculture, business, health, education, government, libraries, voluntary organizations and individuals.

One of the workshop decisions that was made by the local organizing committee was the time, date and location for the event. It was hoped that the local group would have a good idea when and where would be most appropriate given the anticipated participants.

What caused people to show up/not show up to the community meetings? Referring to Appendix 5, Workshop Summary, there existed a wide range in the numbers attending the various workshops. While it should not be suggested that sheer numbers indicate a 'successful' meeting, it should be noted that different methods of promoting the workshops resulted in varying attendance. The successful methods could be used as models of attracting participants for events, both IT and non-IT. It should be recognized that measuring quality is hard to do.

Attendance was positively affected in areas where a community network organization was in place and supported. Communities who had already undertaken a community process likely already had

some experience holding meetings and could draw from that experience for the DSIP event. We attempted to do separate workshop templates for each of the community types, however the challenge here was to identify where individual communities stood on the IT continuum.

Appendix 5, Workshop Summary records meetings held on weekdays, weeknights and weekends, in different months. One of the more successful meetings (judged on numbers, lack of early departures etc.) was held in Cloyne (rural remote area) on a Saturday in April in perhaps the winter's worst snowstorm. A meeting held in Burford on a warm June evening yielded only five or so guests.

It should be noted that MEST's 'Connect Ontario' program was announced shortly after the start of the community workshops. After this announcement, MEST made Connect Ontario presentations at the DSIP workshops. The average of \$1,000,000 in funding for Connect Ontario communities was an enticement for many communities in the formation of the DSIP workshop and in attracting participants to the workshop and to future work. Communities and local stakeholders were now interested in how they could get access to connect Ontario funding.

The Community Futures Development Corporations (CFDCs/CDCs) played a large role in sponsoring the community meetings, however not all CFDCs were involved. As evidenced in the attached Workshop Summary (Appendix 5), at over half of the workshops the local CDC was either a primary or secondary sponsor of the community workshop.

Other community organizations that played a role in championing the initiative included Women In Rural Economic Development (WRED), local IT groups and others.

7. Local Convenors / Local Champions Who Achieved Success

Key factors emerged when examining the roles of champions and their organizations. Future community meetings/events, whether IT related or not may benefit from these points. Successful organizations tended to:

- pick up the phone and call contacts instead of simply posting newspaper ads
- hold pre-meeting meetings which helped to stimulate local interest
- draw on internal resources in their organizations to work on the project; others used DSIP funding to hire temporary assistance
- use previous experience holding community meetings, and had existing local profiles. They knew had to engage their local media and had existing contact lists

8. Then There Were The Challenges

- DSIP partners not available to attend all workshops
- Local demonstrations of ICT applications were not always available
- Conflicting meetings – same time as DSIP workshops
- Presence of municipal restructuring initiatives proving too much of a local distraction
- Differences across the regions were wide - there is a need for more dedicated staff instead of volunteers who have the know-how of how to get the resources.
- There wasn't always a clear deference between the DSIP and Connect Ontario programs.
- There was often a preoccupation with the technology and the cost of the new services
- In many cases, workshops needed to go back to an awareness raising stage, before speaking about frame relay and hyperstream services
- Distance limitations of the new DSIP upgrades and other emerging technologies mean many rural and small town people do not benefit directly
- Many communities could not clearly identify their needs versus their wants

9. Community Benefits of Workshops

- Regardless of IT, the community was engaged in a local process. People came together who would not normally do so. DSIP offered an opportunity to 'kick start' a local process
- Generally, there was an increased awareness of the benefits of IT, the benefits of collaboration, and an awareness of the community itself, and its local potential
- Growth in the community champions themselves in terms of their abilities
- Local suppliers (including Bell, OTA members, and others) recognized the rural community's interest in IT
- Examples of communities who have achieved success were very relevant and useful in raising awareness of possible applications and solutions

C. Wrap Up Meetings

1. The Meetings

The intent of these 'Wrap Up' meetings was to bring the champions together again, to evaluate the program and to participate in identifying progress, next steps, continued gaps and common requirements.

Similar to the initial Regional Meetings, four meetings were planned centrally around Southern Ontario. Consideration in selecting manageable dates was constrained due to the program ending date, the summer holiday season and a Connect Ontario submission deadline.

Two representatives from each DSIP community or emerging Connect Ontario rural community were invited to represent their community. Representatives from other related agencies such as CAP, Partnerships, Accessibility, Connectivity, Transformation Strategies (PACTS) and OMAFRA were also invited to attend. Bell, OTA, TORC, RNO and MEST were also represented at these meetings.

The format of these events was different than the original regional meetings. The meetings were held in round table style with participants encouraged to highlight their successes and challenges, and to discuss them with neighbouring communities and with the DSIP partners. The DSIP partners and other resource people were asked not to dominate the discussions, in favour of allowing the champions their chance to be heard.

The following agenda was used as a guide to the discussions:

- Learnings from the DSIP Team including Participant Survey results
- Learnings from the community champions
- Next steps and related activities? Where do we go next?
- Funding opportunities

The DSIP coordinators also asked each community to submit a brief snapshot of their area with respect to ICT initiatives. A template (see Appendix 3a) was provided. The intent was to share these documents, aiding discussions and other communities as they went through what is so often a similar process.

The meetings drew an average of 20-25 participants. Discussions were very interactive with similar comments on experiences and needs made by the community champions at each event.

It was largely from these discussions that the DSIP partners determined the recommendations listed previously in this document.

2. Comments From the Community

Required guidance on how to:

- to identify and reach the right audiences
- to engage the local media
- overcome e-Commerce as an 'unknown' and how local businesses can utilize it
- continue to raise awareness levels
- find additional people support - often community champions are well-meaning volunteers, however activities are becoming such that a coordinator is required which means financial resources are also required

- identify IT people within a community to provide expertise to the community champions
- find sources of sustainability for the CAP sites that are key to ICT awareness and training as well as Internet access
- engage municipal councils / administrators in the process
- find resources to assistance with understanding funding applications and guidelines
- continue maintaining momentum and community partnerships throughout lengthy government funding processes

3. From The DSIP Partners' Perspective

- How has process been adopted and if challenges still exist, how can they help?
- As a result of community interest in IT shown through the DSIP process, additional supplier services are being deployed (i.e. ISDN / DSL)
- Recognized increased level of excitement and awareness of process
- Need for support for ICT awareness
- Recognition that increased willingness of CAP communities to work together was direct evolution of DSIP process

D. Communication Tools

A need was identified to provide prompt feedback from regional meetings, information on status of upgrades, opportunity to ask questions of any or all partners or of other communities, instructions/guidance to proceed to organize workshops, information on best practices, ICT applications, successful community processes, community network organizations, funding programs.

The DSIP partners discovered that there was no single place where interested communities could access information on many of these items. Thus, much of the early work of the coordinators involved researching and collecting information to share with DSIP communities on best practices, ICT applications, community networks and funding opportunities. It was decided that the best tool to make this information available to communities was through a website, supported through email and directed mailing lists.

- **Mailing Lists:** Developed list of regional meeting participants and emerging champion organizations for local workshops
- **Website:** Developed structure for website as main communication tool to support champions, profile the project and stimulate further interest in telecommunications and ICT across the province; included toolkit of workshop resources for community champions (speakers, associations, videos, presentations), links to ICT projects and funding programs, templates to assist communities with advertising, invitations, agendas, reporting, etc,
- **Newsletter:** Began sharing of information and building of community capacity in DSIP with a newsletter updating people on the process and pointing to the resources available on the DSIP website.

E. Participant Survey

1. The Survey

In order to get a baseline picture of the workshop participants a survey (please refer to Appendix 4) was included in the workshop materials. During the course of the workshop, participants were urged to complete this document, and to hand it into the workshop sponsors before leaving the meeting.

It was recognized that while the completed surveys provided information to the DSIP team, they also would give the community champions details from people and sectors within their community on perspectives and hopes for IT, concerns, issues, awareness level, etc. Also of value, was the provision of contact information from local participants who wanted to be involved with any future IT related activity in the community.

Evaluation input on the workshops themselves was another important element of the survey questions. The results from this helped to determine the successfulness not only of the workshop but also of the DSIP program overall.

602 surveys were collected (a further 15 were collected at a later date, but are not included in the analysis). This information was entered into a database and analysed.

Based on an estimated total attendance at the workshops of 1900 participants, 602 completed surveys represent a completion rate of roughly 1/3. In some workshops, collection of the completed forms proved to be a challenge.

The following are the summaries of the questions where an objective answer was required. Answers to the subjective questions were not analysed due to the wide variety of responses.

Many of the respondents overwhelmingly answered the questions favourably. Where the attendees already the converted?

2. The Questions and Answers

Question 5. Which sectors do you represent?

(Note: Participants were allowed to check more than one sector)

Despite the expected audience, as evidenced by this response, many of those attending the workshops had an interest in business or their 'own interest'. The question posed did not allow us to discern whether these were owner/operators from Small Office / Home Offices (SOHOs) or representatives from larger firms. Judging from the professions listed (questions 4) by the respondents, most were from small/medium businesses.

One theory suggests that the attendees were a whole group different from the original target group. If this is the case, then is why did the target crowd not materialize? In each community, organizers were provided with similar generic promotional materials; the meetings formats were more or less similar; and the coordinators provided each community with similar instructions.

Perhaps the target audience was advanced sufficiently (had good connectivity and were aware of IT), that these workshops were not of interest to them. On the other hand, perhaps those from the SOHO

sector were in need of better connectivity and needed assistance re awareness of how IT could assist them.

Sector	Percentage
Business	27.44%
My own interests	18.72%
Education	13.99%
Voluntary / Community Sector	13.77%
Municipal Government	10.83%
Health	8.41%
Library	6.20%
Agriculture	5.99%
Youth	3.47%
Federal Government	3.15%
Provincial Government	3.05%
Faith Community	2.00%
Other	0.00%

Question 6. In which age category are you?

An overwhelming percentage of the participants were in the age category 29-65. This category should have been split into smaller segments.

Age Range	Less than 29	29-65	Over 65	N/K
	7%	88%	3%	1%

Question 7. Assess your current understanding of Information Technologies (IT) by checking the most appropriate category.

Fifty percent of the attendees claimed to be active users at home/work. In other words they had some level of IT illiterately. The argument could be made that the promotion of the workshops did not attract those with little understanding.

Current Understanding Of IT	Little or No Direct Experience	Active User At Home/Work	Planning Future Activities	N/K
	14%	50%	36%	0%

Question 8. In what way do you think Information Technologies (IT) will affect your community in the next 3 years?

The following table outlines how the participants felt that IT would affect various sectors. High on the positively list were the health, business, education and library sectors. Government did was not score highly, surprising given the number of government funding programs aimed at IT.

Sector	Positively	Neutral	Negatively	No Answer
Health	87.04%	4.98%	0.33%	8%
Business	87.87%	3.99%	0.66%	7%
Education	87.38%	3.32%	0.83%	8%

Data Services Improvement Program: *Connecting Rural Ontario*

Federal Government	57.14%	22.76%	1.0%	19%
Provincial Government	59.3%	20.76%	1.66%	18%
Municipal Government	71.1%	14.29%	1.0%	14%
Library	82.72%	6.64%	1.0%	10%
Youth (up to 29 years)	77.08%	8.31%	1.0%	14%
Agriculture	59.63%	23.26%	1.5%	16%
Voluntary / Community	63.62%	20.76%	1.33%	14%
Faith Community	31.56%	42.86%	2.99%	23%
Own Interests	76.58%	7.97%	0.33%	15%
Other	8.97%	1.0%	0.50%	90%

Question 11(i). Has this workshop raised your awareness of IT and their potential?

Almost 80% reported that the workshops raised their awareness to some degree. Only 8% felt that it did not.

Raised IT Awareness	Yes	No	Somewhat	N/K
	69%	8%	20%	3%

Question 11. (ii) Has this workshop increased your knowledge of local applications and resources?

Over 90% felt that the workshops had increased their knowledge of local applications and resources.

Increased Knowledge	Yes	No	Somewhat	N/K
	68%	5%	24%	3%

11. (iii) Has this workshop stimulated your interest in engaging IT for community development?

Over 90% felt that the workshop had stimulated their interest.

Engaging IT / Comm. Dev.	Yes	No	Somewhat	N/K
	75%	3%	17%	5%

12. Did you find any potential partners today or meet new people with whom you might work in the future to achieve common goals?

Over 80% felt that they had met new partners.

Potential Partners	Yes	No	Somewhat	N/K
	50%	10%	32%	8%

13. *Did this event meet your expectations?*

Over 90% advised the workshops met their expectations. Some of the comments from those that felt otherwise suggested that they came 'wanting to know more about the Internet'. Some of the 'positive' comments alluded to more information on technology and more use of hands-on type of workshops.

Event Met Expectations	Yes	No	Somewhat	N/K
	71%	2%	21%	5%

F. Steering Committee

Crampton, Barrie	Executive Director, Regional Networks For Ontario (RNO)
Girard, Debbie	General Manager Ontario Telephone Association (OTA)
Joselin, Anne	Community Technology Specialist Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)
Kuczer, C. Andrew	Senior Advisor, Information Highway Secretariat Ontario Ministry of Energy Science & Technology (MEST)
Laidley, Kevin	Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)
Lacroix, Ray	Deputy Director, Government and Community Relations Bell Canada
Maddock, Doug	DSIP Coordinator, The Ontario Rural Council
Millar, Debbie	DSIP Coordinator Regional Networks For Ontario
Murphy, Joe	Team Leader, Integrated Community Networks Bell Canada
Robertson, Mary	General Manager, The Ontario Rural Council (TORC)

APPENDIXES

Appendix		Page
1	Acronyms	26
2	Community Workshops	27
3	Wrap Up Meetings	28
3a	Guidelines re: Snapshot Of Community ICT Initiatives	28
4	Participant Survey – Questions	29
4a	Participant Survey – Number of Surveys Compiled	31
4b	Participant Survey – Summary of Question 6	32
4c	Participant Survey – Summary of Question 7	33
4d	Participant Survey – Summary of Question 8	34
4e	Participant Survey – Summary of Evaluation Question 11 (i)	35
4f	Participant Survey – Summary of Evaluation Question 11 (ii)	36
4g	Participant Survey – Summary of Evaluation Question 11 (iii)	37
4h	Participant Survey – Summary of Evaluation Question 12	38
4i	Participant Survey – Summary of Evaluation Question 13	39
5	Workshop Summary	40

Appendix 1 - Acronyms

CAP	Community Access Program
CDC	Community Development Corporation(s) see also CFDC
CFDC	Community Futures Development Corporation
DSIP	Data Services Improvement Program
IT	Information Technologies
ICT	Information & Communications Technologies
MEST	Ontario Ministry of Energy Science and Technology
OMAFRA	Ontario Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs
OTA	Ontario Telephone Association / Ontario Telecommunications Association
PACTS	Partnerships, Accessibility, Connectivity Transformation Strategies
RNO	Regional Networks For Ontario
SOHO	Small Office, Home Office
TORC	The Ontario Rural Council

Appendix 2 - Community Workshops

Date	Community	Location
Saturday, April 15, 2000	Stormont-Dundas-Glengary	Tagwi Secondary School, Avonmore
Monday, March 06, 2000	Bancroft-Apsley-Haliburton	Apsley Community Centre
Wednesday, March 29, 2000	Huron-Perth	Mitchell Town Hall
Thursday, March 30, 2000	Huron-Perth	Clinton OMAFRA Office
Saturday, April 08, 2000	Lennox-Addington-Frontenac	Cloyne Education Centre
Tuesday, April 11, 2000	Grey Bruce	Thurnbury - Beaverton Community Centre
Saturday, April 15, 2000	Stormont-Dundas-Glengary	Tagwi Secondary School, Avonmore
Wednesday, May 03, 2000	Victoria-Peterborough-Northumberland-Durham	Ramada on Hwy #7 near Lindsay
Wednesday, May 03, 2000	Prescott-Russell	La Cite Golf Club, Hawksbury
Thursday, May 04, 2000	Victoria-Peterborough-Northumberland-Durham	Sir Sandford College in Peterborough
Tuesday, May 09, 2000	Grey Bruce	Georgian College, Owen Sound
Wednesday, May 10, 2000	Grey Bruce	Underwood Community Centre, Underwood
Thursday, May 11, 2000	Grey Bruce	Hartley House Hotel, Walkerton
Friday, May 12, 2000	Simcoe	Holiday Inn, Barrie
Tuesday, May 16, 2000	Lanark-Leeds-Grenville	Kemptville College
Thursday, May 25, 2000	Lambton-Kent	St. Clair College
Friday, May 26, 2000	Lambton-Kent	Lambton College
Monday, May 29, 2000	Oxford	Market Square, Woodstock
Tuesday, May 30, 2000	Hastings-Prince Edward County	Tweed Playhouse, Tweed
Tuesday, June 06, 2000	Renfrew	Pembroke Legion
Tuesday, June 06, 2000	Essex	Kingsville Golf & Country Club
Thursday, June 08, 2000	Bi-Lingual Summit	NavCan, Cornwall
Tuesday, June 13, 2000	Wellington-Dufferin	Monora Park Pavillion, Orangeville
Thursday, June 15, 2000	Muskoka	Muskoka Riverside Inn
Monday, June 19, 2000	Brant-Haldimand-Norfolk	Fanshaw College, Simcoe
Tuesday, June 20, 2000	Brant-Haldimand-Norfolk	Burford High School, Burford
Thursday, June 22, 2000	Niagara	Niagara College

Appendix 3 – Wrap Up Meetings

Date	Communities	Location
Monday, September 11, 2000	Muskoka Victoria Peterborough Northumberland Durham Haliburton Hastings & Prince Edward	Ramada Inn, Lindsay
Tuesday, September 12, 2000	Renfrew Prescott-Russell Lennox- Addington Frontenac Stormont-Dundas- Glengarry Lanark & Leeds-Grenville	Sam Jakes Inn, Merrickville
Monday, September 25, 2000	Wellington, Grey, Bruce, Simcoe Huron Perth	Monora Park Pavillion, Orangeville
Tuesday, September 26, 2000	Dufferin, Oxford Essex Niagara Lambton- Kent Middlesex Elgin Brant-Haldimand- Norfolk	Quality Inn, Woodstock

Appendix 3a – Guidelines re: Snapshot Of Community ICT Initiatives

- general demographics of your community - main industry, unemployment, (perceived) telecommunications infrastructure (present, planned)
- have you formed a community IT organization
- if yes:
 - is this committee meeting regularly (i.e. is it active)
 - if it is not active, can you identify any barriers/challenges that may be the cause
 - and what area do you consider to be your community
 - and what are some of your successes - (i.e. submissions/acceptance of Notice of Intent/Business Plan under Connect Ontario)
- are you in the process of applying for project funding (i.e. Connect Ontario, CAP, other)
- do you feel you and/or your committee have a good understanding of IT including infrastructure, applications (i.e. GIS, e-commerce, information servers)
- if you feel your group needs a better understanding, indicate in what areas and perhaps suggest ways you would like to address that need
- if no - what impediments are you encountering in forming a committee
- yes or no - what resources would help you in your endeavours (further workshops, community meetings, demonstrations, partnership development support, etc)
- any additional comments

Appendix 4 – Participant Survey – Questions

A. Participant Profile

1. Date
2. Workshop location
3. What is your telephone area code and exchange (first 3 numbers of your phone number)?
4. What is your profession?
5. Which sector(s) do you represent? Check all that apply. Circle the primary sector you represent today if you are representing more than one. (Health, Business, Education, Government [Federal, Provincial, Municipal], Library, Youth [to 29 yrs], Agriculture, Voluntary / Community Sector, Faith Community, My own interests, Other)
6. In which age category are you: (less than 29 years, 29-65 years, Over 65 years)
7. Assess your current understanding of Information Technologies (IT) by checking the most appropriate category: (Little or no direct experience; Active user at home or work; Planning future activities based on advanced applications / or a technical support person / consultant) (Comments)

B. Information Technologies & Your Community

8. In what way do you think Information Technologies (IT) will affect your community in the next 3 years? Check one box per sector. (Positively, Neutral Negatively) (Health, Business, Education, Government [Federal, Provincial, Municipal], Library, Youth [to 29 yrs], Agriculture, Voluntary / Community Sector, Faith Community, My own interests, Other)
9. Can you think of any examples of how IT could address a critical need or issue facing your community?
10. Help us develop an inventory of applications or uses of IT in your community. What are 3 to 5 of the most significant applications currently in use or planned within your community. These can be from any sector.

C. Evaluation

11. Has this workshop: (Yes/No/Somewhat)
 - i. Raised your awareness of IT and their potential?
 - ii. Increased your knowledge of local applications and resources?
 - iii. Stimulated your interest in engaging IT for community development?
12. Did you find any potential partners today or meet new people with whom you might work in the future to achieve common goals? (Yes/No/Possibly)
13. Did this event meet your expectations? (Yes/No/Somewhat) (Please clarify)

D. Next Steps

14. What would you like to see as the next step in the community process started today? (For example, further workshops; training; formation of a local or new network; an awareness campaign)
15. Is there anyone who did not attend this event who you think would have benefited from participating or would have made a contribution to the discussion? Please identify these people so they can be included in future activities.
16. Would you like to get involved in further activity? (Yes/No) (If yes, how)

17. Do you have any additional comments you would like to share with us?

Please fill in contact information below, if you would like to participate in future activities. (Name, Organizations, Address, Email, Phone, Fax)

Appendix 4a – Participant Survey – Number of Surveys Compiled

	#	%
Apsley Community Centre	49	8.14
Barrie	40	6.64
Bracebridge	25	4.15
Burford High School, Burford	1	0.17
Chatham	0	0.17
Clinton OMAFRA Office	22	3.65
Cloyne Education Centre	56	9.3
Cornwall	1	0.17
Georgian College, Owen Sound	28	4.65
Kemptville College	28	4.65
Kingsville Golf & Country Club	20	3.32
La Cite Golf Club, Hawksbury	16	2.66
Lambton College	20	3.32
Lindsay	16	2.66
Mitchell Town Hall	16	2.66
Niagara College	8	1.33
Orangeville	25	4.15
Pembroke Legion	18	2.99
Peterborough	21	3.49
Simcoe	6	1
St. Clair College	13	2.16
Stoneridge Inn, London	36	5.98
Tagwi Secondary School, Avonmore	34	5.65
Thurnbury - Beaverton Community Centre	33	5.48
Tweed Playhouse, Tweed	19	3.16
Underwood Community Centre, Underwood	9	1.5
Walkerton	31	5.15
Woodstock	10	1.66
Total	602	

Appendix 4b – Participant Survey – Summary of Question 6

In which age category are you?

Workshop	Less than 29	29-65	Over 65	N/K	#
Apsley Community Centre	0%	86%	14%	0%	49
Barrie	8%	90%	3%	0%	40
Bracebridge	8%	88%	0%	4%	25
Burford High School, Burford	0%	100%	0%	0%	1
Chatham	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
Clinton OMAFRA Office	14%	86%	0%	0%	22
Cloyne Education Centre	5%	84%	11%	0%	56
Cornwall	0%	100%	0%	0%	1
Georgian College, Owen Sound	0%	100%	0%	0%	28
Kemptville College	11%	86%	4%	0%	28
Kingsville Golf & Country Club	5%	95%	0%	0%	20
La Cite Golf Club, Hawksbury	6%	94%	0%	0%	16
Lambton College	25%	65%	5%	5%	20
Lindsay	13%	88%	0%	0%	16
Mitchell Town Hall	6%	94%	0%	0%	16
Niagara College	25%	75%	0%	0%	8
Orangeville	8%	88%	0%	4%	25
Pembroke Legion	11%	89%	0%	0%	18
Peterborough	5%	95%	0%	0%	21
Simcoe	0%	83%	0%	17%	6
St. Clair College	8%	92%	0%	0%	13
Stoneridge Inn, London	19%	81%	0%	0%	36
Tagwi Secondary School, Avonmore	6%	91%	3%	0%	34
Thurnbury - Beaverton Community Centre	3%	91%	3%	3%	33
Tweed Playhouse, Tweed	5%	89%	5%	0%	19
Underwood Community Centre, Underwood	0%	100%	0%	0%	9
Walkerton	6%	87%	6%	0%	31
Woodstock	0%	100%	0%	0%	10
Overall	7%	88%	3%	1%	602

Appendix 4c – Participant Survey – Summary of Question 7

Assess your current understanding of Information Technologies (IT) by checking the most appropriate category.

	Little or No Direct Experience	Active User At Home/Work	Planning Future Activities	N/K	#
Apsley Community Centre	33%	47%	18%	2%	49
Barrie	5%	53%	43%	0%	40
Bracebridge	12%	52%	32%	4%	25
Burford High School, Burford	0%	0%	100%	0%	1
Chatham	0%	100%	0%	0%	1
Clinton OMAFRA Office	23%	32%	45%	0%	22
Cloyne Education Centre	23%	55%	21%	0%	56
Cornwall	0%	100%	0%	0%	1
Georgian College, Owen Sound	7%	54%	39%	0%	28
Kemptville College	7%	46%	46%	0%	28
Kingsville Golf & Country Club	5%	25%	70%	0%	20
La Cite Golf Club, Hawksbury	6%	75%	19%	0%	16
Lambton College	10%	55%	35%	0%	20
Lindsay	6%	56%	38%	0%	16
Mitchell Town Hall	6%	50%	44%	0%	16
Niagara College	0%	25%	75%	0%	8
Orangeville	24%	52%	24%	0%	25
Pembroke Legion	0%	50%	50%	0%	18
Peterborough	5%	52%	43%	0%	21
Simcoe	17%	83%	0%	0%	6
St. Clair College	8%	62%	31%	0%	13
Stoneridge Inn, London	8%	53%	39%	0%	36
Tagwi Secondary School, Avonmore	6%	56%	47%	0%	34
Thurnbury - Beaverton Community Centre	27%	27%	45%	0%	33
Tweed Playhouse, Tweed	16%	37%	47%	0%	19
Underwood Community Centre, Underwood	11%	67%	22%	0%	9
Walkerton	19%	42%	39%	0%	31
Woodstock	10%	80%	10%	0%	10
Overall	14%	50%	36%	0%	602

Appendix 4d – Participant Survey – Summary of Question 8

In what way do you think Information Technologies (IT) will affect your community in the next 3 years?

Sector	Positively	Neutral	Negatively	No Answer
Health	87.04%	4.98%	0.33%	8%
Business	87.87%	3.99%	0.66%	7%
Education	87.38%	3.32%	0.83%	8%
Federal Government	57.14%	22.76%	1.0%	19%
Provincial Government	59.3%	20.76%	1.66%	18%
Municipal Government	71.1%	14.29%	1.0%	14%
Library	82.72%	6.64%	1.0%	10%
Youth (up to 29 years)	77.08%	8.31%	1.0%	14%
Agriculture	59.63%	23.26%	1.5%	16%
Voluntary/Community	63.62%	20.76%	1.33%	14%
Faith Community	31.56%	42.86%	2.99%	23%
Own Interests	76.58%	7.97%	0.33%	15%
Other	8.97%	1.0%	0.50%	90%

Appendix 4e – Participant Survey – Summary of Evaluation Question 11 (i)

Has this workshop raised your **awareness of IT** and their potential?

	Yes	No	Somewhat	N/K	#
Apsley Community Centre	59%	6%	35%	0%	49
Barrie	70%	8%	18%	5%	40
Bracebridge	60%	8%	24%	8%	25
Burford High School, Burford	0%	0%	100%	0%	1
Chatham	0%	0%	100%	0%	1
Clinton OMAFRA Office	64%	5%	27%	5%	22
Cloyne Education Centre	73%	11%	13%	4%	56
Cornwall	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
Georgian College, Owen Sound	71%	0%	25%	4%	28
Kemptville College	68%	11%	21%	0%	28
Kingsville Golf & Country Club	85%	0%	10%	5%	20
La Cite Golf Club, Hawksbury	63%	38%	0%	0%	16
Lambton College	90%	0%	10%	0%	20
Lindsay	69%	0%	25%	6%	16
Mitchell Town Hall	75%	6%	13%	6%	16
Niagara College	75%	13%	13%	0%	8
Orangeville	68%	0%	32%	0%	25
Pembroke Legion	78%	6%	11%	6%	18
Peterborough	76%	5%	19%	0%	21
Simcoe	67%	0%	33%	0%	6
St. Clair College	69%	8%	23%	0%	13
Stoneridge Inn, London	75%	0%	19%	6%	36
Tagwi Secondary School, Avonmore	56%	24%	21%	0%	34
Thornbury - Beaverton Community Centre	70%	15%	12%	3%	33
Tweed Playhouse, Tweed	53%	11%	32%	5%	19
Underwood Community Centre, Underwood	44%	11%	33%	11%	9
Walkerton	77%	13%	6%	3%	31
Woodstock	50%	10%	30%	10%	10
Overall	69%	8%	20%	3%	602

Appendix 4f – Participant Survey – Summary of Evaluation Question 11 (ii)

Has this workshop increased your knowledge of local applications and resources?

	Yes	No	Somewhat	N/K	#
Apsley Community Centre	41%	6%	47%	6%	49
Barrie	73%	8%	15%	5%	40
Bracebridge	68%	4%	20%	8%	25
Burford High School, Burford	0%	0%	100%	0%	1
Chatham	0%	0%	100%	0%	1
Clinton OMAFRA Office	68%	0%	27%	5%	22
Cloyne Education Centre	70%	7%	20%	4%	56
Cornwall	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
Georgian College, Owen Sound	64%	4%	32%	0%	28
Kemptville College	86%	0%	14%	0%	28
Kingsville Golf & Country Club	85%	0%	10%	5%	20
La Cite Golf Club, Hawksbury	81%	19%	0%	0%	16
Lambton College	75%	10%	15%	0%	20
Lindsay	56%	6%	31%	6%	16
Mitchell Town Hall	50%	6%	38%	6%	16
Niagara College	50%	0%	50%	0%	8
Orangeville	64%	0%	36%	0%	25
Pembroke Legion	72%	0%	22%	6%	18
Peterborough	62%	10%	29%	0%	21
Simcoe	50%	0%	50%	0%	6
St. Clair College	69%	15%	15%	0%	13
Stoneridge Inn, London	86%	0%	11%	3%	36
Tagwi Secondary School, Avonmore	68%	6%	26%	0%	34
Thornbury - Beaverton Community Centre	76%	9%	15%	0%	33
Tweed Playhouse, Tweed	63%	11%	21%	5%	19
Underwood Community Centre, Underwood	44%	0%	33%	22%	9
Walkerton	74%	10%	13%	3%	31
Woodstock	60%	0%	30%	10%	10
Overall	68%	5%	24%	3%	602

Appendix 4g – Participant Survey – Summary of Evaluation Question 11 (iii)

Has this workshop stimulated you interest in engaging IT for community development?

	Yes	No	Somewhat	N/K	#
Apsley Community Centre	67%	4%	24%	4%	49
Barrie	83%	3%	8%	8%	40
Bracebridge	60%	0%	32%	8%	25
Burford High School, Burford	0%	0%	100%	0%	1
Chatham	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
Clinton OMAFRA Office	73%	0%	23%	5%	22
Cloyne Education Centre	77%	4%	14%	5%	56
Cornwall	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
Georgian College, Owen Sound	86%	4%	7%	4%	28
Kemptville College	75%	0%	18%	7%	28
Kingsville Golf & Country Club	85%	0%	10%	5%	20
La Cite Golf Club, Hawksbury	94%	6%	0%	0%	16
Lambton College	75%	0%	25%	0%	20
Lindsay	69%	0%	25%	6%	16
Mitchell Town Hall	50%	6%	31%	13%	16
Niagara College	75%	0%	25%	0%	8
Orangeville	84%	0%	16%	0%	25
Pembroke Legion	83%	0%	0%	17%	18
Peterborough	81%	5%	14%	0%	21
Simcoe	83%	0%	17%	0%	6
St. Clair College	54%	15%	23%	8%	13
Stoneridge Inn, London	78%	0%	17%	6%	36
Tagwi Secondary School, Avonmore	79%	3%	18%	0%	34
Thurnbury - Beaverton Community Centre	70%	9%	18%	3%	33
Tweed Playhouse, Tweed	79%	0%	16%	5%	19
Underwood Community Centre, Underwood	44%	22%	22%	11%	9
Walkerton	68%	10%	13%	10%	31
Woodstock	70%	0%	20%	10%	10
Overall	75%	3%	17%	5%	602

Appendix 4h – Participant Survey – Summary of Evaluation Question 12

Did you find any **potential partners** today or meet new people with whom you might work in the future to achieve common goals?

	Yes	No	Possibly	N/K	#
Apsley Community Centre	31%	27%	33%	10%	49
Barrie	50%	3%	43%	5%	40
Bracebridge	40%	8%	40%	12%	25
Burford High School, Burford	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
Chatham	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
Clinton OMAFRA Office	45%	9%	41%	5%	22
Cloyne Education Centre	41%	11%	38%	11%	56
Cornwall	0%	0%	100%	0%	1
Georgian College, Owen Sound	64%	14%	18%	4%	28
Kemptville College	61%	0%	32%	7%	28
Kingsville Golf & Country Club	60%	0%	30%	10%	20
La Cite Golf Club, Hawksbury	63%	31%	6%	0%	16
Lambton College	45%	10%	40%	5%	20
Lindsay	56%	6%	31%	6%	16
Mitchell Town Hall	25%	13%	50%	13%	16
Niagara College	50%	0%	50%	0%	8
Orangeville	36%	8%	52%	4%	25
Pembroke Legion	67%	0%	28%	6%	18
Peterborough	62%	5%	29%	5%	21
Simcoe	50%	17%	17%	17%	6
St. Clair College	54%	8%	31%	8%	13
Stoneridge Inn, London	61%	0%	36%	3%	36
Tagwi Secondary School, Avonmore	74%	9%	18%	0%	34
Thurnbury - Beaverton Community Centre	45%	9%	39%	6%	33
Tweed Playhouse, Tweed	53%	11%	21%	16%	19
Underwood Community Centre, Underwood	11%	22%	44%	22%	9
Walkerton	52%	19%	13%	16%	31
Woodstock	50%	20%	10%	20%	10
Overall	50%	10%	32%	8%	602

Appendix 4i – Participant Survey – Summary of Evaluation Question 13

Did this event meet your expectations?

	Yes	No	Somewhat	N/K	#
Apsley Community Centre	53%	8%	31%	8%	49
Barrie	83%	0%	8%	10%	40
Bracebridge	56%	0%	36%	8%	25
Burford High School, Burford	0%	0%	100%	0%	1
Chatham	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
Clinton OMAFRA Office	59%	5%	32%	5%	22
Cloyne Education Centre	84%	4%	7%	5%	56
Cornwall	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
Georgian College, Owen Sound	75%	0%	18%	7%	28
Kemptville College	82%	0%	14%	4%	28
Kingsville Golf & Country Club	85%	0%	10%	5%	20
La Cite Golf Club, Hawksbury	94%	6%	0%	0%	16
Lambton College	75%	0%	25%	0%	20
Lindsay	56%	0%	31%	13%	16
Mitchell Town Hall	44%	6%	44%	6%	16
Niagara College	63%	0%	38%	0%	8
Orangeville	68%	4%	28%	0%	25
Pembroke Legion	94%	0%	0%	6%	18
Peterborough	62%	0%	29%	10%	21
Simcoe	83%	0%	17%	0%	6
St. Clair College	62%	15%	23%	0%	13
Stoneridge Inn, London	86%	0%	14%	0%	36
Tagwi Secondary School, Avonmore	85%	0%	15%	0%	34
Thurnbury - Beaverton Community Centre	61%	3%	30%	6%	33
Tweed Playhouse, Tweed	58%	0%	37%	5%	19
Underwood Community Centre, Underwood	33%	0%	44%	22%	9
Walkerton	68%	3%	23%	6%	31
Woodstock	60%	10%	20%	10%	10
Overall	71%	2%	21%	5%	602

Appendix 5: Workshop Summary

	Month	Time/Day	Day / Week	Attend- ance	Depart Early	Main DSIP	Sponsor 1st	2nd	Meeting Format	Weather	Since Done	Comments
Apsley	March	Aft/Evening	Monday	100-125	Yes	TORC	IT Group	CDC/Other	General	Not Unusual	Nothing	
Avonmore (SD&G)	April	Daytime	Saturday	100	No	RNO	IT Group	Co-op Students	General	Beautiful	Cont Ont App	
Barrie (Simcoe)	May	Daytime	Friday	100-125	No	TORC	Municipal		General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	
Burford (Brant)	June	Aft/Evening	Tuesday	< 25	No	TORC	CDC	CDC	Trade Show	Warm. Rain due	Nothing	Haying due to rain
Clinton (Huron-Perth)	March	Daytime	Thursday	25-50	No	RNO	CDC	Mfg. Assn	General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	App turned back
Cloyne (Len-Fron-Add)	April	Daytime	Saturday	100	No	RNO	IT Group	ISP	General	Bad snow storm	Cont Ont App	
Essex	June	Daytime	Tuesday	50-75	No	RNO	IT Group		General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	
Hawkesbury (Prescott-Russell)	May	Daytime	Wed	50-75	No	RNO	CDC		Panel	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	Francophone event
Kemptville (Lanark-Leeds-Gren)	May	Daytime	Tuesday	50-75	No	RNO	WRED	IT Groups	General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	
Lambton College(Lambton-Kent)	May	Daytime	Friday	75-100	No	RNO	IT Group		General	Beautiful	Cont Ont App	Co-sponsored with HRDC
Lindsay/Durham	May	Daytime	Wed	25-50	Yes	TORC	WRED	CDC	Panel	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	
Middlesex-Elgin	March	Aft/Evening	Monday	75-100	Yes	RNO	CDC		General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	Before Connect Ont announced
Mitchell Town Hall (Huron-Perth)	March	Daytime	Wed	< 25	No	RNO	CDC	Mfg. Assn	General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	App turned back
Muskoka	June	Daytime	Thursday	50-75	No	TORC	CDC	N/A	Panel	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	
Orangeville (Well-Duff)	June	Daytime	Tuesday	50-75	No	TORC	Municipal	Chamber	General	Heavy Rain	Cont Ont App	
Niagara	June	Daytime	Thursday	25-50	No	TORC	IT Group	N/A	Panel	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	
Owen Sound (Grey/Bruce/Geo)	May	Aft/Evening	Tuesday	50-75	Yes	RNO	CDC	IT Group	General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	
Oxford	May	Daytime	Monday	50-75	No*	TORC	IT Group	N/A	Trade Show	Warm	Cont Ont App	*Format allowed coming/going
Peterborough/Northumberland	May	Daytime	Thursday	25-50	Yes	TORC	WRED	CDC	Panel	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	
Prescott-Russell/SD&G (Bi-Lin)	June	Morning	Wed	50-75	No	RNO	IT Group		General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	Held jointly with Cornwalls' Smart City Conference
Renfrew	June	Daytime	Tuesday	50-75	No	TORC	Municipal	N/A	General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	
Simcoe (Hal-Nor)	June	Aft/Evening	Monday	25-50	Yes	TORC	CDC	CDC	Trade Show	Warm	Nothing	
St Clair College(Lambton-Kent)	May	Daytime	Thursday	75-100	No	RNO	IT Group		General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	Co-sponsored with HRDC
Thornbury (Grey/Bruce/Geo)	April	Daytime	Tuesday	50-75	No	RNO	CDC	IT Group	General	Light snow	Cont Ont App	
Tweed (Hastings/PEC)	May	Daytime	Tuesday	25-50	Yes	TORC	Other	CDC		Not Unusual		
Underwood (Grey/Bruce/Geo)	May	Aft/Evening	Wednesd ay	< 25	Yes	RNO	CDC	IT Group	General	Heavy Rain	Cont Ont App	
Walkerton (Grey/Bruce/Geo)	May	Daytime	Thursday	75-100	No	RNO	CDC		General	Not Unusual	Cont Ont App	