Volunteer roles

This is a list of the key volunteer roles we had for the asset mapping event.

Role	Name(s)	Explanation
Event manager		Troubleshoot issues, cue start of event
Operations lead		Make sure things are set up, ready to go
Volunteer lead		Coordinate volunteers
Room set up		Set up space as needed
AV/Tech		Set up projector, PPT, run PPT
Minute taker		Record key points or action items
Guest sign in		Welcome attendees, get people to register, sign up for newsletter
Food service		Ensure the food table is set up
Event facilitator / asset mapping lead		Introducing activity. Rotate through each mapping station, answering facilitators questions.
De-escalation, process discussion		If the conversation gets heated who will step in to support de-escalation
Asset mapping table facilitators (x5)		Prompt discussion at each station, guide engagement, and facilitate the activity.
Childminders		Provide childcare free of cost to parents who want to participate

Designing an Asset Mapping Activity around Safety

This will not serve as a full description of asset mapping, for more information on such activities you could look at our three main sources of inspiration: 1) the 2012 Healthy City's <u>Participatory Asset Mapping Toolkit</u>; 2) The Fall Brooks Center's <u>Sustainable Communities: a guide to community asset mapping</u>; and; 3) the 2016 Iconoclasistas's <u>Manual of Collective Mapping</u>.

Based on our collective imagining and planning of the activity we had two main goals for the design: 1) identify key community institutions, groups, and places in the neighborhood; and 2) provide a way to discuss aspects of safety like lighting or greenspace from a strength based perspective. These two goals led us to creating five mapping stations (for a full breakdown of how each question was worded and set up see Appendix 3):

1. Location and Lighting:

- a. **Question(s)**: Roughly where did people live? Where was there good, concerning, or poor lighting in the neighbourhood?
- b. Reason: For the first question we had a sense certain areas of the neighbourhood were not attending events and we wanted to confirm this. For the second we knew from the literature review that lighting could play a role in people's perceptions of safety and we wanted to find out how much of an issue this was in our community.
- c. Did it work: We were able to confirm our participants only represented certain blocks of the neighbourhood. The lighting questions were very effective for both learning how much of an issue it was and where potential concerns were located.

2. Community Associations

- a. **Question(s)**: What informal clubs, groups, or associations exist in the neighbourhood? How connected were people to these groups? And what groups might they want to see?
- Reason: This was a fairly standard asset mapping question that we hoped would offer insights into the less visible networks and activities happening in the community.
- c. **Did it work**: This was a difficult question to facilitate and for people to engage with in a short period of time. It ended up mostly being a list of things people wished existed.

3. Local Places

- a. **Question(s)**: Where do people walk or visit often? where do they avoid?
- b. **Reason**: We wanted to capture a nuanced picture of what spaces people were spending time in and why.
- c. **Did it work**: This was a challenging question to facilitate but it gave us a really good picture of where people spent time in the neighbourhood. Many of the places listed by respondents as a favourite local spot was also a place they had concerns about.

4. Community Institutions

- a. **Question(s)**: What businesses, formal services, or organizations exist in the neighbourhood? How important were these to people?
- b. **Reason**: Another standard asset mapping question. Our focus was on not just having people name businesses and organizations but ranking how connected they felt to them.
- c. **Did it work**: Ranking was a particularly effective tool as most people discussed the businesses in the neighbourhood. Ranking let us distinguish between commercial businesses and the local shops that fostered relationships.

5. Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

- a. **Question(s)**: Where were there safety issues with streets, crossings and traffic? What changes would people like to see to address these issues?
- b. Reason: This was the one question which assumed a problem existed. This was based on previous conversations and discussion which had made clear traffic was an established community concern. Because of this we focused on finding problem areas and working together to imagine what solutions and changes would address the issue.
- c. **Did it work**: This was a very effective map that gave a clear list of problem intersections and a range of imaginative solutions that we could advocate for.

Participants were given 5-7 minutes at each of the stations to add to the map and discuss the questions. Each station had a member of the SVRA team who was responsible for asking the prepared questions and guiding residents who felt unsure how to engage. Facilitators were given explanations of each question and ideas for follow-up questions if discussion stalled.

Each station was equipped with a pre-drawn map of the neighbourhood on flip chart paper to make it easy for participants to visualize the neighbourhood. There was also a selection of markers, stickers, sticky notes, and pens at each station. Each map was taped to butcher block paper to give extra room in the margins for comments and additions. Stations #2 and #4 had an additional piece of butcher block paper where people could list assets and rank their connections to each asset using green, yellow, or red stickers. Residents were encouraged to add to the map by answering the questions verbally, attaching color coded stickers to the maps, drawing or writing on the map directly, or writing comments and attaching them with sticky notes.

We also included an unfacilitated sixth map on a separate table for additional comments or thoughts that weren't captured anywhere else. This map was not engaged with and was unnecessary. In addition as we reflected afterwards it may have been more impactful to separate out the 'mapping' and 'ranking stages of some of the stations, so that people could have focused a bit more on each.

