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Executive Summary

On February 17, 2016 The Alberta Centre for Sustainable Rural Communities (ACSRC) at the University of Alberta conducted a regional collaboration workshop in Hanna, Alberta. The event was one of seven workshops held in communities across Alberta from April 2015 and March 2016. Twenty three participants engaged in this event.

The purpose of the event was to bring representatives from a wide variety of areas including rural municipalities, regional economic development alliances, rural associations (AUMA, AAMDC), Aboriginal communities, and not-for-profit and private sector associations. The inclusion of these groups in this event was meant to create a balance of inter-sectoral representation with geographic, political and social considerations. During this event, a three-part collaboration and capacity-building exercise took place.

The three parts to this event were in the form of exercises to help enable regional collaboration within the context of rural Alberta. The exercises were as follows: (1) Establishing criteria for identifying and prioritizing high-impact action areas; (2) Establishing priority areas, themes, questions and actions for regional collaboration (based on (1)); and (3) Completing a 4-phase scenario planning process (see for example HHL based on 1 and 2 (above) in order to (1) identify core problems and frame their analyses; (2) identify assumptions and models about regional collaboration; (3) discussing and evaluating current trends; and (4) developing scenarios for the "ideal" regional future.
Introduction

Collaboration within and between regions is a priority area for rural Alberta, and improved/increased partnerships are key elements in potentially reducing costs, increasing economic benefits and focusing planning services and project development. Particularly with the gradual adoption of the Land Use Framework, there are increased pressures upon rural communities to integrate, collaborate and partner in innovative ways, as well as a need for opportunities to consider the form, function and implications of regional collaboration. This is particularly true from the perspective of the regional development alliances, rural municipalities and rural service providers, and is clearly recognized in Strategy 5.1 of the Rural Alberta Economic Development Action Plan (2014). As a result, finding mechanisms to not just foster collaboration, but engage community-based stakeholders in a broader process of determining priorities, impact areas, needs, gaps and future scenarios are important components of this process. It is these mechanisms that will drive the workshops

This project facilitated the design, implementation and evaluation of a series of facilitated regional collaboration workshops in locations around the province. These workshops were structured around three primary goals: (1) identifying priority and high-impact areas for regional, inter-municipal, inter-organizational and REDA-oriented collaboration; (2) establishing necessary conditions for success for these areas; and (3) engaging the participants in a broader process of scenario planning to identify both those conditions, and the external/internal factors that can facilitate, and frustrate, success collaboration of this form. On the conclusion, approximately 200 stakeholders from rural community, policy and economic sectors (including governance, natural resources, infrastructure, energy, small/medium enterprise, education, social service providers and health) will have been engaged.

We believe that these workshops proved a valuable means of not only fostering the connections and relationships necessary to develop meaningful collaboration, but also as a way of determining the local, regional and provincial priority areas that can best achieve the goals and objectives outlined in the Rural Alberta Economic Development Action Plan in 2014.
Regional Collaboration

Today’s economic, social and environmental challenges demand that people, industries and institutions work together. While regional collaboration can be addressed in many ways, this event took place in a one day workshop with a goal to help support and better enable regional collaboration within Alberta.

Some of the benefits of regional collaboration involve:
- Finding new resources and capacities to cope with challenges
- Fostering discourse
- Synthesize ideas and needs
- Building relationships

Methodology

Four different exercises were conducted during the workshop. The four exercises used rotating table discussion. The main topics discussed included identify potential areas for collaboration, what is the ideal future for the Grande Prairie region was seen as, where was collaboration most needed and what were the possible trends and patterns.

Objectives

The outcomes of the event were as follows:
1. To increase rural dialogue and engagement with the concept, practices, opportunities and challenges of regional collaboration.
2. To increase inter-regional communication and knowledge sharing through the transfer of priorities, futures and success criteria.
3. To link regional economic development alliances and initiatives with both governance, economic, environmental, social and planning stakeholders at the regional level.
4. To engage Aboriginal community leadership with regional development and governance initiatives.
5. To create opportunities for regional collaborations and partnerships to build capacity, share knowledge and develop collaborative opportunities and initiatives.
6. The evaluation of prioritization and scenario planning methods through workshop and project evaluation.
7. To identify regionally-based needs, gaps, opportunities and capitals that support long-term community sustainability in rural Alberta.
Project Evaluation

This project will undertake a post-facto evaluation of regional collaboration through an online survey of workshop participants in late 2016. This evaluation is premised on an already validated theory of change that supports activities such as asset mapping, scenario planning, prioritization and horizon scanning as initiatives that can spark long-term discussion, planning and even action within rural communities. While these workshops are far from the only causal factor that will influence the nature, form and content of collaboration, we will assess the effects of these workshops as triggers or facilitators of increased and/or high-impact collaboration. These data will be cross-referenced with on-site event evaluations conducted at the conclusion of each workshop.
Summary of Findings

Session 1: World Café

SUMMARY: The first session of the workshop involved discussion around identifying potential areas for collaboration; challenges to collaboration; and clarifying the “region” in regional collaboration.

Before discussing potential areas for collaboration, the participants identified existing collaborations, a number of which they saw as having the potential to grow. A number of counties work with small communities to provide them with financial administration services. There is potential for collaboration on administrative functions to increase. Collaborating on space and administrative functions is also occurring with the Hanna Learning Centre, an umbrella association providing career and employment, learning, volunteer, and Rural Alberta Business Centre opportunities and services for the people of Hanna and district. In Settler, collaboration has occurred with industry: their learning centre is housed in an oil and gas building.

RCMP and emergency services are both areas in which there is existing collaboration but in which participants felt there could be more whether over a larger area or in terms of increased resources.

There are a number of regional commissions, waste management was given as an example, but there doesn’t appear to be a lot of collaboration between the commissions.

In education, the Regional Collaborative Service Delivery (RCSD) team, of which there are 17 in the province, was identified as an effective collaboration. The government paper, Inspiring Action on Education, identified collaboration and shared governance as key elements in ensuring success for all students in an inclusive system. To that end, Education, Health and Human Service ministries are working together as key stakeholders in the RCSD model. For higher education, Campus Alberta was cited as an effective collaboration of the province’s 26 publicly funded post secondary institutions and community organizations, making adult education accessible across the province.

The Canadian Badlands tourism branding was identified as an effective collaboration focused on marketing a unique region of the province to tourists.
Potential areas identified for regional collaboration during the workshop included:

- Collaboration between volunteer groups; communicating better in order to
  not duplicate events and better share volunteer time.

- Access to broadband internet. Internet has become as critical as water or
electricity for the sustainability of communities. The challenge is that there
needs to be a big enough pool of customers for Internet Service Providers to
have a business case for setting up in rural areas.

- Specialization in medical services. Participants suggested that each rural area
have its own specialization. For example, Drumheller currently has a CAT
scanner which brings people to the community who would otherwise travel
to the city for that medical service.

- There needs to be better collaboration with the provincial government, some
way to facilitate regular meetings with provincial representatives.

- Economic development. As the coal industry shuts down, there needs to be
collaboration with the provincial government to transition to, and attract the
development of, alternative industries

- Access to water. This also requires collaboration with the province as water
licensing is a provincial jurisdiction. However, it is important for rural
communities to have access to quality water in order to be attractive for
people to live in and for industry to establish.

- Specialization in arts, culture and recreation. Instead of each community
having its own performing arts centre or pool or other facility, have each
community in the region with something different. The question arises as to
whether people are willing to travel to access those services.

- Transportation. With specialization, whether medical or
cultural/recreational, people need to be able to get to other communities.
Transport can be a challenge for seniors and youth. If parents have to do
more driving, participation decreases.

- Renewable energy. Starland County has been providing grants to farmers to
use solar energy for pumping water. They are now working on setting up a
renewable energy co-op. There is a great deal of potential for collaboration
in renewable energy.
• Value-adding in the agri-food industry. A lot of food and specialty crops are grown in the region, and participants thought it would be worth doing processing and packaging there as well. Furthermore, climate change could increase the diversity of crops that can be grown.

Of the areas discussed, those identified as having the greatest potential:

• Regionalization of services – recreation, culture, waste management, etc.

• Ensuring access to highspeed internet, as part of adapting to a changing job market.

• Regionalization of government. Too many different councils divides loyalties and diffuses priorities.

• Though agriculture is a highly visible part of the region, it can’t be a main focus. It is too small a part of the tax revenue. Economic diversification is needed even if it isn’t always popular.

In transition to the next section, the question of what was considered a region was posed to the participants. Participants responded with a variety of answers:

• Depends on what the goal of the collaboration is. Regions can, and should, be defined based on the purpose of the collaboration. For instance the Eastern Alberta Trade Corridor has brought together a wide variety of participants, but they all have a common purpose.

• Regions can vary in size, some can be very small such as within a town and others can exist as half or the entirety of a province.

• Participants also discussed the importance of thinking beyond smaller regions and consider the entirety of rural Alberta as a region, existing separately from the two major urban centres.

• Regions can be historical.

• It is important to keep in mind natural networking areas and the look outside of them in order to find new opportunities for collaboration.
Session 2: Scenario Planning

This section involved a three part scenario planning exercise. First, a discussion of a potential future collaboration which involves identifying what values, principles, actions and structures were ideal for regional collaboration as well as what regional collaboration looks like and why it matters. Second, a look at proximal and distal causes - those things that will have immediate and arm’s length impact on the collaboration. The third step goes further out again, looking at trends and patterns that could affect the collaboration.

SUMMARY: Potential future collaboration

Values and principles identified as important to regional collaboration included:

- Establishing a common quality of life. While quality of life is not easily defined, and tends to differ from person to person, it was noted that there should be a common level in terms of access to education and healthcare services.

- Open and honest communication in a trusting environment. Trust is something that needs to be worked on continuously.

- Shared passion for a shared vision: everyone in the collaboration has a common understanding of the values and goals of their collaboration.

- Sharing knowledge.

- Sharing risk.

- “Fair” and “equal” are not the same. We cannot demand complete equality because that is not possible given geography and distribution of the population. One participant referred to this as the “Athenian principle”: that everyone gets an equal voice, but not necessarily the same outcome.

- Complimentary rather than competitive mindset.

- Willingness to compromise. In the 1970s every community got a pool and a hospital, but that isn’t a sustainable model anymore. There is a need to consider having those things somewhere in the region, but not in every community.

- Let go of turf protection.
• While resources are important, money alone doesn’t make the collaboration. People need to be engaged and take ownership.

• Strong leadership.

• Flexibility.

• Cost effectiveness. There is a need to balance where and how budget dollars are spent. The fact that there aren’t enough dollars to go around is what makes collaboration necessary.

Structures and actions identified that for a successful collaboration included:

• Recognition that there is no single structure that works for every collaboration. While you might start with a template, it may be necessary to modify the collaborative structure.

• Binding agreements.

• Defined roles and responsibilities.

• Predictability and stability, particularly in funding. It is difficult to do long term planning when funding is year-to-year.

• While it is important for all members to have a voice, there also needs to be a leader who will be responsible/accountable.

• A champion (who may or may not be the leader), someone who helps other potential partners and the community that the collaboration is serving a common good.

• Define the goal and refer back to it.

• Perform a needs assessment to ensure that the collaboration is fulfilling an actual rather than a perceived, need.

• Identify and engage key players.
SUMMARY: Proximal and Distal Variables that Affect Collaboration

Proximal variables can be seen as “what affects me immediately/over what have I got immediate control.” The following are proximal variables identified by participants:

- Neutral spaces. Having places like the Hanna Learning Centre where all service providers can come together on equal footing.

- Prioritizing the collaboration. This can also be a distal variable, as an organization only has control over their own prioritization.

- Identifying the value of being involved; and bringing a positive, proactive approach to the collaboration.

- Recognizing the depth and breadth of impact we can achieve with our own knowledge and resources, and how that expands with the inclusion of others.

- Funding. Being willing to allocate organizational budget and/or paid staff time.

- Keeping an open mind. There are many ways to achieve an outcome.

- Ensure that everyone is heard, including youth and newcomers to the community.

- Acknowledge the strengths and abilities that each partner contributes.

- Celebrate our successes.

- Making use of all avenues of communication.

Distal variables can be seen as “arm’s length variables.” Some examples of distal variables cited during the workshop include:

- Geography. Distance can be a barrier to collaboration. On the flip side, technology has helped bridge the distance, reducing costs of time and money that were associated with travelling to get together with partners.

- History, good or bad. Historical definition of regions and historical relationships can support or prevent collaboration. Or limit it to the “usual” partners.
• Municipal limitations. Can’t fund initiatives if they are not within the boundaries of the municipality; and the municipality has to find a balance in where it is able to provide funding.

• External funding is very short term/unstable/unpredictable.

• Government policy and regulations can either help or hinder.

• Election cycle is too short for councilors and politicians to make commitments to a long term vision.

• The tension between a desire to collaborate, particularly on administration and governance, and the community’s fear of losing their unique identity.

• Need to get past the idea that every community should have every amenity and service. People’s definition of community needs to be more regional.

• Legal liability prevents collaborations.

• Level of engagement from others.

• How long the process can take, particularly when it involves educating the public.

SUMMARY: Trends and Patterns
This section involved identifying the trends and patterns that could impact regional collaboration.

• Volatility in oil prices.

• Economic downturn that is sufficiently severe that in some families, high school students are working to help support the family.

• Bigger divide between haves and have-nots.

• Regulations and requirements at banks make it difficult for small business to get loans.

• Weak Canadian dollar.

• Reduced availability of funding programs.
• Urban sprawl.

• Social media and an “always on” society. With interaction being less face-to-face, there is a loss of emotional intelligence.

• Cultural sense of entitlement.

• Urbanization. Youth go to cities for education but don’t go back to small communities when they are done.

• Busy is a lifestyle. People seem to have less time to volunteer and contribute to their communities.

• Distrust in all levels of government, particularly on the part of rural Albertans.

• Increased automation reducing human labour (and jobs).

• Increasing speed of change.

• If you are a rural region within commuting distance of a city, there is a trend for people to move out to rural residential.

• Less money all around.

• Regionalization. Collaboration is necessary for survival.

Looking at what is likely in terms of collaboration, participants suggested that:

• There will be more collaboration, as there are more issues on which to collaborate and resources need to be shared.

• If communities dissolve, there will be fewer potential collaborative partners.

• Communication, and reactions, are much swifter due to technology.

• Despite the tendency to see all youth leaving rural, there is a younger population who are coming back to rural areas.

As far as the best way to collaborate regionally, it was suggested that collaboration cannot be mandated, but rather needs to grow organically from the region. That said, participants thought it is good to have some overriding rules, though those
rules can be created by the collaborative partners. Incentivizing collaboration was seen as a good way to make it happen without mandating it.
Responses – From Participant Comments on Evaluations

Following the event, participants were asked to submit evaluations. Twenty evaluation forms were returned.

Quantitative Responses
Tables 1-3 account for the means of each of the quantitative questions given. Participants were given each of the following questions and asked to rate their satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all and 5 being very much so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: Meeting of Goals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the workshop define and explain the scenario planning process and purpose</td>
<td>3. 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the workshop discuss the ideal future for regional collaboration and what factors may positively or negatively affect collaboration</td>
<td>4. 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: Agreement with the following statements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had sufficient opportunity to participate in discussions.</td>
<td>4. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt I could make a contribution to the issues being discussed.</td>
<td>4. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work was valued during the workshop.</td>
<td>4. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentations were appropriate and relevant to the event.</td>
<td>3. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3: Overall satisfaction with the event</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how satisfied were you with this event?</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Responses
When asked what the participants liked the most about the workshop, two themes within the comments were prevalent. These themes were the ability to network and the group discussions. Participants noted how the people at this workshop do not normally interact with one another and that this diversity of attendees provided an
excellent opportunity to share ideas. Participants also praised the timeliness of the workshop.

Overall, 85% of participants were pleased with the types of groups and organizations represented at this event. When asked what groups or organizations should have been present, three participants suggested that there be representative from the provincial government there. Three evaluation forms also wanted to see more representatives from healthcare and education there. Additional suggestions included: local business, special areas board, Alberta Health Services and representatives from special areas.

When asked how the event can be improved, respondents mentioned having attendees introduce themselves at the beginning of the workshop. They also suggested telling participants what the end goal of the workshop was and having shorter sessions.
## List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Health Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Jobs, Skills, Training and Labour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cactus Corridor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Brooks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronation and District Support Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Newell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Alberta Trade Corridor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna Learning Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View County</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainview County EDO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyen FCSS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Alberta Centre (HLC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starland Community Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stettler FCSS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent Prairie Land SD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Hanna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Trochu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Empress</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A. Project Backgrounder

Alberta Centre for Sustainable Rural Communities Regional Collaboration Workshops Backgrounder:

The Alberta Centre for Sustainable Rural Communities (ACSRC) at the University of Alberta is conducting a series of regional collaboration workshops in 7 different communities dispersed across Alberta between April 2015 and March 2016. These workshops will bring together representatives from rural municipalities, regional economic development alliances, rural associations (AUMA, AAMDC), Aboriginal communities, and not-for-profit and private sector associations to engage in a 3-part collaboration and capacity-building exercise. The participants in these workshops ideally create a balance of inter-sectoral representation with geographic, political and social considerations.

Specifically, each workshop will engage these participants in three different exercises to help support and better enable regional collaboration in Alberta: (1) Establishing criteria for identifying and prioritizing high-impact action areas; (2) Establishing priority areas, themes, questions and actions for regional collaboration (based on (1)); and (3) Completing a 4-phase scenario planning process (see for example HHL (www.scenario-planning.eu)) based on 1 and 2 (above) in order to (1) identify core problems and frame their analyses; (2) identify assumptions and models about regional collaboration; (3) discussing and evaluating current trends; and (4) developing scenarios for the "ideal" regional future. (Note: This approach was recently used by the ACSRC as part of a Land Use Planning and Municipal Governance project, and was extremely well-received by the 65+ municipal participants). Through the implementation of these 7 workshops, this project will support meeting the following objectives:

1. Increase rural dialogue and engagement with the concept, practices, opportunities and challenges of regional collaboration;
2. Increase inter-regional communication and knowledge sharing through the transfer of priorities, futures and success criteria;
3. Link regional economic development alliances and initiatives with both governance, economic, environmental, social and planning stakeholders at the regional level;
4. Engage Aboriginal community leadership with regional development and governance initiatives;
5. Create opportunities for regional collaborations and partnerships to build capacity, share knowledge and develop collaborative opportunities and initiatives;
6. Evaluation of prioritization and scenario planning methods through workshop and project evaluation;
7. Identify regionally-based needs, gaps, opportunities and capitals that support long-term community sustainability in rural Alberta.
Appendix B: Project Information and Consent to Participate Form

Rural Alberta Regional Collaboration Workshops
Given your experience and role as a community and/or government representative, you are being asked to participate in a workshop as part of a research study to further develop the collaborative capacity and regional cooperation in rural Alberta.

Objectives:
The objectives of this project are to: (1) increase rural dialogue and engagement with the concept, practices, opportunities and challenges or regional collaboration; (2) increase inter-regional communication and knowledge sharing through the transfer of priorities, futures and success criteria; (3) link regional economic development alliances and initiatives with both governance, economic, environmental, social and planning stakeholders at the regional level; (4) engage aboriginal community leadership with regional development and governance initiatives; (5) create opportunities for regional collaborations and partnerships to build capacity, share knowledge and develop collaborative opportunities and initiatives; (6) evaluation of prioritization and scenario planning methods through workshop and project evaluation; (7) identity regionally-based needs, gaps, opportunities and capitals that support long-term community sustainability in rural Alberta.

Background:
The data from these workshops will be one component of data collection. Your participation is totally voluntary, and you can withdraw at any time.

This one day workshop will give participants the opportunity to engage in three different exercises to help support and better enable regional collaboration in Alberta: (1) establishing criteria for identifying and prioritizing high-impact action areas; (2) establishing priority areas, themes, questions and actions for regional collaboration; and (3) completing a 4-phase scenario planning process based on 1 and 2.

Confidentiality and Data storage:
The data and results of this project are confidential. In no way will you be personally identified in any of the data collected, or in the results (reports, articles, papers, etc.). After the workshop is completed, confidential data (notes, etc.) will be stored (both hard and soft copies) in a locked cabinet in a locked storage room accessible only to departmental administrative staff. Electronic data are encrypted as per University of Alberta policy, and data will be destroyed after 5 years. Only trained ACSRC staff and the project team will have access to the data.

Benefits:
This project may not have any direct benefits for you. It is possible that you will become aware of new resources or capacity that are applicable to you, or your organization, to cope with challenges, areas of concern or areas where your
organization excels.

**Risks:**
Participating in this workshop may present some minor risks to you:
It is possible that the questions and discussion in this workshop may trigger unpleasant memories or experiences. If this is the case, you may withdraw at any time you choose (even if only for a few minutes) and we will remove your input (See below).

**Freedom to withdraw from the workshop:**
Even after you have agreed to participate, you can decide to withdraw or not complete the process. This can be done at any time, and we will remove your contribution from the data collected.

**Use of your Information:**
This project is being undertaken by the University of Alberta, with additional support being provided by part-time staff at the University of Alberta. This project is being funded by the Government of Alberta, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. The responses will be compiled and presented in a report, as well as in supporting documents required by the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. None of the reports will have your name or identifying information in them. Organizations will not be identified by name without prior written consent of appropriate personnel at that organization.

**Investigators:**
If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate contacting the persons listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lars Hallstrom, PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor &amp; Director, ACSRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments of Political Studies/Resource Economics and Environmental Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: (780) 679-1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:lars.hallstrom@ualberta.ca">lars.hallstrom@ualberta.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Contacts:**
If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a participant, or how this study is being conducted, you may contact the University of Alberta's Research Ethics Office at 780-492-2615. This office has no affiliation with the study investigators.

Thank you for your contribution to this research project!
CONSENT FORM

Do you understand that you have been asked to participate in a workshop as part of a research study to further develop the collaborative capacity and regional cooperation in rural Alberta?

YES  NO

Do you understand that the information collected in this workshop is part of a project led by University of Alberta personnel funded by the Government of Alberta, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development?

YES  NO

Do you understand the benefits and risks involved in taking part in this workshop?

YES  NO

Do you understand that you can choose to not participate, or you can choose to withdraw at any point during your participation in the process?

YES  NO

Do you understand that the information that you provide will be kept in strict confidence and that any link between your responses and your name/organization name will be destroyed?

YES  NO

Do you know that you can contact the researchers below if you have any questions about the research or the interview?

YES  NO

Do you give us (the researchers) permission to use the data and the information that you provided for the purposes specified?

YES  NO

Do you give us permission to use the data and the information that you provided in this workshop for future research and analysis?

YES  NO
I agree to take part in this workshop.

YES  NO

Name (please print):                                 Date:

Signature:

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate contacting the persons listed below.

Lars Hallstrom, PhD
Associate Professor & Director, ACSRC
Departments of Political Studies/Resource Economics and Environmental Sociology
University of Alberta
Phone: (780) 679-1661
Email: lars.hallstrom@ualberta.ca

Please Note:
The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines by a Research Ethics Board at the University of Alberta. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the Research Ethics Office at 780-492-2615
## Appendix C: Agenda

**Rural Alberta Regional Collaboration Workshops**  
**Funded by the Government of Alberta**  
**Hanna Learning Centre**  
**Hanna, AB**  
**Tuesday February 17, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:10</td>
<td>Welcome and Introduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10:10 – 11:00 | World Café  
|              | Identify potential areas for collaboration  
|              | High impact                                                              |
| 11:00 – 11:15 | Break                                                                    |
| 11:00 – 12:00 | Plenary Session  
|              | Top potential areas for regionalized collaboration                        |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | Lunch                                                                    |
| 13:00 – 13:40 | Regional Collaboration – what is the ideal future for this region?       |
| 13:40 – 14:20 | 1) Proximal and Distal Causes  
|              | 2) What are we missing?                                                  |
| 14:20 – 14:30 | Break                                                                    |
| 14:30 – 15:10 | Trends and Patterns                                                     |
| 15:10 – 16:00 | Plenary Discussions                                                      |
Appendix D: Workshop PowerPoint

Rural Alberta Regional Collaboration Workshop: Hanna
Dr. Lars Hallstrom, Trish Macklin and Willisa Reist
Alberta Centre for Sustainable Rural Communities
University of Alberta
Funding provided by Government of Alberta

Process of the Day

Welcome and Introduction
- Identify potential areas for collaboration
- Which of these areas has the highest impact

Plenary Session
- Which of these areas is the most critical, viable, or greatest impact for collaboration

World Café

What Scenario Planning is and isn’t
- Scenario planning is a tool
- Scenario planning is about exploring the future
- Scenario planning Does Not predict the future
- Scenario planning provides ‘clues’ for what could be key drivers of change
Regional Collaboration— What is a future for this region?
1. What values, principles, actions and structures are ideal for regional collaboration?
2. What does it look like and why does it matter?

What Affects Regional Collaboration: proximal/distal causes and what we are missing
1. Identify things that have immediate or arm length effects on regional collaboration and regionalization.
2. Distill between things that have influence over and things that happen to them.
3. What are the key elements along the way that we need to recognize that we often don’t recognize?
4. What do we know, know we don’t know, and what are we missing?
5. What are the things people aren’t thinking of in terms of regional and interregional relationships?
6. What are the implications of this knowledge?

Trends and Patterns
1. What are the trends?
2. What is likely in terms of this region and collaboration?
3. What are the trends in arm length variables identified in previous session?

Plenary Session
1. What is the best way to collaborate regionally?
2. What are your table’s top 2 ways to do that?

Contact Information:

Lars K. Holstrom
Chair
Alberta Centre for Sustainable Rural Communities
University of Alberta
Two Hills, AB
Email: lars.holstrom@ualberta.ca
Website: www.alsrc.ualberta.ca
Facebook: UCPA ALSRC
Twitter: @ALSRC