



# **Towards an Integrated Immigrant Services Delivery System in Durham Region**

Research and Considerations for  
Moving Forward

**August 2010 v.2**



***Towards an Integrated Immigrant Services Delivery System in Durham Region: Research and Considerations for the Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council***

© 2010 Community Development Council Durham, all rights reserved.

Copies of this document may be reproduced non-commercially for the purpose of community awareness or community development with appropriate recognition to the Community Development Council Durham (CDCD) . In all other cases, permission must be sought from CDCD.

**Copies of this report may be obtained from:**

Community Development Council Durham  
134 Commercial Avenue  
Ajax, Ontario, L1S 2H5  
Tel. (905) 686 – 2661  
Fax (905) 686 – 4157  
ssquire@cdcd.org

**Or Online at:**

[www.cdcd.org](http://www.cdcd.org)

**This report was prepared by:**

Peter Clutterbuck and Krista Lords  
PC Human Resources

Ben Earle, Sarah Squire and Megan Cramer  
Community Development Council Durham

Funding for this research generously provided by:



Citizenship and  
Immigration Canada

Citoyenneté et  
Immigration Canada

# Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Integrated Service Delivery	5
2.1 The Case for Integrated Immigrant Service Delivery	5
2.2 Overview of Literature on Integrated Service Delivery	7
3. Approaches to Integrated Service Delivery	10
3.1 Place-based Planning Approach to Integrated Service Delivery	10
3.1.1 Case Examples: Place-based Planning Approaches	12
3.2 System-Wide Collaborative Approaches to Integrated Settlement	14
3.3 Service Delivery Approaches to Integration	15
3.3.1 Community Hubs	15
3.3.2 Person-Centered Approaches	22
3.3.3 Client-Focused Approaches: Integrated Case Management	27
4. Considerations for Integrated Settlement Support Planning in Durham Region	29
4.1 The Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council	29
4.2 CIC's Modernized Approach	29
5. Current Community-Based Research	31
5.1 Methodology	31
5.2 Findings	32
5.3 Discussion	38
6. Conclusion and Recommendations	43
7. References	46
Appendix A – Interview Guide	49
Appendix B – Settlement Service Organizations in Durham	52

# 1. Introduction

The Region of Durham has experienced an unprecedented rate of growth and development over the past decade that has resulted in substantial changes to the social, cultural, economic, and political landscape of the Region and its municipalities. In the decade between 2000 and 2009 the population in the Region has increased by 29% and is projected to reach 624,250 in 2010 (Ontario Ministry of Finance, 2009). This growth is expected to continue at an average annual rate of 2% over the next 25 years to a total population of 1,028,780 in 2036 (Ontario Ministry of Finance, 2009). Currently, immigrants make up 20% of the overall population in Durham. Although this is lower than other Greater Toronto Area (GTA) communities (Peel and York for example), immigrants represent a significant proportion of the growing population in Durham, accounting for 34% of the total population increase that occurred in Durham between 2001 and 2006 (Earle, 2010). Of this group, 53.5% were recent immigrants, having arrived in Canada between 2001 and 2006 (Earle, 2010). This trend is expected to continue, with a conservative estimate predicting that the immigrant population in Durham will increase at an annual rate of 3% over the next 25 years, outpacing the annual growth of the population overall (Earle, 2010).

This growth has led to an increasingly diverse immigrant population living in Durham, as newcomers to Canada now tend to come from non-traditional source countries in East Asia, South Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. This trend has manifested in the growth of several ethnic communities in Durham. For example, the Latin American community in Durham grew by nearly 700% between 2001 and 2006 (Earle, 2008). This was followed by significant growth in ethnic populations coming from South Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe (Earle, 2008). This has also resulted in significant growth in the population of visible minorities in the Region.

From this brief overview of the data it is apparent that Durham Region is in a state of rapid change and diversification. Whereas previously the Region may have been viewed as a secondary settlement area for immigrants moving to the area from Toronto and other GTA communities, Durham is now receiving more recent immigrants than in the past. This trend may be an indication that it is becoming increasingly a primary settlement area or a first place of residence for many people. Another change, in step with overall Canadian immigration patterns, is that the source of the newcomer population is from a broader range of countries: many from South Asia, the Caribbean and other non-European countries. This is contributing to more racial, cultural and linguistic diversity in the population base of the Region (Earle, B., 2008).

As new and increasingly diverse communities continue to settle and grow in Durham they bring with them a wide array of needs and desires that ultimately create new and unique challenges for the existing social and health service infrastructure. In order to meet these challenges, several organizations who currently serve immigrants living in Durham came together in 2005 to form the Durham Consortium of Partners Serving Immigrants and started discussing options for a more cooperative, integrated and seamless approach to service delivery. The result was a submission in February 2007 of a proposal to Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) to fund the establishment of a Welcome Centre in the Region of Durham.

This proposal was ultimately turned down, and the feedback received from CIC at that time indicated that although the intention and vision were good, there was a need for a more defined and appropriate vision for an integrated approach to settlement services in Durham.

Accepting this feedback, the Consortium enlisted the assistance of independent consultant Merle Cole, a former HRSDC manager, who is well known to the partners and has extensive experience working in the Region of Durham, to assist in the facilitation of further discussions between the partners, and help in the redevelopment of the proposal. This decision was made to both expedite the process and clarify the position and vision of each of the partners.

To this end, Merle met with each organization in turn to discuss and clarify their individual visions for a Welcome Centre model in Durham, and gathered feedback on the types of programs, services, and facilities that they believe should be part of this model. He also collected feedback on a potential governance and management structure for the centre. This information was compiled and presented for discussion at a Consortium meeting in December 2007.

The key decisions that came from these discussions were:

1. That there was common acknowledgement of the need to develop an integrated service delivery model for settlement services in the Region of Durham that would help to facilitate organizational cooperation in the successful integration of newcomers in our community.
2. That as the primary agency delivering core settlement services in the Region the Community Development Council Durham was best positioned to take on the role of lead partner on this initiative.
3. That although there was a common vision for moving forward there were many details to be worked out in order for an appropriate model, that is specific to the needs of Durham and its residents, to be developed.

In response to the third conclusion from these consultations, the Community Development Council Durham submitted a proposal to CIC in February 2008 asking for financial support for a more in-depth research process that would allow for the identification of current models for integrated service delivery and for the inclusion of community stakeholders that had been excluded from the original planning process. This report is the result of this process.

## **2. Integrated Service Delivery**

Within the context of this report, the term 'integrated service delivery' refers to any model of delivering programs and services to clients wherein two or more organizations collaborate by coordinating their knowledge, skills, and service delivery goals. Integrated service delivery can be as simple as sharing information between agencies or as complex as joint programming or co-location. The purpose of this approach is to improve efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery, to the benefit of clients and front-line workers alike. The following sections provide further details on the way this approach applies to immigrant and settlement services.

### ***2.1 The Case for Integrated Immigrant Service Delivery***

The search for effective integrated service delivery models arises from several sources. Foremost are the experiences of those whose settlement depends on adequate services. In many cases, people are:

- unaware of where to turn to get what they need;

- unable to find what they need on their own from the service base in the community; and/or
- encountering a maze of service agencies and programs that they do not know how to navigate without assistance.

A report undertaken by a consortium of social planning and ethno-specific agencies in Toronto concluded that...

*There is presently no “seamless service delivery system” that responds to the needs of people in an intentional way. Instead, service is compartmentalized and fragmented across different “delivery outlets”, and participants feel they are unnecessarily shuttled back and forth across the system with so many confusing and artificial program boundaries. (Integrated Settlement Planning Consortium [ISPC], 2000, p. 68)*

Funders and service agencies themselves look to more integrated service delivery as a way to better use the resources available for service responses. The interests of government and private foundation funders are obvious in this respect. There is a bit more circumspection in the service agency world, since service coordination and integration models tend to favour the larger providers over the smaller, especially ethno-specific agencies in the community. Recent Local Immigration Partnership initiatives in Ontario have shown sensitivity to this concern by developing collaborative approaches that are more inclusive and respectful of the diversity in the service agency base (St. Stephen’s Community House, 2009; DeCoito, 2010).

In recent years, researchers and policy analysts have pointed to serious limitations to settlement support policies and funding patterns. They note the focus of settlement support on three things: one, short-term needs such as language training; two, the expectation that support for settlement can be concentrated over a three-to-five year period for newcomers to become acculturated to their new home; and three, funding patterns that have shifted from core support to categorical and contract funding for community-based agencies (Richmond & Omidvar, 2003).

A report of a family services agency in London, Ontario identifies 29 barriers to effective settlement ranging from fundamental needs such as finances, employment and housing to racism, lack of social networks, fear of institutional authorities (e.g. approaching schools regarding their children’s education) and many others far beyond the basic instrumental needs of effective communication in one of the official languages (Wraparound Initiative Diversity Project, 2005). These numerous barriers that are associated with individual, community and systemic factors, demonstrate the need for a service system that addresses the person as a whole within a broader system.

A longer-term perspective on the settlement process emphasizes even further the importance of more coordinated or integrated support systems. Basic needs for stability - such as housing and employment supports, including training and education as well as language programs - are critical. Successful settlement must take the long view through several stages that stabilize the newcomer’s situation upon arrival and facilitate the development of his/her capacities - not only for acculturation but for his/her eventual contribution - socially, economically and culturally - to life in the community and Canada. Briefly, these stages are:

1. Immediate stabilization involving *“needs for assistance with reception services such as food, clothing, shelter, orientation about Canada . . . along with translation and interpreting and initial language instruction”* (Mwarigha, 2002, p. 9).

2. Intermediate support for entry into the labour market - not just for self-supporting employment but for career paths - suitable housing (e.g. affordable, decent and appropriate for family size), access to legal, health and education services and, more frequently, employment-specific language instruction.
3. Final acculturation that includes active participation in and contribution to community life.

Integrated settlement service delivery may be very important in the first two stages when the immigrant and her/his family may be relying more on formal human services, but the delivery of these supports effectively at that time also offer opportunity to help newcomers make connections and build bridges to other social networks that will facilitate the third stage of their settlement.

The long-term perspective on settlement support demands a highly responsive and adaptive service system. Service coordination and integration within each stage would be challenging enough, but the system should also provide a smooth transition through the stages. The Canadian Council of Refugees (1998) offers a general test for integrated service delivery in settlement support, proposing the following as best practice values in integrating service practices:

<input type="checkbox"/> Access	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural sensitivity
<input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Community development
<input type="checkbox"/> Client empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration
<input type="checkbox"/> User-defined services	<input type="checkbox"/> Accountability
<input type="checkbox"/> Holistic approach	<input type="checkbox"/> Orientation towards positive change
<input type="checkbox"/> Respect for the individual	<input type="checkbox"/> Reliability

## ***2.2 Overview of Literature on Integrated Service Delivery***

Service integration can be described as a mixture of strategies pursued to achieve a better delivery of services, whether these are operational changes at the frontline level or behind-the-scenes administrative changes (Ragan, 2003).

Ellen Konrad (1996) explains service integration as a process, situating:

- information sharing and communication (loosely structured connections) at one end of a continuum,
- with cooperation and coordination (moderately structured connections) in the middle, and
- collaboration and integration (highly structured connections) sitting at the furthest end of the continuum.

In Ontario, the *Healthy Babies, Healthy Children Program* (Robinson et al., 2002) adapts this continuum into the following stages from least structured to most structured and formalizes it in a five-point evaluation scale:

- 1) *Awareness: Separate and independent agencies in a community know about each other's services but no mutual effort is made in service delivery or in active*

*communication.*

- 2) *Communication: Agencies in the community have active programs of communication and information sharing.*
- 3) *Cooperation: Agencies use their knowledge of other services to guide and modify their own service planning in order to avoid duplication of services.*
- 4) *Collaboration: Agencies jointly plan the common use of administrative services and/or the offering of services to families and actively modify their own service activity based on advice and input from their mutual discussions.*
- 5) *Integration: Agencies join together to offer a new, fused service which draws on the service strengths offered in the participating agencies, but does so in a form in which the contributing agencies are no longer clearly and separately identifiable.*

While collaboration may be limited to joint planning among organizations, actual service coordination and certainly service integration suggests a formal agreement between two or more autonomous organizations – which creates a new trans-organizational structure/system built on a common agenda, purpose and/or program (O’Farrell & Reszczynski, 2010).

Knowledge of system-wide integration is limited by the fact that most service integration efforts have been based on collaboration around particular programs rather than a broader systems approach (Browne et al., 2004). What is known and suggested by the research is that amalgamation of organizations is not essential for integrated service delivery.

Alternatively, recent attempts at service integration in Ontario suggest that integration depends on whether actors involved can move beyond divisions related to funding, turf, and autonomy towards trust building and whether those in leadership positions support the move towards integration (Browne et al., 2004; Southern Alberta Child and Youth Health Network, 2002).

*Focused Integration* is the term used to describe targeted development of relationships, in which some members develop multiple ties and are more closely connected to the network, compared to others whose engagement might be characterized as more peripheral or periodic in nature (Lynn O’Farrell-Howie, 2010).

The impact of integrated service systems on clients or community members is unknown (Ragan, 2003; Southern Alberta Child and Youth Health Network, 2002). Despite minimal concrete evidence on the beneficial outcomes of service integration on clients and a lack of cases of fully integrated systems from which to draw lessons, a handful of research studies have collected the views of institutional leaders on the key factors facilitating system integration.

Several factors for successful integrated services delivery are identified in the following:

- twelve case studies involving either shared services or service delivery collaborations in a number of jurisdictions throughout North America and Europe (Centre for Technology in Government, 2004);
- a review of five case studies of joined-up services in Great Britain (National Audit Office, 2001);
- a study of service system integration in twelve U.S. states (Ragan, 2003); and
- a survey of over 150 senior government and NGO officials from across Canada (Crossing Boundaries National Council, 2006).



Based on these studies of self-reported learning's by senior leaders in human services systems employing integrated service delivery models, it would appear that effective service integration entails the following primary elements:

- **Clearly defined, shared goals:** It is hard to fly a plane if two co-pilots are steering in different directions. Excitement about partnering may mask different perceptions about what is the purpose of the common initiative. It is necessary to make the goals explicit and without any ambiguity, preferably through a formal document of agreement.
- **Leadership:** There not only needs to be buy-in and support from the top, but also a willingness to champion the partnership and to mobilize a collaborative approach across the partnering organizations, ensuring the goals of the partnership are understood and actively supported at all levels.
- **Measuring performance:** Goals that are both understandable and arrived at by consensus need to be made concrete in the form of outcome indicators. Having clear indicators will allow participants to see where progress is being made; in essence providing feedback on whether things are working or not, and prodding change where necessary.
- **Strong communication, effective coordination and positive working relationships:** Good partnerships rely not only on each partner's ability to carry out their own function well, but also on the ability of each partner to work well with each other. Partnership work is not a series of discrete, disconnected tasks, but the interplay and conjunction of tasks.
- **Resources:** The synergy caused by collaboration (that is, the capacity to do more and/or to do it more effectively), does not by itself generate the resources to make it so, although parties entering partnerships sometimes seem to feel that will be the case. Partnerships require the dedication of staff, resources and time to realize their goals.
- **Trust:** Trust makes partnerships possible, because of the need to rely on the other partner. Trust needs to be assumed at the outset, but it also needs to be earned and supported.

Supporting considerations to the preceding primary elements for successful integration include:

- good management skills;
- staff who are trained in the management of relationships with agency partners; and
- a governance structure for the partnership that enables problem-solving and decision-making, within the context of a flexible, yet stable, environment.

The literature also identifies many barriers to system integration. The most pressing challenges are:

- **Power and Status.** Members will report differences in terms of organizational as well as individual power which, depending on how these realities are addressed (e.g. inclusive membership, consensus-based processes) will determine the effectiveness of collaborations. Those with more power will need to be willing to subordinate agency goals to those of the larger partnership.
- **Professional and/or Organizational Priorities.** Differences in individual and

organizational philosophies, as well as the inability of members to identify common goals (referred to in the literature as 'domain similarity') interfere with effective service collaboration. The degree of consensus is important to understand from the perspective of network behaviour, since front-line workers must be cognizant of the goals of their employer as well as the larger network.

- **Benefits vs. Costs.** Participants must clearly see that the benefits of collaboration - to their clients and their organizations - outweigh the costs (short and long term), if networks are to remain effective and sustainable.

Not unexpectedly, many of these barrier factors are inter-related to the preceding success factors. For example, clear and open communication is contingent upon strong relationships, which also speaks to issues of trust. Trust in turn, is associated with social capital, including but not limited to those issues relating to power and status.

### **3. Approaches to Integrated Service Delivery**

#### ***3.1 Place-based Planning Approach to Integrated Service Delivery***

Community or local level planning approaches are an important element of building a more integrated immigrant settlement system. Prior to the Local Immigration Partnership (LIP) processes, planning primarily took place at the level of individual organizations (Integrated Settlement Planning Consortium, 2000). Establishing planning structures and processes at the local level will provide the opportunity for two things to happen:

- 1) setting priorities for service delivery appropriate to local conditions and circumstances, and
- 2) creating local instruments of accountability for how resources are used and how services are delivered (ISPC, 2000).

Place-based approaches to planning and policy-making fit quite well with the current emphasis within immigrant settlement policy on local areas as best positioned to plan service delivery systems. Furthermore, place-based approaches cast light on principles and methods towards the integration of services.

Place-based planning is grounded in the belief that "*places are social constructs and that individuals help to give meaning to particular locations. Place is something that can be nurtured and reshaped through individual and collective effort*" (MacLellan, 2008, p. 4).

On an applied level, and in relation to new directions in planning and policy, place-based approaches refer to processes where people who have a connection to or live in a local area work together on a collaborative basis to develop or shape their place or community (Gillen, 2004). Policies developed exclusively by upper levels of government are not "*integrated place-sensitive solutions*" (Bradford, 2005, p. 10). The alternative to top-down policy directives is building new ways for government, civil society, and economy-based actors to work collaboratively together in ways that attend to the assets, needs, and concerns of diverse groups within the community (Bradford, 2005). Thus, place-based planning is driven by community needs and concerns generating locally appropriate and responsive solutions (Bradford, 2005; Torjman, 2007; Nilsen, 2005).

A place-based framework is congruent on some levels with Citizenship and Immigration Canada's Local Immigration Partnership strategy. Explicit in this strategy is the idea that the

local context matters in terms of the nature of the problems, the stakeholders and the development of solutions. The engagement of local stakeholders in a collaborative planning process creates the opportunity to establish and strengthen relationships, which should serve to increase the potential for more coordinated and integrated service delivery. Bradford (2005) contends that the most innovative solutions will be those which are *“integrated interventions that respond to location-specific challenges and engage fully the ideas and resources of residents”* (p. 8).

### **Newcomers as Stakeholders in Planning**

Place-based planning, applied to the newcomer settlement support field, suggests the active participation of immigrants in local planning processes. Immigrants settling in an area are well positioned to define and give meaning to the place from their experience and to develop priorities for action that would facilitate successful settlement (MacLellan, 2008; Nilsen, 2005). MacLellan (2008) proposes that since cities, such as Toronto, are increasingly populated by immigrants and people from diverse communities, immigrants should be participants in the planning process. One benefit of inclusive planning processes is the opportunity to tap into the existing local social networks - in this case immigrant networks - and to build on these (MacLellan, 2008).

Milroy and Wallace (2004) agree, emphasizing that *“[as] immigration continues to change the mix of municipalities...inclusive participation practices are a minimum requirement for planning”* (p. 3). They add that, since the ethno-cultural composition of the population is always changing, it is critical that representatives of these groups be involved in planning. This way, planning decisions are more likely to reflect demographic changes and associated needs (Milroy & Wallace, 2004). Their measure of truly inclusive participation is *“who sits around the table when decisions are made”* (Milroy & Wallace, 2004).

### **Collaboration as Key to Integrated Solutions**

Place-based thinkers see collaboration as a mechanism for developing place sensitive solutions. Effective collaborative efforts require trust between those involved. Torjman contends that relationships of trust which lay the foundation for social action and positive outcomes *“can be built locally and only in neighbourhoods and communities”* (2007, p. 3).

Collaboration enables the development of integrated strategies and solutions. Currently challenges or problems are addressed in silos or as if they are separate and independent factors, whereas most problems are connected to several interrelated factors and entail a *“set of interwoven strategies”* (Torjman, 2007, p. 14). Collaborative or integrated efforts create conditions and *“bridging mechanisms”* that facilitate the coming together of various organizations and actors connected to different factors (Torjman, 2007, p. 14).

Traditionally, funding practices have given advantage to the more established and larger agencies and in the process have *“neglect[ed] strategies for developing acceptance of newcomers in the community or of supporting the active participation of immigrants in the full range of activities that make up community and civic life”* (Integrated Settlement Planning Report (ISPR), Consortium, 2000, p. 72). In its focus groups research with immigrants to Toronto, the ISPR Consortium identified the importance of planning a service system that assigns ethno-cultural service providers a key role in the system. Inclusion of ethno-specific providers also benefits the service system at large insofar as these players are able to support a *“culturally appropriate system of delivery”* (ISPC, 2000, p. 77). In the eyes of the ISPR Consortium, the first responsibility of any settlement planning body should be *“to design a settlement support system that would optimize the strengths of the various stakeholders”* such as these actors (ISPR Consortium, 2000, p. 81).

### **3.1.1 Case Examples: Place-based Planning Approaches**

**Peel Newcomer Strategy Group** The Peel Newcomer Strategy Group (PNSG) has embraced a place-based approach as part of its role as a catalyst or facilitator of systems change in Peel. Since the formation of this group, measures have been taken that demonstrate a commitment to building on local knowledge and assets. Peel is comprised of over 70 ethno-specific organizations and many of these are service providers. Newcomer communities have established an infrastructure of support and service provision, both formal and informal. The PNSG recognizes this asset and also the value this diversity of services brings to Peel Region. The group actively seeks ways to build on this local knowledge and expertise (P. DeCoito, personal communication, February 2, 2010).

Despite this emphasis, a focus on building upon local knowledge and assets does not replace, but rather complements, more technical expertise. For example, the PNSG contracted several researchers to examine various aspects of settlement patterns and needs in Peel and for newcomers in general (DeCoito, 2010).

Recognition of the diversity and large number of ethno-specific organizations and service providers has been critical to the Peel settlement system planning process, and will be a significant factor as the settlement sector moves towards more integrated models of delivery (DeCoito, 2010).

Increasingly in Peel Region, newcomers access support through informal resources such as cultural groups, faith groups, and social networks. Though less structured and with limited financial capacity, these providers have many assets that make them a strong option for those new to the area. These informal sources of support *“tend to accommodate the newcomers’ preferences for engaged support structures, offering face-to-face, one-on-one supports in comfortable, accessible settings in their own language in ways that were responsive to their cultural expectations”* (Peel Newcomer Strategy Group [PNSG], 2009, p. 22).

The PNSG plans to become either a permanent planning body in the future, or a *“central coordinating mechanism”* (DeCoito, 2010). Its role will be an advisory one, to provide suggestions regarding collaboration and cooperation and also assess the state of service development. At this point in time, its role is being loosely shaped so that eventually organizations in the Peel Region will play a central role in shaping the model. This loose planning structure thus far creates an opportunity for ethno-cultural service providers to influence the model and thereby participate in the planning process (DeCoito, 2010).

**Smart Settlement Community Engagement Model** The Policy Roundtable Mobilizing Professions and Trades (PROMPT), proposes a policy framework or model for effective immigrant settlement. Rather than viewing immigrants as merely a source of labour, they are viewed in this model as partners in community building and in their own settlement process (Policy Roundtable Mobilizing Professions and Trades [PROMPT], 2005). This model, adopted in a few communities, takes a long term view of the settlement process. It stands apart from the current settlement system, predominantly concerned with helping immigrants settle in the initial period.

What is necessary for sustainable settlement to communities, according to the model designers, is *“a move from focusing only on the initial settlement cycle stage of ‘welcome’ services, to the full spectrum of enabling and employing community connections and access to local social, political and economic institutions”* (PROMPT, 2005, p. 22). In their view, particularly in smaller cities where immigrants tend not to stay for the longer term, effective settlement necessitates that immigrants become partners in community building;

that they build a stake in and contribute to the development of the community (PROMPT, 2005). If Durham is in fact becoming a primary settlement area, retention of immigrants and sustainability questions are particularly relevant. Although communities may not wish to adopt the PROMPT model of community engagement wholly, it stands as one alternative to the current model.

This community engagement model of sustainable settlement is based on a number of strategies:

- 1) Leadership - Developing multi-stakeholder leadership initiatives to shape community development processes and to work towards the goal of fostering immigrant engagement.
- 2) Social Capital - Taking proactive approaches to linking immigrants into community networks. This social capital development benefits both the newcomers and the host community.
- 3) Human Capital – Host communities should create proper linkages to learning networks and institutions.
- 4) Community-Driven Action – Involving newcomers in community-driven action, as stakeholders and partners, creates a sense of belonging. (PROMPT, 2005)

This community engagement model for settlement is clearly one that builds on the assets of newcomers; it takes a long-term view of the settlement process and it benefits whole communities in addition to facilitating newcomer settlement.

**Mental Health Systems Change Towards a Recovery Model** The Waterloo-Wellington-Dufferin Region prioritized user participation in its eight-member multi-organizational partnership. It was formed with the goal of creating policies and practices which will improve case management services based on a recovery model (Support Coordination Committee [SCC], 2008). User involvement in community system planning is a key element and mechanism for systems change, in that user participation occurs at multiple levels. The goal of service user participation - in areas of advocacy, system design, and governance - and hiring of service users as case management staff is built into the evaluation system (a service and system logic model). User involvement is institutionalized into the process. A further example of this is that the committee of mental health partners - the Support Coordination Management Committee - developed a set of principles and values of recovery to which all relevant policies and services of the partnership would be accountable. The Self Help Alliance, an independent self-help umbrella organization, authored the Values and Principles document, acknowledging a community-run organization as an equal partner in the network (SCC, 2008).

**West Downtown Toronto Settlement Service Strategy Planning Project** Building trust is an important element in collaboration; the presence of trust enables partners to work effectively and productively together. Yet, achieving trust is challenging in an environment where funding regimes and other factors encourage competition between stakeholders. The West Downtown Toronto Settlement Service Strategy (WDTSSS) Planning Project is a collaborative partnership comprised of more than twenty organizations, ranging from small to large. These partners have worked together over the last two years in a process of trust building. Senior management commitment to this extended planning process has resulted in consensus on a strong statement of principles and values, the generation of learnings on effective collaborative and participatory planning, and the identification of best practices in partnerships and collaborations (St. Stephen's Community House, 2009).

The WDTSSS Steering Committee clearly communicated that this initiative is fully committed to a client-centered, “*no one left behind*” approach that “*recognizes the unique contributions of different agencies, and the importance of different areas of service expertise, cultural expertise, and generational expertise*” (St. Stephen’s Community House, 2009, p. 14; B. Sinclair, personal communication, January, 29, 2010). The Project’s Statement of Project Principles and Values to guide the initiative includes a commitment to respect the diverse character of existing settlement services in West Toronto, saying:

*We believe that the diversity of groups and agencies working in downtown west Toronto – including large and small agencies, multi-service and single service agencies, and multicultural and ethno-specific agencies – is a strength we want to build on. Respecting our individual contributions, insights and challenges is essential to working together* (St. Stephen’s Community House, 2009, p. 11).

### **3.2 System-Wide Collaborative Approaches to Integrated Settlement**

In respect to settlement approaches, particularly for skilled immigrants, some communities are beginning to develop coordinated strategies beyond simply bringing service providers together. This trend raises the question for communities designing their settlement systems around who should be engaged in their systems and what players might be included in a truly system-wide approach.

The Maytree Foundation and Naomi Alboim (2002) propose a system-wide approach for assisting skilled immigrants into their fields and into the labour market. Since the main goal of skilled immigrants is to secure a job in their field or in a related field, Alboim proposes that all labour market related players be engaged in system-wide collaborations. Maytree believes that an integrated system can only work and assist people in realizing their career objectives if approaches involve all key stakeholders (Alboim, 2002).

Stakeholders might include service providers, colleges, universities, employers, employer associations, professional associations, regulators, and the list could continue. Maytree proposes that “*the multiplicity of players and complex jurisdictional roles present special challenges in achieving a truly integrated system*” (Alboim, 2002, p. 7). When all key stakeholders are engaged in the process, “*we ensure the right mix and quality of programs, services and practices to expedite the labour market entry of skilled immigrants to Canada*” (p. 14).

In line with this recommendation, some initiatives already recognize the importance of involving all relevant stakeholders. One example of this is the Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council (TRIEC), a multi-stakeholder council involving government, employer, and community-based organizations. Bringing this diversity of players to the table is a unique model (Fong, 2009). The goal of TRIEC is to “*facilitate the entry of skilled immigrants into the labour market*” (p. 2).

As communities bring together service providers to plan and implement settlement systems, it may be helpful to think broadly in terms of the range of stakeholders involved in a system (Alboim, 2002). Some questions to consider are: How important is it to involve a particular stakeholder in the system? What will it take for a stakeholder to be involved? While Maytree has developed this system-wide approach based on one group of newcomers, skilled immigrants, this also more generally provides an example of the kind of thinking and strategy required for a system approach.

A few key points are made, by Alboim (2002), regarding how to develop a successful multi-stakeholder collaboration. One of the key recommendations for successfully bringing stakeholders to the table and keeping them there is being clear on what are the incentives and supports needed for each stakeholder to maintain a level of engagement. The system-wide approach is sustainable, in their view, because of the incentives for each of those involved. Put differently, in a system-wide approach, stakeholders have a clear sense of their role and the benefits of participation. Another point worth highlighting from this report is the suggestion that successful collaborations rely not only on incentives for stakeholders, but on *“clear accountabilities, identified leadership roles and a spirit of collaboration”* (p. 15).

### **3.3 Service Delivery Approaches to Integration**

The literature indicates that integrated service delivery can occur at the organizational, the program operations or the client level, although the objective in all cases is to provide the individual/family in need with responsive and adaptive support that is appropriate and continuous for as long as the support is required. It is difficult to find fully integrated service systems at the organizational level; however, several models have emerged at the program operations and the client levels.

**Community hubs** and other related models that emphasize an accessible, non-stigmatizing location in which multiple agencies are based and/or operate are a good example of service coordination or integration at the program level.

**Person-centered planning** and case coordination and other forms of **client-focused case management** bring the various service agency capacities to bear around the individual/family and thus create at least the opportunity for integrated service delivery.

These approaches will be reviewed following an exploration of their application to integrated service delivery in the settlement service sector. It should be noted that these approaches need not be mutually exclusive.

#### **3.3.1 Community Hubs**

Community hubs are multi-service facilities that *“provide a focal point for service delivery and community development”* (Public Interest, 2008, p. 3). The goals established by The United Way of Toronto in developing hubs throughout the city, effectively capture the key elements of a community hub. The *“aim is to develop effective multi-service partnerships, combining co-located agencies in dedicated space, a roster of agencies using space on an intermittent basis, flexible community space, and governance and engagement structures that ensure that they are accountable and responsive to the communities they serve”* (Public Interest, 2008, p. 3). Hubs may be housed in community centres, schools, libraries or health centres. The hub design not only draws on a range of services but also allows for the use of community space in the following ways: program provision (e.g. language instruction, employment training), community group functions and activities, office accommodation for community organizations, etc. (Farrell, Taylor & Tennant, 2002; Richardson, 2008; Valdez, 2007; Bertrand, 2007; Klahow-eya Aboriginal Centre of SACS, 2007).

A community hub can be perceived by its users/participants as more than a service provider but also as a locally-based community resource that attracts participants as well as service users and employs a community development orientation. In the Peel Region planning process for a newcomer support strategy, the creation of locally-based community hubs were tailored to the demographic composition of the neighbourhood.

Recommendations were as follows:

- *Encourage hub models that draw on community capacity and local social networks to guide hub priorities and shape hub policies.*
- *Develop hubs as community centres designed to not only offer services, but also to increase connections between community members, build local social capital, and provide a venue for the development of new skills (PNSG, 2009, p. 6).*

### **Common Hub Principles and Methods**

Research and evidence for hub models with regard to immigrant settlement is thus far scarce. On the other hand, the literature on hubs across diverse sectors points towards a number of principles and methods that guide the development of hubs. These include:

- Community hubs depend on strong partnerships and collaboration.
- Community hubs are usually hosted by a lead organization among a set of partners -- an established agency that serves as trustee (financial responsibility), administrator (oversight of shared support staff and office services to multiple agencies), and property management for the hub facility.
- Community hubs bring together agencies in a way that improves access to information among clients but also among workers from different agencies.
- Community hubs promote a "*seamless continuum of services*" in that they de-emphasize the specific service provider and take advantage of the partnership commitment and the physical proximity of other providers in the same location to emphasize finding the appropriate response to the individual/family need.
- Community hubs are locally based and, thus, can be shaped according to community needs and assets.
- Community hubs have a flexible, community development orientation and thus are adaptable to the changing environment.
- Community hubs optimize the creative use of physical space in both formal program delivery and informal community use.

(Farrell, Taylor & Tennant, 2002; Richardson, 2008; Valdez, 2007; Bertrand, 2007; Klahow-eya Aboriginal Centre of SACS, 2007)

### **Benefits for Integrated Services Delivery**

While the benefits of a hub model will depend on the structure, practices, and aim of the hub in question, some of the general benefits of a hub model reflect stated limitations of the settlement sector service delivery system. Some include:

- Single point of access to a range of services
- Clients are more aware of the kinds and range of services available
- Better coordination of service delivery as hubs allow for more interaction between organizations and sectors, more collaboration and referral systems based on both organizational and practitioner relationships.
- Possibility for capacity building of services involved, with exchanges of knowledge and practices among the service workers that occurs in shared space.
- Better access to space for meetings, events, community organizing, etc.



- Cost-efficiencies resulting from co-locating multiple providers in one physical space and providing a central administrative function (e.g. shared maintenance and office services). (Clemons & Smith, 2007; Bertram, Pascal, Bokhari, Gasper, & Holtermann, 2002)

### **Hub model as Venue for Integration**

The Community Hub model of social service delivery can be seen as a kind of *bridging mechanism* that has potential to facilitate some level of integration between interrelated programs or services that may have traditionally been administered separately and independently. It provides a structure for cross-agency or cross-sector collaboration focused on more effectively, seamlessly, and holistically serving clients.

Perhaps it is an open question whether hubs, in themselves, are the key to a more integrated system or whether hubs are one component of a more integrated system. In answering this question, the BSN Evaluation Report (2010) describes Best Start Networks as the key drivers of system integration while viewing hubs as a venue for integration (Farrell-Howie, 2010). The Best Start Network is a strong collaboration involving Government, the health sector, the education sector, community children and family services, post-secondary institutions, and parents and families. The Network came into being for the purpose of maximizing the potential of children and families locally. It was in place prior to the agencies organizing their service delivery functions into 13 school-based hubs throughout Sudbury (Farrell-Howie, 2010). This example suggests that the strength of a collaborative planning process that establishes and builds working relationships among partners may enhance the chance of success in creating and operating a community hub.

### **Variations on the Hub Model**

There are different hub models in terms of how agencies or organizations are connected to the hub. For example, agencies may be an “anchor” tenant, or one of several tenants, or residing in the hub on a more temporary basis (Clemons & Smith, 2007; Bertram et al., 2002). There are many variations on the role of the trustee partner in a hub. For example, the trustee agency may be formally responsible for financial management, but still be an equal partner in respect to decision-making. Alternatively, the trustee agency may have or be given a greater amount of authority over decisions (Public Interest, 2008). There are a wide range of practices in terms of levels and ways of including clients or the community in governance and planning. Users may be involved at the level of providing input, mainly, or they may be in key governance roles.

### **Case Examples: Community Hubs**

Looking at selected case examples offers perspective on the range of hub models, practices, and lessons to be learned. The purpose of this discussion is to touch on issues such as governance practices, to gain a sense of the range of hub approaches rather than understanding in full detail, each case example.

*Welcome Centre Immigrant Services:* The Welcome Centre Immigrant Services, in York Region, was set up to create “a coordinated, one-stop concept that would provide all services to assist immigrants under one-roof and was proposed as one way to support their need for information, assistance and resources in a welcoming, culturally-sensitive way” (<http://www.welcomecentre.ca/about/background.html>). Welcome Centre managers refer to the model as a collaboration or partnership (R. Cazzola & V. Martin, personal communication, February, 8, 2010). This case example represents a highly structured collaboration and service delivery model.

*East Scarborough Storefront:* The East Scarborough Storefront (ESS) can be characterized as a one-stop shop model of community services delivery, with services delivered by a wide range of organizations, agencies, and service providers housed in one location (Public Interest, 2008). This example represents a less formalized partnership model with a strong community participation and engagement component.

*Best Start Community Hubs:* The Greater Sudbury Best Start Network (BSN) is implementing 13 Best Start Community Hubs in Sudbury. This is an initiative involving a wide array of partners and players including school boards and schools, municipalities, health organizations, daycares, social planning agencies and other nonprofit organizations (Farrell-Howie, 2010). This example approaches a fully integrated service system with the engagement of many community children's service providers and public institutions and is an attempt at full geographic coverage of the Sudbury area.

*Peel Newcomer Strategy Group:* The Peel Newcomer Strategy Group is in the early stages of planning and redesigning Peel Region's newcomer settlement system after conducting extensive research and consultations with communities and stakeholders in the Region (DeCoito, 2010). The idea of implementing a hub in Peel Region is in its infancy, and therefore is not yet a fully developed model to draw upon. This example is mentioned because the general hub design being conceived may be of interest to Durham since, like Peel, Durham's immigrant population is growing rapidly.

### **Governance Structure and Mechanisms**

The Welcome Centre Immigrant Services collaboration of five large organizations is not incorporated, so that it operates without a board of directors. Instead, there is a lead governance committee comprised of the managers of the Welcome Centre and executive directors of the five partner agencies, with the chair appointed by the governance committee. The partnership is headed by one agency, COSTI, selected in part because it is "*highly viable on its own to be able to assume the responsibilities involved in such a project*" (Cazzola & Martin, 2010). The other agencies, to be involved as partners, needed to have the capacity to support the model from an infrastructural perspective. Executive directors from the partner organizations hold responsibility for the overall operation and management of the centre and develop organizational policies (Cazzola & Martin, 2010). There is also a committee of program managers, drawn from the partner organizations, and a committee of front line staff (Public Interest, 2008).

It is generally acknowledged among the partners of the Welcome Centre collaborative that the first Centre, now located in Vaughan and under the organizational lead of COSTI, will likely be followed by four or five additional Welcome Centres spread throughout the geographically vast and increasingly diverse York Region (Cazzola & Martin, 2010). Additional Centres will create the opportunity for other agencies among the partnership to assume a lead organizational role and to build on the learning from this first initiative in Vaughan.

East Scarborough Storefront's governance structure includes a Steering Committee comprised of both partner agencies and residents. The trustee agency sits permanently on the Steering Committee. Accountability for financial issues sits with the trustee agency though the Steering Committee may be consulted on financial questions. Partnership agencies participate in governance decisions as they are able to provide advice to the steering committee (Public Interest, 2008).

### **Human Resources / Staff Management**

At Welcome Centre Immigrant Services, a "*matrix management*" model is employed where

front line staff report to their supervisors in their home agencies and relay to the Welcome Centre Manager operational questions at the site. The Welcome Centre Manager does not have authority over service workers employed by the partner agencies and based at the Centre, although they do have the chance to provide input to the performance evaluations of front-line staff based at the Centre (Cazzola & Martin, 2010). The Manager does oversee the administrative support staff that supports the Welcome Centre's shared operations. Since COSTI is the lead partner agency, staff of the Centre not associated with one of the partners is employed by COSTI. Front-line staff from the partner agencies based at the Centre adheres to the policies, mission statement, and values of the Welcome Centre as established by the Governance Committee of executive directors (Public Interest, 2008). In terms of hiring, all executive directors from the partner agencies are involved in hiring managers, administrative and support positions, while frontline staff members are hired by their home agencies (Cazzola & Martin, 2010).

At the East Scarborough Storefront, staff from each of the organizations work independently in their own programs, and though not supervised by ESS management, the ESS staff might share feedback from the community regarding service provision issues or needs (Public Interest, 2008).

### **Space Sharing Arrangements**

Space is made available at the ESS, without a fee, to service providers and community organizations. Use of the space requires that organizations are able to work within the values set out by the ESS and participate in quarterly meetings (Public Interest, 2008). Yet, under this model, organizations do not depart from their original mandate but generally make independent decisions regarding the services and programs that they deliver on-site at the Storefront (Public Interest, 2008).

In the Welcome Centre collaboration the lead agency, COSTI, is the lease holder while the five partners pay for space, and other resource use, based on the amount used (Public Interest, 2008). Other, more temporary organizations using the space are brought in through a 'hoteling' process where agencies apply and decisions are made primarily based on whether organizations serve a clear need (Cazzola & Martin, 2010). 'Hoteling' may involve a short- or long-term presence depending on the need for the service. Some 'hoteling' arrangements are for the delivery of programs or services at the Centre on a weekly basis or a seasonal schedule. Paying rent is an option but not required for use of the space and these organizations can use Welcome Centre resources within reason. After a three-month probation period organizations can stay for one year at which time space use will be looked at for renewal and alteration should different needs be determined as requiring support through the 'hoteling' capacity of the Centre (Public Interest, 2008).

### **Partnership Practices**

The Best Start Hub building and implementation experience calls attention to the importance of strong relationships as a basis for working together effectively. While it has been challenging working collaboratively with the school partner due to the *“systemic challenges that working in school environments present,”* these barriers have been overcome in cases where strong relationships have been built with schools (Farrell-Howie, 2010). Another key learning regarding the Best Start Hub partnership is the importance of not only involving management in the planning and implementation of the hub, but also of engaging frontline staff in this process as a condition for effective implementation (Farrell-Howie, 2010).

The Welcome Centre Immigrant Services partnership is underpinned by a *“commitment to*

*non-competition and on the realization that this process will only work with a high level of cooperation*” (Cazzola & Martin, 2010). The Centre does not bear the logos or any insignia of the partner agencies. The intention is to promote the Centre as a resource for newcomers and not for any specific agency services, even though the front-line staff who will engage clients work for their own agencies. The creation of the hub at the organizational level of the partner agencies sets up the conditions for front-line workers to also work collaboratively, since their physical proximity allows them to share information and easily consult with each other informally or in scheduled meetings.

The co-located and integrated operational context at The Welcome Centre thus supports integrated or at least more coordinated service practices by workers. For example, a defining feature of the collaboration is a blending of the intake and program roles so that case managers are drawn from each of the programs, taking time away from their program function. As a result, they come to the case management task with knowledge of the program areas; where usually these roles are separated (Cazzola & Martin, 2010).

Several elements are seen as facilitating a fruitful collaboration in relation to the East Scarborough Storefront including (Roche & Roberts, 2007, p. 127):

- *The identification of need and the emergence of the project*
- *Defining “community” (and its role in the project)*
- *Processes for decision-making and governance*
- *The establishment and support of a vision over time*
- *The role of leadership*
- *The “complementarities” of service delivery*
- *Relationship capital*
- *Critical Challenges over time*

### **Involving Community / Service Users in Governance & Planning**

The East Scarborough Storefront, from the beginning, embraced the idea of “*shared ownership*” and “*equal input*” by community residents and service providers (Public Interest, 2008, p. 23). The overall approach was to build the organization from “*an asset based development approach which relied first on what agencies and community members brought to the table*” (Public Interest, 2008, p. 23). Several mechanisms are in place for involving community members in governance, in direct and indirect ways. A number of spots are reserved on the Steering Committee for community members. A “community nominating committee” made up of residents interviews potential candidates (Public Interest, 2008, p. 23). Another mechanism for involvement of community members is a “Community Speaks” forum where people can articulate their ideas and concerns regarding the future of the initiative. Key issues raised are subsequently reported back to decision-makers (Public Interest, 2008, p. 23). While these approaches benefit from the involvement of community members in decisions, decisions are still often made by outside organizations (Public Interest, 2008).

At the Welcome Centre Immigrant Services, the community provides input into governance and planning through consultations with the community and client feedback mechanisms (Cazzola & Martin, 2010). The community is not “*directly involved in governance for liability reasons*” (Public Interest, 2008, p. 39). In contrast, the East Scarborough Storefront has designed its governance and operational structure in a way that avoids liability obstacles (Public Interest, 2008). The Welcome Centre Immigrant Services does, however, have in place a strategy for engaging the community; a Community Liaison staff person outreaches to the community for the explicit purpose of identifying community needs (Public Interest, 2008).

The experience of The Greater Sudbury Best Start Network (BSN) with implementing 13 Best Start Community Hubs in Sudbury has drawn attention to the importance of engaging those most directly affected by their services in the planning and implementation of the hub. Lessons learned, in regard to user involvement in planning and implementation of the hubs includes:

- Taking time to implement hubs with the active engagement of those most directly affected will prevent the kind of unintended consequences that some key informants referred to during the course of this evaluation.
- The experience of other jurisdictions suggests that parent engagement is critical at all levels of BSN -- particularly the governance level – insofar as they represent the conscience of the network (O'Farrell-Howie, 2010).

### **Formal Agreements**

Welcome Centre Immigrant Services is developing a Memorandum of Understanding as a formal agreement outlining the components of their collaboration (Cazzola & Martin, 2010). The organization has also put in place an agreement to reduce dynamics of competition between partner agencies, particularly where there may be competition for funding (Public Interest, 2008).

The East Scarborough Storefront has produced a partnership agreement that sets out explicit parameters and guidelines around service providers' use of space, roles and responsibilities, and systems for resolving conflicts (Roche & Roberts, 2007).

### **Involving a Diversity of Service Providers**

Involving a diversity of service providers in a service delivery strategy may be desirable, as inclusion of a broader range of actors may enhance system integration and better serve the community.

As described above, the Welcome Centre Immigrant Services has designed a way of involving a diverse range of service providers in a progression towards the end goal of better serving peoples' needs. Some partners have a 'hotelling' relationship to the hub which means the service provider is located and engaged with the hub on a temporary basis or as long as is needed. Hotelling organizations are selected based on whether their services address an identified need (Cazzola & Martin, 2010).

In Peel Region, the hub model under development builds on and supports the wide diversity of actors in the area, many of which are ethno-specific organizations (DeCoito, 2010). This may even mean that, rather than creating a new organization, hub activities will *"bring services to communities and neighbourhoods and not necessarily [create] a new organization"* (DeCoito, 2010). This is a "No Wrong Door" approach, indicating that whenever a newcomer goes to an agency for help, a common intake, assessment, information and referral process is triggered that all partners incorporate into their service practice. However, the operational management of the hub model in this way does present challenges with respect to maintaining consistency of practice across geographically dispersed agencies and foregoes the benefits cited earlier of proximity among workers that are co-located. Nevertheless, this approach may be more appropriate for regions where a highly developed, if dispersed, agency base has evolved.

A lesson from the Best Start Hub implementation process, which may be particularly relevant to Durham Region, is that some of the more marginalized service providers, primarily rural agencies, could have been engaged in more ways to ensure successful implementation of community hubs (Farrell-Howie, 2010).

## **Service Delivery Partnerships with Public Institutions**

Public institutions may be in a position to take up a role in facilitating the settlement of new immigrants. Some analysts go as far as saying that public institutions, such as libraries, should see this as part of their role, to *“provide innovative solutions in order to meet the needs of new immigrants”* (Quirke, 2007, p. 156). Bringing services for immigrant settlement into public spaces or institutions also creates a diverse environment where newcomers and others are sharing a space. There is potential for the broader community to also benefit from these interactions, with the right strategies in place (Quirke, 2007).

Libraries can play a very instrumental role in newcomer settlement, since they are a major source of information (Caidi and Allard, 2005). In addition, a library can also be a “social centre” (Quirke, 2007, p. 157). When public institutions like libraries take on a role in immigrant settlement, they *“signal to the host society that they reflect the multicultural realities of Canadian society”* (Quirke, 2007, p. 156).

The Library Settlement Partnerships model is an example of service cooperation between public libraries, CIC, and settlement agencies where service agency staff are placed in libraries to provide newcomers with information and referrals. The distinct roles of the partners involved are highly defined. The role of the library is to provide space and office equipment and ensures their services are accessible and visible within the library. Although the staff person from a service agency is fairly independent in providing the actual services, the library itself is the *“primary facilitator”* of the service (Glass and Sheffield, 2008, p. 7). This means that a library staff person actively supports the settlement worker to integrate *“into the library culture and ensures that the settlement worker receives adequate training and orientation”* (Glass and Sheffield, 2008, p. 7).

### **3.3.2 Person-Centered Approaches**

Another way of organizing services is to build in "person-centered" processes. While the term "person-centered" has not been applied to the immigrant settlement sector in Canada, it has been used more often in the disability and mental health fields, and in sectors working with older people. In contrast to its overall low profile in Canada, the term has taken on a high level of importance in Britain as it has been accepted at the government policy level (Dowling, Manthorpe, & Cowley, 2006).

The interest here is in how person-centered models of service planning for individuals and families demand a degree of collaboration and coordination among service providers, thus promoting from the level of the client a form of integrated service delivery.

According to one literature review of person-centered support or care, there is agreement in the literature that services structured in this vein encompass the following practices:

- User focused
- Promote independence and autonomy rather than control
- Involves users choosing from reliable, flexible services
- Tend to be offered by those working with a collaborative team philosophy  
(Innes, Macpherson, & McCabe, 2006)

While person-centered planning models emphasize people/clients becoming leaders in planning for the delivery of their own services, some more individualized forms of case management might show evidence of some of these characteristics as well (Dowling et al., 2006).

Whether these models are actually implemented, or implemented well in practice, is

another question. Even where policy paradigms have supported an overall shift towards person-centered service delivery, as in the case of Britain, challenges surface at the level of implementation (Dowling et al., 2006). Obstacles are largely associated with the difficulty of creating user-led services in the face of an increase in bureaucratic and managerial practices and structures (Innes et al., 2006).

### **Wraparound Model: A Person-Centered Approach**

Wraparound is a person-centered approach fulfilling all the above criteria associated with person-centered care. Wraparound is based on the idea that improvement in people's lives comes when they

- *have a say in their own lives through self-determination,*
- *build skills to manage the challenges of the future, and*
- *are surrounded with support from others*

(Ontario Council of Associations Serving Immigrants [OCASI], 2009, p. 15).

Wraparound is the term used to indicate "*a facilitated team based approach in which the person needing assistance is supported by a carefully identified circle of people who can help and are committed to doing so*" (OCASI, 2009, p. 9). The circle, or team, works collaboratively with the person and together they produce and execute a plan with the objective of improving the person's life in desired ways (OCASI, 2009). The notable feature of the wraparound model is that the person is at the centre of the process and participates in all decision-making on his/her arrangements for support (Jonquil Eyre Consulting, 2009).

Originating in the 1980s across a number of health and social service sectors, wraparound has just recently come into consideration for its application to the immigrant settlement sector (OCASI, 2009).

What distinguishes this model from other team-based service models is that it is not entirely professionally-based. Planning and support teams may be constituted of service workers and professionals but also include other family members, friends, and co-workers. Again, the focus of the team process always places the person (or family) requiring support at the centre (OCASI, 2009). A critical mechanism for ensuring this condition is the designation of a team facilitator. The facilitator "*works closely with the client and stays neutral to ensure that the person or family guides their own wraparound plan*" (OCASI, 2009, p. 83). The role of the facilitator is key, particularly in light of the finding that many teams are challenged to achieve a "*balance in collaboration between individual and family 'voice and choice' and various team member ideas*" (OCASI, 2009, p. 28).

In an ideal situation, wraparound would result in an integration of service systems surrounding the person. Integration would be generated by collaboration among team members, including workers from different service agencies, and this integration would be driven by a commitment to support the individual and their plan. Integration is described as "*the operating approach needed in wraparound*" (OCASI, 2009, p. 15). While many client-centered approaches to service delivery pursue better communication and cooperation between services and programs, this person-centered approach, to be successful, demands a level of integration.

Some characteristics of wraparound that reflect integrated practice and thinking include:

- **Systems Coordination.** Wraparound offers a format and possibility to "*coordinate varied supports including education, employment, recreation, health, housing, and community services*" (OCASI, 2009, p. 24). If these service sectors are represented as needed on a person's/family's team along with non-service advocates, and if the service representatives are mandated or authorized to collaborate with each other to

create and effect an individualized plan, systems coordination becomes activated in relation to the particular needs of the person at the centre of the planning process.

- **Single Team-Based Plan.** Wraparound involves “*shared decision making in a team that includes the person in the driver’s seat, producing a single plan that meets all system mandates and that is owned by the entire team*” (OCASI, 2009, p. 15). This process contrasts with the norms within “siloed” systems where clients may be subject to more than one plan among different service providers and these plans may be at odds with one another. The wraparound approach posits that the perspective of one professional alone is insufficient to create a plan of action (OCASI, 2009).
- **Principles and Values as Integration Mechanism.** Consistently applying a set of established principles is viewed as a tool for guiding the implementation of a team process and plan. The principles may differ depending on the initiative and the sector (OCASI, 2009). For example, The U.S. National Wraparound Initiative (NWI) has established ten guiding principles. One of the principles, namely Collaboration, recommends that: “*Service Systems and schools agree to the principle of Collaboration, working together and moving to integration where all parties work in a team with the family to design and implement one plan*” (OCASI, 2009, p. 22).
- **Strengths Based.** One emphasis of wraparound is to build on the strengths of people at the centre. Whereas services often assist people based on what they know of their deficits, this practice rather wants to “*validate, build on, and expand a person’s assets*” (OCASI, 2009, p. 13). Similarly, when the Rockefeller Institute of Government carried out field research to learn about actual service integration efforts in local communities in the U.S, researchers found that many sites take a strength-based approach to “*assessing needs, establishing expectations, and setting goals for clients*” (Ragan, 2003, p. 33).

### **Wraparound Applied to the Settlement/Immigrant Serving Sector**

Several aspects of the Wraparound model respond to concerns raised regarding the inadequacies of the settlement system. A strength-based focus, touched upon briefly above, has not been commonly taken in the immigrant settlement sector. Yet, it holds great resonance in a context where immigrant skills and strengths are largely undervalued and underutilized in the Canadian labour market.

Wraparound is a model that has been tried when there are concerns that service systems are not effectively supporting individuals and are seen as being “*uncoordinated, inflexible, professionally driven, and deficit based*” (OCASI, 2009, p. 7). Since there is a widespread dissatisfaction with the settlement service system, it makes sense to look towards this model, not necessarily to wholly adopt the approach, but to review the features of a model that has arisen as a key alternative to the established system in several social sectors and in many regions.

One important consideration with respect to the use of wraparound in settlement services is its relevance to particular situations. Many newcomers may not wish to become part of a “team” even if it were to be person-centered. Many newcomers may prefer to just have clarity about where they can get answers to their questions about employment, housing, education, language training, etc. without entering an intense planning process. It would be good for the service system to accommodate this kind of self-initiative. Still, some immigrants may have more complex needs and issues that require the engagement of service professionals in an integrated planning process, and these are the situations in



which wraparound models would seem to make some sense.

The Senior's Wraparound Initiative at the InterCommunity Health Centre in London, Ontario is an example of what would seem to be an appropriate use of the wraparound model in immigrant support. This project supports immigrant seniors to continue living in their homes and in the community. The facilitation role supports and gives structure to the initiative and the role has been developed in a unique manner well suited to the immigrant sector. Internationally Trained Professionals with transferable skills are hired as facilitators to outreach for seniors and to support the individuals and their circle/team process (OCASI, 2009, p. 72).

If the settlement sector chooses to pursue this or a related approach to service integration, it will be adopting what is seen as an evolving model. In part due to its developmental status, there is a lack of research demonstrating the value of this approach over others (OCASI, 2009). It is, however, significant that a US survey conducted in 2007 found that 91 percent of US states had some kind of wraparound process. The explanation given for this is that it is an attractive option when there is frustration with the established service delivery system (OCASI, 2009).

Some support for the wraparound model is evident in the settlement sector. The Ontario Coalition of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI) carried out focus groups and interviews in 2008 to assess the level of interest in the wraparound approach amongst 18 representatives from settlement sector organizations in Ontario. The results of these consultations highlighted many features as potentially contributing in a positive way to the settlement sector. Some of these include:

- Community non-professional support to newcomers
- Community stakeholder investment in the person's success
- Flexibility including meeting on weekends and in people's homes
- Transparency for the client/person and always checking back with them
- Avoiding multiple referrals, multiple intakes and multiple assessments
- Encouraging goal-setting by the person, which can be motivating and result in more ownership of decisions and a greater sense of control of one's own life (OCASI, 2009, p. 66)

In the report *Wraparound for Settlement*, the authors of the OCASI study conclude that "wraparound would require a systems change within the immigrant settlement sector and therefore presents a challenge" (OCASI, 2009, p. 76) Those interviewed for the US survey discussed the challenge of applying wraparound principles in the context of systemic factors such as siloed systems, staff turnover and limited and inflexible funding (OCASI, 2009). Rather than dismissing the approach altogether, the authors of *Wraparound* suggest incorporating some aspects of the wraparound model in service practice (OCASI, 2009, p. 76). Another option is to consider wraparound or something related as one mechanism for system integration complemented by other approaches at the individual, organizational, inter-organizational, and network levels.

Authors of the *Wraparound* report have developed a Newcomer Wraparound Model based on the findings from their research. The model is suggested for individuals or families whose situation is complex and for whom their use of existing settlement services is not facilitating a successful settlement experience. A team of people, professionals and nonprofessionals, who know and care about the newcomer is formed to make a plan with the person and support the achievement of the plan's goals (OCASI, 2009).

**Person-Centered Case Management: Mental Health Systems Change in Waterloo-Wellington-Dufferin**

Waterloo-Wellington-Dufferin offers a unique model of mental health systems change built upon changes at the frontline level of case management that reflect wraparound principles. This case is distinct from the case management approaches discussed above due to it being an example of systems integration occurring at many levels and with user involvement at all levels. The aim of the Waterloo-Wellington-Dufferin mental health initiative was for users to be more involved and empowered in their own case management but also that users would be key participants in all other aspects of systems integration of mental health services (SCC, 2008).

This partnership decided to build a system using a recovery approach to case management. A recovery approach is based on the idea that recovery is about a *“hope for the future, a belief in oneself to move beyond the illness, label, and the system; and the ability to have control and voice over one’s own life and personal goals”* (SCC, 2008, p. 6). The new case management approach would enable clients to direct and be partners in their own case management and planning.

Users are involved more in their own case management but are also woven into other levels of system integration. For example:

- **User Involvement in Community System Planning.** Users participate in the system in areas of advocacy, system design, and governance; and hiring of service users as case management staff.
- **User Involvement in Developing Values and Principles.** The Committee developed a set of principles and values of recovery which would provide the overall accountability framework for the system change. The Self Help Alliance, an independent self-help umbrella organization, authored this document.
- **User Involvement in Education.** Users are partners in providing recovery training to case managers and service users, as well as community wide education.
- **User Involvement in Action Research.** Research involves users on research teams and/or in the planning of research projects. Research will be pursued in order to learn and develop the recovery focused system. (SCC, 2008)

The role of user involvement was seen very positively in an evaluation of the Waterloo-Wellington-Dufferin initiative, involving interviews with managers, case managers, and users, and concluded that the role of user involvement was very positive. The contributions of the Self Help Alliance, in particular, were viewed as *“extremely valuable for the partnership”* (SCC, 2008, p. 23).

One of the challenges of this systems change effort is gaining attention from managers. Since the focus of the systems integration is at the case management level, then case managers and case manager supervisors will be engaged in the system change process, rather than the upper management. It was especially challenging to involve upper level managers in the partnership in the case of larger organizations. This factor is significant because *“managers directly linked to day-to-day case management services may not have the institutional influence to create wider organizational buy-in”* (SCC, 2008, p. 23). Any hope for changes in how organizations collaborate, or adjustment in how the service system functions as a result of the demands of person-centered and controlled approaches, will require not only the understanding, but also the commitment, of senior managers in the participating organizations (something akin to the five executive director governance committee that makes decisions for the Welcome Centre community hub model in York Region).

### **3.3.3 Client-Focused Approaches: Integrated Case Management**

There are many examples of client-focused approaches to case management, assessment, and referral. Since the purpose of designing a more integrated settlement service system is to better serve those who use the services, it makes sense to examine some of these client-centered practices. We can learn from these many initiatives, whether they are at the early stages of integrated thinking and practice or at more advanced stages of system integration.

*The Human Services Agency (HSA)* of San Mateo County has been identified as the most advanced case of system integration in the *Rockefeller Institute of Government* study conducted by Ragan (2003). It might also be argued that HSA is further developed in terms of user involvement and reflecting person-centered principles.

*The Welcome Centre* in Ontario is a model built on a commitment to a collaborative system and practices, though it is in the early stages of development.

*Woodgreen Immigrant Services* is committed to being client-focused in its practices and systems and is only just beginning to imagine itself as part of a more integrated system.

#### **User Focused / Person-Centered**

The Human Services Agency (HSA) of San Mateo County is fairly advanced in its effort to create a social service system that is responsive and client-focused. In combination with several other integration strategies, HSA has developed client/user focused case management practices. Reflective, to some degree, of person-centered practices, HSA includes the family or individual in cross-program team meetings. The purpose of their involvement is to enable clients to “*make informed choices among the range of potential services, to delineate agency responsibilities, and to secure client acceptance of their own responsibilities relative to their case plans.*” (Ragan, 2003, p. 33). (See attached document for more info on San Mateo). HSA also stresses people’s strengths, like other service integration efforts cited by Ragan (2003) and not unlike the wraparound approach.

While this practice of user involvement in the team process has been identified as a core component of this initiative and of several other integrated service system developments in the U.S. (Ragan, 2003), it is less common to see such practices in the settlement system in Ontario.

#### **Collaborative Teams**

These user involved approaches to case management are supported by multidisciplinary teams acting together for the benefit of the clients in the case of San Mateo County. Referred to as Family Self-Sufficiency Teams, they represent several programs and service providers meet on a weekly basis to put their heads together around specific client cases (Ragan, 2003).

While case management meetings happen less frequently at The Welcome Centre in York Region, on a monthly basis, smaller case conferences take place in the interim between hub staff. Because staff members are co-located and work in physical space close to each other within the hub, informal sharing is facilitated. These kinds of informal exchanges were found to be present in several of the integrated service initiatives looked at as part of Ragan’s study. Woodgreen Community Services also assembles case coordination teams occasionally, though these efforts are limited by lack of funding for such practices.

#### **User Focused Intake/Case Management**

Another client-focused feature of the system is a common intake process. Staff are trained

in programs beyond their own program focus to enable them to administer a “*comprehensive screening and assessment tool to determine client needs*” (Ragan, 2003, p. 14). A clear benefit for clients is they avoid going through multiple intakes, as is often the case with the settlement system in Ontario at present.

The Welcome Centre intake case management system is set up in a similar manner so that case managers are drawn from each of the programs/partner agencies; they step away from their core program role to wear a case management hat for certain clients. These systems, and the integration between the intake function and program delivery, are clearly designed with a client focus; one manager interviewed described this as a component of “*seamless*” service delivery (Cazzola & Martin, 2010). Because in both of these cases intake staff are drawn from or aware of the program areas, there is a greater interconnection between the intake and program involvement, and clients will not have to feel that they are on their own in figuring out the next steps.

### **Client-Focused Data Systems**

San Mateo County, The Welcome Centre, and Woodgreen have all worked on developing data systems to serve two purposes: for better tracking and serving clients and for improved management decisions regarding service delivery. At Woodgreen, client information is shared between program staff – of the Language, Settlement, and Employment programs – with some limits on information sharing based on confidentiality. There is sensitivity among all agencies with respect to information sharing with other workers and agencies that the client provides signed approval for the sharing of personal information.

Aided by information technology systems, a client tracking system is shared by all staff in San Mateo and further used by management for setting organizational priorities (Ragan, 2003). San Mateo County’s system is conceived broadly as they use not only standard performance measures but measures of community well-being. This means monitoring the impact of their programs on “*economic self-sufficiency, family strength, and community capacity*” (Ragan, 2003, p. 44).

In contrast, the Welcome Centre in York Region has decided to allow the various agencies in their collaboration to define their own outcomes because they find it is “*difficult to track outcomes with regard to settlement*” (Cazzola & Martin, 2010). They do, however, collect data on referral paths, on who uses the Centre and where they are referred from, and use this for planning. Woodgreen has created a data system to pull out information in the aggregate to make better service decisions (Cazzola & Martin, 2010).

### **Client-Focused Referral Practices**

Currently, enhanced referral practices tend to be the most common way of dealing with the fragmented character of the settlement service system in Ontario. While improved referral approaches may not be sufficient to address the full extent of the problems and gaps in the settlement system, referrals will always be a component of the system; therefore, best practices should be looked at and built upon.

Woodgreen provides an example of client-focused referral practices. Although referral systems are currently in development, Woodgreen has developed several practices to support the client as they are being referred to other services. One client-focused practice is that referrals are always done “live” in terms of a phone call being placed to the “referral person” rather than a service (D. Dyson & M. Lo, personal communication, February 3, 2010). The counselors make all efforts possible to speak personally with a worker to which the referral is being made. This is the case whether the referral is being done internally

within Woodgreen's own programs or with an external organization (Dyson & Lo, 2010).

This practice is part of addressing the recommendation that came out of the West Downtown Toronto Settlement Service Strategy that “*referral systems be relationship-based and supported by relationship building*” (St. Stephen’s Community House, 2009, p. 55). The client is also given a business card from the Woodgreen counselor to keep in contact once he/she has moved on to other services (Dyson & Lo, 2010). The counselor may call on behalf of the client, if the client is unable or faces barriers. The counselor may also support the client to script the dialogue to clarify the messages that the client is trying to convey to the organization to which he/she has been referred. The client is encouraged to call back or come back or the counselor will check back within the week to follow up if needed (Public Interest, 2008).

## **4. Considerations for Integrated Settlement Support Planning in Durham Region**

### **4.1 The Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council**

Responding to waves of immigration with employment opportunities and adequate social supports is always a challenge. However, there is growing recognition of the importance of attracting newcomers for the contribution of their skills and abilities to a strong workforce. In this vein, the Regional Municipality of Durham, its area municipalities, and both the private and community sectors in Durham Region, see newcomers as a necessary resource to the Region’s growth and vitality. Consequently, these stakeholders have come together in partnership to plan the establishment of needed support systems for the successful settlement of immigrants to the Region (Regional Municipality of Durham, 2009).

The Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council (LDIPC) was established in Durham early in 2008 to help the community focus on the development of strategies and action plans to address the information and settlement needs of newcomers and prospective new immigrants. A community consultation was undertaken in the summer of 2008 which found that community organizations were interested in potential action strategies in three broad themes: inclusivity awareness, service enhancement and collaborative infrastructure. Specifically, establishment of a welcome centre and better coordinated inter-agency information, outreach and referral processes were suggested. These findings do not only lend support to the findings established in this report, below; they should be taken into consideration in any future plans of action for implementing integrated immigrant service delivery in Durham Region.

### **4.2 CIC’s Modernized Approach**

Current changes in Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s vision and approaches for settlement, under the Modernized Approach, point towards new possibilities for the kinds of services and the character of service delivery systems being designed and implemented at the local level. The Modernized Approach suggests a new level of flexibility and capacity for designing programs to better serve newcomers.

These changes will take effect in 2010 as communities are already in the process of redesigning their immigrant settlement systems, as part of the Local Immigration Planning processes. While these alterations add a new element to the change already taking place

surrounding LIP's initiatives, this also adds more complexity and may also open a door for new learning and innovation. Most importantly, it seems to be a step in the right direction in terms of creating a system that works for immigrants and that leads to better outcomes.

In 2010 CIC will ask all currently funded agencies to reapply for their current funding under the new framework. This will be a new experience for all, a challenge for some and an opportunity for some.

The following description of the Modernized Approach is based on Adrienne Smith's (Policy Analyst - Integration, Citizenship and Immigration Canada) analysis.

### **Activity and Outcome-Based Programming**

*Settlement programming has moved from separate programs (i.e., LINC, ISAP, and Host) to one single Settlement Program. The approach is activity - and outcome-based to ensure that settlement programming is responsive and flexible to meet clients' needs.*

### **Mixing Services / Streams**

*To achieve the expected results, six streams of services allow service providers to develop project proposals that best meet the needs of their clients, and produce intended results by mixing services from six different streams. Service providers indicate, in a project proposal, how the project will contribute to one of the five expected results (by drawing from activities in one or more of the six streams).*

- *The Information and Awareness Services stream*
- *The Language Learning and Skills Development stream*
- *The Employment-related Services stream*
- *The Community Connections stream*
- *Needs Assessment and Referrals and Support Services are the two streams that help facilitate a newcomer's access to settlement services*

In many instances, services that previously required multiple contribution agreements may now be delivered through one agreement covering a range of services. This means that SPOs can spend more time and energy on serving clients.

### **Expected Results**

*Results will be focused on outcomes of immigrants in areas of orientation, language/skills, labour market participation, welcoming communities, and program and policy development. Each of these outcome areas will be measured by indicators. For example, for orientation indicators should include the percentage of clients who report that they received information which helped them learn more about Canadian laws, community resources, life, and culture. For Welcoming Communities, indicators may include the percentage of clients who report that they feel connected to the broader community and social networks will be used.*

(Smith, 2010)

As communities are in the midst of reworking or redesigning their service delivery systems, in conjunction with the LIP process, the Modernization Approach may provide a window of opportunity to apply creativity and produce innovative approaches to service delivery. It may provide a platform for having new discussions and raising new ideas that were formerly not possible due to the rigidity of policy and program guidelines.

CIC has developed an overall framework or parameters within which program development and delivery will occur, assigning program officers to work with communities at navigating

the new approach. Consequently, if local communities wish to take advantage of the opportunities provided by this new framework, it may mean developing effective strategies for working with CIC partners, in particular the program officers in the front line.

This fairly dramatic change in government policy, or in the broader policy framework shaping the work of the settlement sector, raises the question of how to plan at the ground level in the face of a changing and uncertain broader environment. Those involved with planning connected to the *West Downtown Toronto Settlement Service Strategy* formed their planning body and began their work a few years before the LIP process came into effect. When the LIP process became a factor, meaning new geographic planning areas added to the West Toronto mix, it meant having to adjust and allow new partnerships and collaborations to form (Sinclair, 2010). The report advises that:

*A good assumption to inform any planning process is that the environment is indeed changeable, often in unpredictable ways. A good strategy stresses the importance of making decisions that will ensure an ability to successfully respond to changes in the environment. The West Downtown Settlement Strategy 2008 is about fundamental direction, but it does not attempt to make future plans. This strategy involves anticipating the future environment, but also recognizes that decisions will be made in the present.*

(St. Stephen's Community House, 2009)

In this vein, as agencies in West Downtown Toronto are now taking their learning from the West Downtown Toronto Settlement Service Strategy process and embarking on Local Immigration Partnerships, some planning teams are keeping in mind the possibility for innovations in system and program design due to the changing policy environment with the pending Modernization Approach (Sinclair, 2010).

## **5. Current Community-Based Research**

### **5.1 Methodology**

The current community-based research portion of this project was designed to engage representatives from organizations across Durham region that a) provide settlement services directly, and/or b) that engage immigrants and newcomers indirectly – in other words, their target client base is not necessarily immigrants; however, they do come in contact with immigrants through their work on a regular basis. The purpose was to hear their opinions with regard to immigrant and settlement services in Durham as they currently exist, and their suggestions and visions for this sector in the future. Participants were recruited through local networks and word of mouth, and each interview lasted between 30 and 90 minutes.

We completed a total of 15 in-depth interviews and 2 focus groups using a semi-structured interview approach. Of the 27 participants we interviewed,

- 10 worked directly with immigrants – 7 as settlement workers specifically;
- 5 worked in libraries;
- 3 were representatives of ethno-cultural organizations; and
- 9 worked in specialized social services, such as employment, health, and/or housing.

Each interview and focus group was recorded with an audio tape, upon the participants' approval. If consent was not given for the audio recording, the interviewer took detailed

notes. In all cases, recordings and notes were transcribed and typed up in order to facilitate the analysis process. Analysis resulted in the findings described below.

## **5.2 Findings**

### **Defining Inclusion and Integration**

To the multiple organizations in Durham Region that were interviewed, inclusion essentially means equal access for everyone in terms of opportunities, equity and respect. According to one participant, *“an inclusive community is where everybody has the chance to work and live according to their values, beliefs and their culture, and where everybody has a chance to meet their full potential as human beings”*. An inclusive community is one where everyone feels as though they belong and where difference is accepted as a means to enhance relationships and productivity. In order for immigrants to have a positive experience in Durham Region, *“it needs to be non-partisan with an acceptance of cultural relativity and must exist on the premise of non-discrimination.”* Newcomers need to be emotionally integrated into the community; only then will they feel attached and welcome.

For immigrants and newcomers, the process of integration takes time. Newcomer Canadians need to make sure they have a job and a good school for their children. They need to be included in events within the community. Neighbours need to be welcoming, and the community at large needs to include them, in part by giving them appropriate information about programs and services. Everyone in the community is responsible to make sure that immigrant integration is successful – it is a shared responsibility and a multi-directional process. In order to facilitate the integration of both the non-immigrant and newcomer communities to each other, it is imperative that newcomers become familiar with the existing community so that they can adapt to new ways of living, recognize common interests and orient themselves by identifying the differences between Canadian society and their ethno cultural background. From a nuanced and inclusive perspective, each individual immigrant should be treated as a unique addition to the community. A newcomer’s past experiences, skills and previous ways of living will often times compliment the community and the willingness of the community to embrace this will affect the ways in which both parties integrate.

These definitions, as well as the opinions and recommendations provided by those who participated in our research, allow us to consider the current best practices for integrated service delivery in Durham Region and will hopefully help to influence the development of a locally relevant model that will complement and ultimately enhance existing services in the Region.

### **Identified Strengths & Weaknesses of Settlement Services as they Currently Exist**

During interviews with 17 organizations in the Durham Region, CDCD researchers asked participants for their thoughts on the current strengths and weaknesses of settlement services in the community. Strengths included providing good support to newcomers, and the fact that referrals and follow ups are initiated. Some participants were appreciative of the diversity of CDCD settlement staff because it makes for a more comfortable experience for clients. It was also mentioned that there are more linguistic resources being made available, and that there is an increasing effort to promote settlement services throughout the Region. The identified strengths in settlement services would be improved with a more integrated model of delivery; however, the current system is apparently sustainable and efficient.



Information sharing was identified as a major weakness of immigrant and settlement services that are available in Durham Region. While the promotion of services was mentioned as a progressive strength, it was also identified that there is a predominant disconnect between the services that are available and newcomers' level of awareness of their existence and ability to access them. Participants mentioned that not only is there a lack of communication between services and their clients, the communicative relationships between different settlement services, organizations and government offices, are also severely lacking. For example, a few organizations expressed concern with the fact that they need to be better educated about Canadian laws with respect to immigration, settlement and refugee claims. Newcomers ask questions in regards to legalities and service providers are unsure of their role in these matters and the legal implications in providing such support for themselves and their clients.

This lack of communication and information sharing between major and minor players within the settlement service sector was mentioned several times throughout the interviews as being a weakness. Questions regarding who does what, who would be best to contact for specific inquiries, and what community players – such as libraries, schools, community centres, etc. – can do to become more informed and prepared, would be beneficial to address as first steps when evaluating the best practices for integrated service delivery.

In addition, a lack of cultural competency among all players within the region was identified as a major cause for concern. It was a common assertion among all interviewees that there is a need to educate everyone about the process of immigration. Government offices, their representatives, settlement service workers, non-immigrants and newcomers themselves, need to be appropriately informed and integrated within this diverse region. Learning about different cultures will help people to understand clients and their needs; which in turn results in better service, a more culturally sensitive community and a higher level of inclusion for newcomers.

Furthermore, from our interviews, we heard that it is imperative that both the major and minor players in the process of immigration be aware of the differences in cultural norms among clients. They have to understand that actions, words or phrases may look rude or seem inappropriate in the mainstream Canadian cultural context, but could be quite acceptable in another.

It was also posited that newcomers should be included in these multicultural education matters. They too are experiencing difference and need to be culturally sensitive. This learning is important because without it, newcomers may be afraid of their new community; afraid of what is different from them rather than actively incorporating themselves and their diverse backgrounds into the existing society. Settlement services and community development agencies need to be more involved in providing venues in which immigrants and non-immigrants can come together, build relationships and learn from one another. It was identified that there is a need to have more opportunity for multicultural interaction. Examples included things like cooking or fitness programs, something for seniors, culturally integrated youth programs, etc.

Other identified weaknesses that should be considered when evaluating the best practices for integrating services include:

- Severe need for mental health counseling services for settlement workers themselves. They are not trained for the emotional unloading of clients
- Settlement workers are not always available or they do not have access to information about clients
- Settlement workers/teachers cannot visit the home of newcomers

- There is a lack of funding available
- Settlement services are understaffed
- There is an attitude of ‘territoriality’ within settlement services
  - Need to focus on the needs of the client, and not so much on organizational mandates and assumptions of what clients need. One worker does not ‘own’ their clients; other service providers may be able to help them too
- Atmosphere of settlement services needs to be made more comfortable and less ‘formal’, in order for services to be more appealing and less intimidating

### **Ideas about Integrated Service Delivery**

In planning an integrated service delivery model, participants acknowledged that individuals in management positions in existing settlement service agencies should have a leading role in its development. They would have a lot of experience working with newcomers and immigrants and would be knowledgeable about how to overcome challenges relating to the experience of immigration. However, as stated previously in the report the management of integrated services and the input of those in charge can become a challenging situation. There was a concern among the participants that an integrated service delivery model needed to provide what newcomers and immigrants would require in order to proceed in the right direction towards enjoying satisfying lives as citizens of Durham Region. It is imperative that those with experience in this sector develop the foundation and structure of the integrated model, in order to ensure productivity and sustainability for newcomer and immigrant services.

Prior to the planning or development of an integrated service delivery model, there would need to be a consensus among all agencies and services of what needs to be achieved, and for whom. Questions like, ‘who isn’t being considered?’, ‘what direction will the model go?’, ‘what will be the programming and policy angle?’ what do these agencies have the capacity to do?’, and ‘how will it be marketed?’ are all viable inquiries that if appropriately answered, will help to lead to success.

When asked who the major players in immigrant and settlement service delivery were in Durham region, participants mentioned:

- Community Development Council Durham
- Women’s Multicultural Resource and Counseling Centre
- Host Program and Support Workers
- Continuing Education Programs
- Cultural / Religious / and Faith Communities
- Board of Education
- ESL and LINC (Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada) Programs
- SWIS (Settlement Workers in Schools)
- South Asian Alliance
- Hispanic Alliance
- John Howard Society

Minor Players included:

- Women’s Multicultural Resource and Counseling Centre
- Durham Unemployment Help Centre
- Durham College
- Northern Lights
- The Youth Centre

- YMCA
- John Howard Society

When participants were asked who they thought should be more involved in immigrant services than they already are, participants talked about cultural groups, social clubs, Service Canada, libraries, schools – such as colleges and universities – and child services. It was also mentioned that municipalities should be more involved in immigrant and settlement service delivery. It was identified that municipalities are not reflecting the ethno cultural changes that are occurring in Durham region. For example, one participant mentioned that there is a municipal road naming policy whereby new roads can only be named after war veterans. When a group of South Asian residents of Ajax got together and asked about naming some of the new roads something more familiar to their culture – Ghandi Rd, for example – they were told it could not be done. Little things like road names can impact immigrant integration and inclusion because people hear all about how wonderful Ghandi was, but nowhere is he acknowledged in their Canadian community. As previously acknowledged, Milroy and Wallace (2004) state that because the ethno cultural composition of regional populations are always changing, it is critical that representatives of these groups be involved in planning; this way, planning decisions are more likely to reflect demographic changes and associated needs (Milroy & Wallace, 2004). Their measure of truly inclusive participation is *“who sits around the table when decisions are made”* (Milroy & Wallace, 2004).

When asked to define settlement services, participants did so by describing that they are part of the social service structure that facilitates the process of immigration for newcomers. They do so by providing information and proper guidance on issues relating to employment, housing, schools and community involvement opportunities. Settlement services help to support immigrants in contacting agencies that will aid them in successfully adapting to a new community or country. They were also described as services offered to help an immigrant figure out where to go and to give them guidance in terms of what they will need to do to begin integrating into the Durham Region, for example. It was identified that the settlement process has a number of stages: settlement services come first, followed by inclusion, and finally, successful integration. Participants said that settlement services can be considered successful if the workers construct short term and long term goals with their newcomer clients, and ensure that those goals are met by doing follow-ups on their progress. It is also important to not only know what immigrants will need, but be able to anticipate these needs to a certain extent. In addition, one participant made a valuable recommendation that workers should be sure not to paternalize the experience of immigration; settlement services should direct newcomers to appropriate services but be sure not to treat them like dependents.

When asked about integrated service delivery, participants thought that the approach should be an innovative one. One participant said that appropriate information should be offered by the Canadian Embassy to potential immigrants while they are still in their country of origin. This way, they can be better prepared for integrating into Canadian society upon arrival. Participants went on to say that mandatory workshops should be offered and completed by newcomers once someone applies for immigration. In this way, they may be better able to adapt to a new community like Durham region, while still identifying with their own cultural background.

It was a common theme among participant responses that settlement services should be able to help newcomers with anything and everything. In order to do that, organizations need to create partnerships with one another and give immigrants more options in terms of transitioning from one service to another (translators, housing, employment services,

counseling etc). It was mentioned several times in the interviews that the integration of immigrants into a community is a process; therefore, settlement service workers need to ensure that their referrals to other service providers are prioritized so that the experience is positive and fluid. This will make newcomers feel more comfortable and they will be able to build confidence in their new community.

Consequently, an integrated service delivery model would have to be seamless. In the opinion of most organizations interviewed, such a model would need to ensure an understanding of core values, a vision/purpose, trust between members, and positive outcomes from the work done together. In a similar vein, participants were asked what concerns they would want addressed before and during the creation of an integrated service delivery model. One participant summed up the views of other participants by saying that to feel comfortable she would...

*“need to know what our goal would be in an integrated service delivery model; what we would have the capacity to do...It is defining who is out there and being able to provide information in a way that is accessible. For us, youth is our sub-culture; it is our priority population. They are marginalized, they can be discriminated against and it [is treated as if it] is ok. And inside that, we have LGBT populations, new immigrant populations, young parents – all sorts of groups that are even further marginalized other than just being youth. For us, it is finding a balance to be in all of those pockets while maintaining our primary job, to address the culture of youth. And providing a service to that population is different than providing an adult service. Then addressing and dealing with newcomer youth: how do we better serve those youth? And we are trying to figure out, as an organization, how to make adaptations that are sustainable to their service from a health equity standpoint, but how do we ensure that they get what they need?”*

This quote allows us to consider the need for collaboration and partnership among organizations in order to ensure that immigrant needs are being met. The model, through which this should be enacted, in the context of Durham Region, was the subject of an interview question for participants. Their responses are discussed below.

During the 17 interviews, 8 of the representatives expressed that a ‘One Stop Shop’ would be ideal. It would be a place where immigrants and newcomers could conveniently go and have access to all the settlement services needed to successfully engage in the integration process. In the tradition of the Hub Model, a ‘One Stop Shop’ would offer immigrants and newcomers a succinct location where they can be educated in their own language. It would be one central place that could be accessed easily with public transit, and would be an environment conducive to making connections with other immigrants and community members. The participants recommended that core services within such a model should include:

- Support from Citizenship and Immigration Canada
- Service Canada
- Housing services
- Employment services
- Culturally appropriate health care services
- Professional accreditation for employment in Canada
- A job skills centre
- Legal services
- Language programs
- Computer skills training

- Settlement programs such as HOST
- Outreach services
- Access to child care services
- Youth, women and elderly-focused service providers
- Counselors
- Psychologists
- Community Involvement Resource Centre for Families and Youth
- Contact information for parents who need to enroll their children in school
- Youth Centre for positive interaction and integration of different cultures
- Mentoring Services
- Space for both non-immigrant and immigrant community members to meet and create connections
- Space for workshops where newcomers can learn about their rights as workers and as immigrants, can have job search advice etc.

Creating a space where immigrants and newcomers can go to be appropriately directed to services and programs has the potential to be a progressive and culturally competent initiative. However, it would come with consequences and risks to everyone involved. Concerns raised by participants included:

- Location and access
- Over commitment – all clients to be treated equitably; service providers not to be overworked
- Unorganized coordination and conflict in prioritizing services
- Staffing issues
- Complications with hours of operation – need some services in the evenings
- Lack of resources
- Competition – partnerships between agencies would need to be based on trust, inclusivity and cooperation
- Culturally competent service coordination and delivery – Research on specific cultures, their beliefs and traditions would be vital in order to ensure that cultural boundaries are not breached within an integrated service delivery model. For example, if there was a workshop for youth aged 13-19, perhaps in particular cultures they would not allow a 13 year old girl to be in the same class that would have a 19 year old boy.

Aside from necessary elements and potential concerns for the integrated service delivery model, participants had suggestions for improving immigrant and settlement services in the region that did not necessitate a common physical location. For example, participants agreed that there needs to be a type of technological program or database that can act as a server to connect all agencies and their client information, regardless of their location in Durham. In order to make service delivery more integrated, with minimal burden on clients and agencies, it would be beneficial to have this type of centralized database system. By having each client's basic assessment data available in a system or server, the client would not need to continuously repeat their situation or story, or be sent in circles to unnecessarily visit every immigrant-related service organization in Durham. This is reportedly a cause of much frustration for newcomers and it complicates their experience of immigration and sense of inclusion in the community. A database would help both the client and the service providers to save time, ensure productivity, and more easily meet the needs of the immigrants and newcomers. It was also suggested that the assessment component of

settlement service, whereby counselors assess client needs and concerns in order to direct them to appropriate services, be narrowed down.

Another recommendation for the development of a locally relevant model that would enhance existing service delivery in the Region includes a resource handbook. It could be produced as either a hardcopy or PDF via the internet, and should include a prioritized directory of social and settlement services that are available to newcomers so they have more direction for successful integration. The new Immigration Portal is a great example of one form this model could take; however, its usefulness should be monitored regularly in order to maintain relevancy.

It was also mentioned that online translation programs would be helpful for newcomers, and that social media, such as Facebook and Twitter, should be utilized for the promotion of services. Participants suggested that online message boards would be a great tool for newcomers to use in order to access housing listings, job advertisements, and different language courses. However, for online programs and message boards, access to the internet needs to be considered as a barrier to some immigrants' ability to engage in these innovative services.

Three organizations also posed that settlement services should be made available at airports so that as soon as newcomers come to Canada they are not only welcomed but are also informed about what their first necessary steps should be. They should be presented with an information package, brochures and pamphlets listing organizations by their priority to the newcomer to ensure that they have the resources to start their journey towards integration. If at all possible, it was suggested that both the departing airport and the country of settlement should have immigration resources so that the trip is not so onerous on the individual. For example, it would be shocking for someone coming from a warm climate to a Canadian winter. Appropriate clothing should be provided for such individuals and their families. If services like these are already in existence, they could be improved with information pamphlets specific to Durham Region, and an education campaign should be undertaken to inform local service providers about such airport services.

### **5.3 Discussion**

As stated previously in the report:

*There is presently no "seamless service delivery system" that responds to the needs of people in an intentional way. Instead, service is compartmentalized and fragmented across different "delivery outlets", and participants feel they are unnecessarily shuttled back and forth across the system with so many confusing and artificial program boundaries. (Integrated Settlement Planning Consortium [ISPC], 2000, p.68)*

While this quote was taken from an ethno-specific social planning association in Toronto, immigrants and newcomers to Durham Region face the same frustrating complications when seeking settlement support. They are forced to go to several different agencies that are placed within different districts of the region, primarily Pickering, Ajax, Whitby or Oshawa. The process of settlement becomes inconvenient, time consuming and very costly, especially when someone has just arrived and may be economically unstable, may not speak fluent English, if any, and is unaware of how to navigate the Region's various systems: transit, health care, education, etc. These factors are further complicated by the fact that services are often confusing. Newcomers do not necessarily know where they need to go, or in what order, or even what might be available to them. Factors such as

internet access, access to a telephone, support for young mothers - financial or social (day care) - and the social, economic and physical implications of fragmented service delivery for those who are disabled or elderly, are things that should be considered when assessing local needs and the current best practices for integrated service delivery.

There appears to be significant overlap between what was found in the literature and what was heard in the interviews, regarding necessary elements for effective service integration as well as potential barriers and concerns. Chart 1, below, illustrates these correlations.<sup>1</sup>

*Chart 1: Correlations between literature and participatory research findings*

<b>Primary Elements Necessary for Successful Integrated Service Delivery (ISD), as Identified in the Literature</b>	<b>Participants' Concerns (Regarding ISD) that Correlate with the Primary Elements</b>	<b>Barriers to the Successful Implementation of ISD (as per the Literature) that Correlate with Concerns and Primary Elements</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly defined and shared goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over commitment – all clients treated equitably; service providers not overworked</li> <li>Hours of operation – need some services in the evenings;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Differences in professional and/or organizational priorities – may have disagreements over goals and philosophies</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leadership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staffing issues resulting from combining services or programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issues of power and status – some people will need to submit to the priorities of the larger partnership</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measuring Performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to ensure culturally competent service coordination and delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs (of training, etc.) out-weighing benefits</li> <li>Issues of professional and/or organizational priorities</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong communications, effective coordination and positive relationships</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unorganized coordination and conflict in prioritizing services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Differences in organizational priorities – foster negative relationships</li> <li>Issues of power and status – if decisions are made without consensus</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs out-weighing benefits</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to the section of this report entitled, *Overview of Literature on Integrated Service Delivery*, for more detailed descriptions of the primary elements of successful integrated service systems, and the barriers to their successful implementation.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trust</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues of power and status</li> <li>• Differences in professional and/or organizational priorities – might feel the need to put down others in order to come out on top</li> </ul>
---	---	---

We can see that the concerns participants voiced regarding the implementation of an Integrated Service Delivery Model, strongly correlate with the primary elements necessary for success, as identified in the literature. From this, a couple of things can be inferred. Firstly, that service providers in Durham are on the right track in their thinking of integrated service systems. They demonstrate an intimate knowledge of what is required in running a community organization in general, and in providing settlement services specifically. It is heartening to recognize that, if an integrated services system were established in Durham, those who initiate the process would have experience and secondly, that the literature itself is applicable to our local context. This means that similar findings in other studies can be beneficial guides for our own process.

It is also significant that the barriers to successful implementation of the primary elements are so closely correlated to the participants' list of concerns as well. Recognizing the challenges ahead is the first step in overcoming them. Again, it is reassuring to recognize that many potential barriers have been identified by members of Durham's own community services sector. This will help facilitate a quicker transition process if we move towards more integrated service delivery.

In determining which model would best suit the needs of Durham's newcomer population, it is critically important that members of this community have the chance to identify the barriers and challenges they faced, or are facing, during their own settlement and integration processes. While this element was outside the limited scope of the local research done thus far, the information offered by local service sector representatives is very valuable. With this information, each of the integrated service approaches described earlier in this report can be evaluated on the extent to which their various elements address current system weaknesses from the organizations' perspectives. Chart 2 illustrates these connections.

*Chart 2: Integrated Service Approaches as Solutions to Identified Weaknesses*

Current Weaknesses as Identified by Community Organizations	Elements from Approaches that Could Address these Weaknesses		
	Community Hub Model	Person-Centered Approach	Client-Focused Case Management
Info Sharing between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- services and clients</li> <li>- services and other orgs</li> <li>- any/all orgs and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Multiple services housed in one location</li> <li>-Easier flow of info between orgs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Based on formation of personalized plan; services involved/ chosen by client</li> <li>work together on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Regular meetings between client(s) and the various service workers involved in their personal plan</li> </ul>



government bodies		the case	
Cultural Competency: -for <i>everyone</i> -contact between immigrants and non-immigrants	-Is more like a community centre; can use space for inter-cultural interaction	-Focuses on building the individual's strengths and assets	-N/A
Availability of Workers: -evenings -understaffed/ full case loads -ability to make client home visits	-Provides a <i>seamless continuum of service</i> ; multiple agencies increase chance of evening services and shared case loads	-Services are reliable and flexible, to make it as easy as possible for client; evenings, weekends, home visits, etc.	-Referrals to other services/orgs are done with the client present, and 'live' with the second service provider; prevents clients falling through cracks
Access to Client Information	-Common location can more easily facilitate transfer of info between service providers, when necessary, and with client's permission	-Client gives info one time, with understanding that all service providers involved with his/ her plan will have access to it	-One intake process; done by a worker with knowledge of all the network's programs/ services available to client  -Database used for client tracking  -Client data shared between settlement programs; signed permission from client to disclose info to outside orgs
Lack of Funding	-Lead org is an established agency that acts as financial trustee	-N/A	-Practices save time, and therefore money, in the long term
Territoriality/Competition between Orgs	-Lead org deals with space rental, etc.  -Mission, Vision, Values determined by all involved orgs	-Requires a <i>single plan that meets all system mandates and that is owned by the entire team</i> ; no room for silos	-All involved service providers need to agree with putting the client first; aside from that, they do their jobs according to their orgs'

	-Orgs do their work individually, but can consult with other orgs if necessary		mandates
Formal Atmosphere: -intimidating -unappealing	-Not strictly for service delivery; community development approach	-Promotes client independence and autonomy, not control	-Practices are undertaken with thought for the comfort of the individual
Mental Health of Workers	-Potential to share aspects of case loads between workers on-site	-Potential to share aspects of case loads between workers on- or off-site  -Clients take on responsibility for planning and progress	-Potential to share aspects of case loads between workers on- or off-site  -Clients take on responsibility for planning and progress

From these comparisons, we can see that all three models of integrated service delivery include elements that can potentially address all, or nearly all, of the major weaknesses identified by service providers in Durham. This means there is a multitude of variations that our immigrant and settlement services sector and local partners can examine as they move towards developing a locally relevant model. It is significant to note that the weaknesses identified above fit into the list of best practices values in integrated service that should be considered to ensure a smooth transition for newcomers and immigrants (The Canadian Council of Refugees, 1998). Twelve values are listed by the Canadian Council for Refugees. Nine of these overlap with the current system's weaknesses as identified by local service providers, and the corresponding elements of the three models used to address them (Chart 2, above): access, inclusion, cultural sensitivity, client empowerment, user-defined services, a holistic approach, respect for the Individual, community development, and collaboration. The other three best practices values should also be considered as Durham moves towards a more integrated service delivery model. These are: accountability and reliability of organizations and community partners involved, and an orientation towards positive change for all players: service providers, community partners, funders, and clients.

Building upon the notions of client empowerment, inclusion and a holistic approach to integrating services, it is increasingly important in our diverse region that the impact of integrated service systems on clients and community members is researched, as mentioned above. Through this project, we discovered how current service providers felt about integrating services and their thoughts on the benefits and implications of an integrated model. However, there is an increasing need to know what the clients want and how they think the integrating of services would benefit them and others immigrating to the Durham Region.

Congruent with our research for the Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council's 'Strategic Plan' - where we interviewed 49 newcomers, non-immigrants and organizations

about their ideas and experiences around inclusion (Earle *et al*, 2010) - the organizational participants of *this* project laid a heavy focus on the need for more diverse community interaction. Minor players in the Oshawa community recommended that current best practices be enhanced to include community gatherings and festivals that are made more multicultural so that non-immigrants can become familiar with various cultural customs such as trying on a turban, or viewing bridal wear from other cultures. In addition, it was mentioned that there should be language learning groups aimed at making English-speaking non-immigrants familiar with other languages so they feel more comfortable with the diversity around them.

The integration of settlement services, such as the Host Program, with other organizations that offer information sessions and workshops, could utilize the benefits of place-based planning in order to create safe and open spaces where people of all cultures can meet one another. Referring back to the idea of a 'One Stop Shop' or Community Hub, there could be a designated space for community involvement and multicultural interaction. After all, *"places are social constructs and individuals help give meaning to particular locations. Place is something that can be nurtured and reshaped through individual and collective effort"* (Milroy & Wallace, 2004). Therefore, when considering the experience of immigration in the Durham Region, having a space where people feel comfortable and where they have the opportunity to meet others will enhance their level of attachment and improve their settlement experience by making it less isolating.

The recent launch of the Durham Region Immigration Portal, at [www.durhamimmigration.ca](http://www.durhamimmigration.ca), is a significant step forward in creating a welcoming environment for newcomers to the area. This website's capacity to provide current information regarding settlement and community issues may be the perfect platform from which to increase resident awareness of and engagement in these region-wide themes. It may also provide a sufficient medium for increasing communication between organizations. Further recommendations are clearly noted in the final section of this report.

## 6. Conclusion and Recommendations

Throughout this report, it has become clear that in order to improve the current state of settlement services, more communication and collaboration by all parties is essential. In speaking to locally relevant changes, client information sharing and the establishment of a secure database are becoming more immediate necessities when considering the rapid pace at which immigrants and newcomers are settling in the Durham Region.

This community has an opportunity to define and create a system which truly supports the settlement of newcomers. Based on our analysis, it seems that there are three important components of an effectively functioning integrated service delivery system:

1. The **development of a community-based planning mechanism** engaging all the relevant stakeholders in a collaborative planning process.
2. The **establishment of values and core principles** guiding and driving the system.
3. The **design of service delivery system mechanisms** or service delivery "venues" which will likely interrelate with planning structures.

In more specific terms, recommendations for the next steps involved in these components include the following:

1. **Development of a community-based planning mechanism:**

- Expand the appropriate committee(s) of the Local Immigration and Diversity Partnership Council to include all stakeholders interested in collaborating on the creation of a more integrated service delivery model for immigrant and settlement services in Durham.
- Create a research plan to ensure all relevant populations have the chance to be heard on the issues that are important to them; and for their opinions and experiences to be incorporated into any actions that come out of the committee.
- Create a plan for sustaining this community-wide input for the duration of the committee's reign

## 2. Establishment of values and core principles:

- Establish a regular meeting schedule for planning purposes
- Use collaboration toolkits and resource guides to move through the process of establishing shared values and principles for both the committee and the eventual integrated service system.<sup>2</sup>

## 3. Design of Service Delivery System Mechanisms/'Venues':

- Using the information presented in this report, as well as future community research findings and community member contributions, decide on a combination of integrated service delivery elements that is appropriate for Durham Region.
- To improve communication between organizations:
  - -A bolstering of current electronic options, such as the Immigration Portal.
  - -A physical information centre wherein newcomers can access information about various services and/or programs offered all over the region, as well as how to find them.
  - -A hard-copy community resource/contact book that is regularly updated and distributed to organizations who have signed up to receive it.
- To improve access to services/programs for newcomers:
  - -Standardized, coordinated intake and referral system across organizations
  - -Co-location of services from different organizations in a clearly visible building that is easy to get to by public transit (Note: this could be done as a 'One Stop Shop' or as a series of satellites)
  - -On-site childcare, free of charge
  - -Information available in various languages; employees who can converse in various languages (but who also have the skills required for other aspects of settlement service)
- To increase intercultural interaction:
  - -Space available at the information centre, community hub, satellite, or other accessible venue, that is devoted to creating a relaxing, social environment for immigrant and non-immigrant community members (eg: couches; checkers/chess/cultural game tables; tea and coffee station;

---

<sup>2</sup> For examples, see CDCD's booklet, *Facing the Future Together: Connecting the Community Services Sector in the Region of Durham*. (2009). Available electronically through [www.cdcd.org](http://www.cdcd.org)

sudoku/crosswords/word search sheets available; computers for use only by 2 or more people; outdoor basketball nets; quiet room with desks for writing, etc.)

- -Workshops/programs designed to bring together, or appeal to, both immigrant/newcomer and non-immigrant/Canadian-born populations of the community (eg: crafts, yoga, participant mini-presentations on aspects of life and culture, etc.)

While this is a new and perhaps intimidating undertaking for the Durham Region community to develop this type of system, it is clear from the literature that this is a process and how fast and in what ways this process happens will differ depending on the community. In the end, the goal of all this effort and learning is to close the gap between the “*supports available and the needs of the immigrant population*” (ISPR Consortium, 2000, p. 71) and this should be a source of motivation for forward movement and momentum.

## 7. References

- Alboim, N. (2002). *Fulfilling the Promise: Integrating Immigrant Skills into the Canadian Economy*. Ottawa, ON: Caledon Institute of Social Policy.
- Bertram, T., Pascal, C., Bokhari, S., Gasper, M., & Holtermann, S. (2002). *Early excellence centre pilot programme second evaluation report 2000-2001*. Norwich: Queen's Printer. Retrieved from <[www.surestart.gov.uk/surestartservices/settings/earlyexcellence](http://www.surestart.gov.uk/surestartservices/settings/earlyexcellence)>
- Bradford, N. (2005). *Place-based public policy: Towards a new urban and community agenda for Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Browne, G., Roberts, J., Gafni, A., Byrne, C., Kertyzia, J., & Loney, P. (2004). Conceptualizing and validating the human services integration Measure. *International Journal of Integrated Care*, 4, 1-8. Retrieved on March 10, 2010 from <<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1393260/>>
- Caidi, N., & Allard, D. (2005). Social inclusion of newcomers to Canada: An information problem? *Library & Information Science Research*, 27, 302-324.
- Canadian Council for Refugees. (1998). *Best settlement practices: Settlement services for refugees and immigrants in Canada*. Montreal, Que.: Canadian Council for Refugees. Retrieved from <<http://www.ccrweb.ca/bpfina1.htm>>
- Centre for Technology in Government (2004). *New model of collaboration – A guide for managers*. Retrieved from <[http://www.ctg.albany.edu/publications/online/new\\_models/](http://www.ctg.albany.edu/publications/online/new_models/)>
- Clemo, J., & Smith, P. (2007). *Building a community hub* [Powerpoint slides]. Retrieved from <[www.chap-ohio.net](http://www.chap-ohio.net)>
- Crossing Boundaries National Council. (2006). Retrieved from <<http://www.govexec.com/features/0608-01/0608-01advp1.htm>>
- Dowling, S., Manthorpe, J., & Cowley, S. (2006). *Person-centred planning in social care: A scoping review*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Earle, B. (2008). Profile of Immigration and Ethnocultural Diversity in the Region of Durham. *Community Development Council Durham*. Available through <[www.cdcd.org](http://www.cdcd.org)>
- Earle, B. (2010). *Immigration in the Region of Durham: Growth of a Community*. Community Development Council of Durham Research Brief #1. Available online at <<http://www.cdcd.org>>
- Earle, B., Squire, S. & Cramer, M. (2010). Diverse Voices: Understanding Experiences of Immigration in Durham. *Community Development Council Durham*. Available through <[www.cdcd.org](http://www.cdcd.org)>
- Farrell-Howie, L. (2010). BSN Evaluation Report.
- Farrell-Howie, L., & Reszczyński, A. (2010). *Integrated services – Literature review*. Sudbury: Sudbury Social Planning Council. Paper Contracted by PC Human Resources.
- Fong, K. (2009). Overcoming structural barriers to labour market integration: An analysis of the Toronto region immigrant employment council's approach. *Policy Matters Series*, 37, 1-5. Toronto: CERIS – The Ontario Metropolis Centre.
- Gillen, M. (2004). Promoting place: Elevating place-based discourse and new approaches

- in local governance in new south Wales. *Urban Policy and Research*, 22(2), 207-220.
- Glass, E., & Sheffield, D. (2008). *Best practices in multicultural library services: Library Settlement Program (LSP) at Toronto Public Library*. Proceedings from the World Library and Information Congress: 74th IFLA General Conference and Council. Quebec. Retrieved from <<http://ifla.org/IV/ifla74/index.htm>>
- Innes, A., Macpherson, S., & McCabe, L. (2006). *Promoting Person-centred care at the frontlines*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Integrated Settlement Planning Consortium (2000). *Re-visioning the newcomer settlement support system*. Toronto: Integrated Settlement Planning Research Project.
- Konrad, E. L. (1996). A multidimensional framework for conceptualizing human services integration initiatives. In J.M. Marquart & E.L. Konrad (Eds.), *Evaluating initiatives to integrate human services, new directions for evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Laidlaw Foundation. (2003). *The Laidlaw Foundation's perspective on social inclusion*. Perspectives on Social Inclusion. Toronto: Laidlaw Foundation.
- MacLellan, D. (2008). Diversity and immigrant needs: Examining Toronto through a place-based approach. *Policy Matters*, 32, 1-13. Toronto: CERIS – The Ontario Metropolis Centre.
- Milroy, B., & Wallace, M. (2004). Ethno racial diversity and planning practices in the Greater Toronto area. *CERIS Working Paper*, 18, 1-15. Toronto: Joint Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Settlement.
- Mwarigha, M.S. (2002). *Towards a framework for local accountability: Taking action to end the current limbo in immigrant settlement*. Toronto: Maytree Foundation.
- National Audit Office, 2001, Sure Start Children's Centres. Retrieved from <[http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0607/sure\\_start\\_childrens\\_centres.aspx](http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0607/sure_start_childrens_centres.aspx) Dec. 21st/09>
- Nilsen, E. (2005). Rethinking place in planning: Opportunities in northern and aboriginal planning in Nunavut, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 14(1), 22-27.
- Omidvar, R., & Richmond, T. (2003). Immigrant settlement and social inclusion in Canada. *Perspectives on Social Inclusion*. Toronto: Laidlaw Foundation.
- Ontario Council of Associations Serving Immigrants. (2009). *Wraparound: A different way of organizing assistance to newcomers - Research report*. Toronto: Jonquil Eyre Consulting.
- Ontario Ministry of Finance. (2009). *Ontario Population Projections 2008-2056: Ontario and its 49 Census Divisions*. Available online at <<http://www.fin.gov.on.ca/en/economy/demographics/projections/> >
- Peel Newcomer Strategy Group. (2009). *Strategies for addressing newcomers' needs in Peel - draft*. Peel: Public Interest.
- Policy Roundtable Mobilizing Professions and Trades. (2005). *Smart settlement: Current dispersion policies and a community engagement model for sustainable immigrant settlement in Ontario's smaller communities*. Toronto: Triple S. Community-building.
- Public Interest (2008). *Community hubs: Governance, partnership and community inclusion strategies for collaborative and co-located initiatives*. Retrieved from

- <<http://www.publicinterest.ca/portfolio/6>>
- Quirke, L. (2007). More than books: Examining the settlement services of the Toronto and Windsor public libraries. *Our Diverse Cities*, 4. Retrieved from <[www.metropolis.net](http://www.metropolis.net)>
- Ragan, M. (2003). *Building better human services systems – Integrating services and income support and related programs*. Albany, New York: Rockefeller Institute of Government.
- Regional Municipality of Durham. (2009). *Proposal for the Creation of a Regional Municipality of Durham Immigration Web Portal*. Submitted to the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, January.
- Robinson, R., Ryan, B.A., Forsyth, A., & Lero, D. (2002). *Evaluation of the Healthy Babies, Healthy Children program, Consolidated Report*. Toronto, ON: Ministry of Health and Long-term Care, Government of Ontario.
- Roche, B., & Roberts, J. (2007). *East Scarborough Storefront: A successful inter-organizational service collaboration*. Toronto: The Wellesley Institute.
- Smith, A. (2010). CIC's Modernized Approach to settlement programming: A brief description. *International Settlement Canada*, 23(3), 1-4. Retrieved March 2010 from <[http://integration-net.ca:81/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=37&Itemid=1&lang=en](http://integration-net.ca:81/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=37&Itemid=1&lang=en)>
- Southern Alberta Child and Youth Health Network. (2002). *Network literature review: Conceptualizing and evaluating networks*. Alberta: Carey Hill, TriAd Research Inc.
- St. Stephen's Community House (2009). *West downtown Toronto service strategy 2009*. Toronto: WiseSolution Consulting.
- Support Coordination Committee. (2008). *Recovery focused case management and mental health system change in Waterloo-Wellington Dufferin: Evaluation technical report*. Waterloo, ON: Centre for Community Based Research.
- Torjman, S. (2006). *Shared space: The communities agenda*. Ottawa: The Caledon Institute of Social Policy.
- Welcome Centre. Background of the Welcome Centre. Retrieved March 10, 2010 from <<http://www.welcomecentre.ca/about/background.html>>
- Wraparound Initiative Diversity Project. (2005). *Building inclusive and accessible family services in London: Final report phase 1*. London: Llobet, R.



# Appendix A – Interview Guide

## Overall Research Questions:

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current immigrant and settlement service sector? (set-up; management; services provided, etc.)
2. What opportunities / initiatives exist for collective action on improving immigrant services and integration? What are the risks that might prevent the success of a more integrated service delivery model?

## **Introduction:**

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is..... I work as a researcher for the Community Development Council Durham. We are being funded by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) to explore immigration and settlement issues in Durham Region. We are working towards developing a comprehensive community strategy for attracting and retaining immigrants, and effectively integrating newcomers.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me.

We are talking to organizations from across Durham Region to find out about their experiences in, and knowledge of, immigrant and settlement services so we can improve our communities by making them more inclusive. The CDCD's mission is to identify and address social needs across Durham Region. With your input through this project, you can help us to do this better.

Specifically, we would like to get a better idea of the strengths and weaknesses of settlement services, as they currently exist in the region. We will be asking you questions about what opportunities exist for connecting these services in an integrated service delivery model, as well as the potential risks that you are aware of that may prevent collective action on addressing immigrant integration. This will help us identify ways to better address immigration and settlement issues in Durham Region.

The interview should take about 1 hour (*focus group*) or 30 minutes (*interview*). Before we begin, I would like to give you some information about the research project and your rights as a participant.

*Go over Information Letter and Consent form – READ (word for word) Information Letter (to be left with participant) and Consent form to ensure that literacy levels are not a barrier to informed consent. Complete Consent Form and retain for the CDCD's records. Reminder – verbal consent (on the tape) is also acceptable if required.*

*There is also travel supplement available for organizations. Complete travel supplement form with participant if appropriate.*

## Interview Notes/Reminders

- *Ask for details about answers – why something works or doesn't work, what factors make something a success, or to provide examples.*
- *NOTE: Roman numerals indicate probes that can be used when participants need some suggestions in order to answer the question. After each question, pause for a*

*response before continuing with the next question (even within questions).*

Do you have any questions before we begin?

<Start audio recorder>

**Definitions:**

What do the following mean to you?

i. inclusion; inclusive community

ii. integration (of whom?)

-What makes it successful?

iii. settlement services

-What make them successful?

iv. Integrated Service Delivery

-Integrated Service Delivery Model- what does it look like?

*Integrated service delivery could be anything from info sharing to collaborative programming to co-location; we're trying to find out what is best for community.*

**Topic 1: Who**

1. What organizations in Durham region are the major players in immigrant and settlement service delivery?

ii. Who else should be involved?

2. Is your organization currently working in collaboration with any of these players? (Have you in the past? Are there opportunities to do so in the future?)

**Topic 2: Strengths and Weaknesses**

3. What do you feel are the strengths of immigrant and settlement services in Durham region?

i. What are social services in general doing well to serve immigrants and diverse groups?

4. What do you feel are the weaknesses and/or gaps of the immigrant and settlement services in Durham region?

i. What is not working or needs to be improved?

ii. Are there areas that are not serving immigrants as well as they could?

iii. What do you think they could do to remedy that?

5. Do you think more integration of service in Durham Region could address some of the weaknesses? How?

**Topic 3: Integrated Service Delivery**

6. If Durham region was to move towards the use of an integrated service delivery model for immigrant and settlement services, what kinds of services would be the most important (Core services)?

i. What kinds of services would you recommend to play a more supportive role in the model?

7. If an integrated service delivery model was to be established, what are the new infrastructural or technological things that would need to be developed to make this model work properly? (less burden to clients and agencies)

Eg:    -databases                    -message boards on-line  
      -increased number of inter-agency meetings?

8. If your organization was involved, what types of things would make you comfortable in the way it was running? (What concerns would you want addressed...

- i. before it was implemented?
- ii. while it was functioning? (ongoing)

9. As a staff person working with immigrants and newcomers, what benefits do you see in services becoming more integrated and cooperative across Durham Region?

- i. What are the risks?

10. Who needs to be at the table to plan this integrated service delivery model?

11. Is there anything else you think should be considered as we look at improving the immigrant experience in Durham Region?

**Thank you and closing remarks:**

This concludes the interview. Thank you very much for taking the time to speak with me today. Do you have any other comments, concerns or questions?

## Appendix B – Settlement Service Organizations in Durham

Please note: the following list refers to organizations whose services are specifically designed for immigrants and newcomers to Canada. This list does not include libraries or ethno-cultural associations, although many of these groups do offer support.

If you are aware of an organization in Durham Region that should be on this list but whose name you cannot find, please forward that information to Ben Earle, Manager, Community Development, at the Community Development Council of Durham: [bearle@cdcd.org](mailto:bearle@cdcd.org) or 905-686-2661 ext. 115.

### **Community Development Council Durham**

Settlement, LINC Assessment, HOST program, Settlement Workers in Schools, counselling and referrals  
Serving all of Durham Region  
Located in Ajax, Ontario  
[www.cdcd.org](http://www.cdcd.org)

### **Community Economic Development for Immigrant Women**

Social Enterprise, skills development  
Serving all of Durham Region  
Located in Pickering, Ontario  
[www.ced4iw-wo.org](http://www.ced4iw-wo.org)

### **Durham Catholic District School Board – Continuing and Alternative Education**

ESL, LINC, Citizenship course, International Languages  
Serving all of Durham Region  
Located in Oshawa, Ontario [head office]  
[www.con-ed.ca](http://www.con-ed.ca)

### **Durham District School Board – Durham Continuing Education**

ESL, LINC, ELT (Enhanced Language Training), International Languages  
Serving all of Durham Region  
Located in Oshawa, Ontario [head office]  
<http://dce.ddsbschools.ca>

### **Durham Region Unemployed Help Centre**

Job Search Workshops, employment resources  
Serving all of Durham Region  
Located in Oshawa, Ontario [head office] and Pickering, Ontario  
[www.unemployedhelp.on.ca](http://www.unemployedhelp.on.ca)

### **Northern Lights Canada – Employment Services**

Job Search Workshops for Newcomer Youth, employment resources  
Serving all of Durham Region  
Locations in Oshawa, Ontario and Ajax, Ontario  
[www.northernlightsosh.com](http://www.northernlightsosh.com)

### **Women’s Multicultural Resource and Counselling Centre**

Counselling, mentorship, youth HOST program, crisis intervention, referrals  
Serving all of Durham Region  
Located in Pickering, Ontario  
[www.wmrccdurham.com](http://www.wmrccdurham.com)