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A SEARCH FOR MODELS: FROM COOPTATION TO COLLABORATION

“Funders foster unhealthy competition…although they talk the language of partnerships. (Toronto Training Board, Environmental Scan, 1999)

“Individually we are like fragile strands of sweetgrass, but like sweetgrass that is braided together, individuals linked together in a healing circle of families lend support to solving the problems of the community.” (Canadian Council for Social Development, Aboriginal Values and Social Services: The Kahnawake Experience, 1994)

INTRODUCTION:

A. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE REPORT

This literature review analyzed models of collaboration and coordination (sometimes referred to in the report under the broad category of “partnership”) primarily by focusing on the following questions:

What are the strategic policy and program areas where collaboration and coordination are needed?

Who are the different players involved in collaboration and coordination; specifically what are their roles and what is the nature/quality of their relationship?

How does collaboration and coordination happen? What are the examples of strategies and mechanisms used for coordination and collaboration?

Why is collaboration and coordination pursued? At one level, this is a question of goal and purpose; at another level, it is a question of values: what are the fundamental principles and beliefs that inform a good collaboration effort? In this sense, this is the primary question. It is, ultimately, a question of criteria: what makes a certain coordination or collaboration model desirable?

The first three questions will be pursued by examining how collaboration and coordination take place at various levels:

- at the federal level, between departments
- between the federal and sub-national levels of government, but mainly the provincial level
- between funders (federal and provincial) and ISAs
- between ISAs and generic or mainstream service delivery agencies (i.e., institutions considered to be part of the broader public sector, such as schools, hospitals, and other arms length service agencies)
- and finally, between ISAs among themselves.

The fourth question – the purpose and underlying values of collaboration and coordination effort – will be analyzed through a set of proposed principles and criteria. The assumption of the review is that a number of critical principles should inform an effective and equitable partnership or collaboration effort; and that an analysis of models can be done only through the application of a set of clearly articulated criteria.

Limitations

In content, the review does not explicitly examine the issue of devolution of governmental powers and the amalgamation of municipalities in the GTA. However, the review takes into account these developments and, in their light, analyzes their impact on the settlement services sector and on its various efforts to cope with service demands and fiscal pressures.
In methodology, the review relied primarily on available bibliographical sources, both secondary and primary. Some of these data are drawn from unpublished internal organizational reports, such as those emanating from consultation and training workshops, a few of which the author has facilitated and helped organized (e.g., Job Search Workshop Conference, under the OCASI-COSTI collaboration sponsored by CIC, February 2000; the SNISO Partnership Workshop Series, March – April 2000; Leadership Development Program for Immigrants and Refugees sponsored by Maytree, March 2000; and the Professional and Skilled Workers Forum sponsored by York, South Simcoe Training and Adjustment Board, March 2000). In addition, the author conducted selective telephone and person to person interviews with funders, settlement service providers, other researchers, and immigrants and refugees.

At this juncture, the author wishes to acknowledge the unstinting support extended to him by certain individuals/institutions in the course of this assignment, while at the same time absolving them of any responsibility for any flaw in this report:
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B. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Consistent with the terms of reference for this research project, the literature review was conducted utilizing the following analytical framework:

. Analysis of goals, values, and meta-strategies

Through this analysis, the report seeks to discover the fundamental prototypes or paradigms of collaboration/coordination that are being utilized in the sector. At the end, the report presents two opposing paradigms or tendencies: the “adoptive” or survival approach, and the “transformative” strategy. These paradigms epitomize two distinct sets of goals and meta-strategies in pursuing partnership, as gleaned from the literature review.

In this context, the review assumes certain values and standards are fundamental in the settlement service sector, as advocated by certain ISAs networks and coalition groups (e.g., OCASI). These are values and principles of equity and access, interdependence and empowerment, democratic participation and transparency, and accountability. These are in addition to the generally accepted norms in program delivery, such as: adequacy, relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency.

. Analysis of specific strategies and mechanisms

The review further submits specific examples of micro-strategies (as opposed to meta-strategies), tools, and mechanisms for collaboration and coordination. While the paradigms describe broad tendencies, these categories refer to the actual “nuts and bolts” of collaboration and coordination: for instance, such processes as co-location, sub-contracting, mergers, and joint programming. These collaboration examples occur between/among agencies, whether within or across a given community (i.e., South Asians with South Asians, or South Asian with Hispanic groups); and whether between ethno-specific agencies with mainstream ones, or ethno-specific agencies among themselves.
Structural analysis:

The report examines the structure of governance (roles and decision-making processes) in relation to the program planning and delivery structure (including the functions and processes of policy development and planning, resource allocation/funding, program development and implementation, and evaluation). Thus, the roles of various players are examined (e.g., government, public sector human service institutions, and mainstream and community based settlement service agencies) and how these roles are played out across the various phases of policy development and program management, from priority setting to outcome and impact evaluation.

Contextual analysis

The critical examination of models, strategies, or prototypes goes beyond the review of the organizational, programmatic, or functional elements of collaboration and coordination. It situates these models in a historical and environmental context by analyzing how certain socio-economic and political forces, especially of the last ten to fifteen years, have shaped the discourse and practice of various partnership approaches. In doing so, the analysis applies both a structural (e.g., focus on legislation and policies) as well as socio-cultural (e.g., norms, values, and beliefs) perspective to the review of the literature.

Analysis of needs

In the final analysis, the search and examination of partnership models will only make sense in relation to the analysis of the needs and capabilities of immigrants and refugees. In this connection, the review takes into account the earlier and extensive reports on the needs of newcomers and the gaps in services. A key part of this analysis takes into consideration the multi-dimensional needs of “newcomers”, differentiated not only across various communities but also within each community, depending on socio-historical factors like sex, age, length of stay in Canada, citizenship or legal status as immigrant or refugee, and other personal circumstances.

PART I: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. BRIEF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE ROLE OF IMMIGRANT SETTLEMENT AGENCIES (ISA’s)

Coordination and collaboration have always been an inherent part of the way settlement services are delivered in Ontario. Although historically the voluntary or non-profit community sector has always taken the lead in providing services to newcomers, in the last thirty years the government emerged as a strong funder to the sector. While the sector expanded its services with additional government funding, government benefited from this partnership by leveraging its contribution with voluntary and charity resources to fulfill its mandate of providing newcomers with settlement services.

Within the settlement service sector, coordination and collaboration were utilized by providers as means to improving access to a wider scope of services. For example, Immigrant Serving Agencies (ISA’s) often collaborated with mainstream health or employment service providers in order to ensure that the needs of their clients were met in a culturally appropriate manner. On numerous occasions, agencies undertook coordination initiatives in order to reduce duplication and utilize resources more effectively by, for example sharing office location. Many efforts at collaboration and coordination in the settlement sector have yielded more advantages for larger agencies than the smaller collaborating partner or the general client group. With few exceptions, many larger organizations although willing to entertain the idea of collaborating in service delivery put little effort to either share resources or make structural changes in order to build meaningful partnerships.
In the last five years, policy changes introduced by all levels of government have undermined the traditional service delivery environment. Reduced transfers from the Federal to Provincial to Municipal level have been passed on to community based service agencies. According to Ted Richmond, in the settlement service sector alone, the total dollar effect of government funding cuts varied from 20 percent for some of the larger multi-services agencies to 40 percent for some of the smaller agencies. In addition to funding reductions and withdrawal from direct service delivery, governments have been shifting to a system that is based primarily on project funding. In this new system, non-profit service agencies are now required to submit to a competitive and often complex process of tenders and purchase of service agreements. A statement by the Ontario Government, *Future Directions in Social Services, 1996*, signaled its shift from investment in the public sector to a model that is based on a competitive service delivery marketplace. As a result, many smaller ISA’s in particular, have found it extremely difficult to compete with larger organizations that can more readily fit the more stringent and narrowly defined requirements of purchase of service agreements.

ISA’s that have not been forced to close in the last five years have had to adopt new ways of service delivery or seek new partnerships in order to survive in today’s service delivery marketplace. Some of the strategies adopted by ISA’s include:

- undertaking massive fund raising campaigns in order to generate additional funds for services
- refocusing on the core mission and activities of serving newcomers and doing internal reorganization
- collaborating with other related organizations in cooperative ventures in order to generate revenue for services, and
- coordinating services in order to cut costs by sharing space and gaining efficiencies by using volunteers more effectively and sharing of office space.

Today, many ISA’s that are still in operation are struggling to discover more creative and flexible ways of planning and delivering services, learning new ways and discarding old ones. Many are seeking new and meaningful partnerships based on the principle of equitable sharing of resources, democratic representation, and effective community empowerment. Their role within the entire social service domain in general and in the settlement sector in particular is fast-evolving and the new forms of partnership with various players in the field have both the potential and the risks of either enhancing or reducing access, equity, and effectiveness in the planning and delivery of settlement services to the established and emerging communities of GTA and beyond.

### B. FUNDAMENTAL PARADIGMS, BASIC ISSUES, AND MAJOR FORCES/INFLUENCES

#### B1. Fundamental Paradigms

To highlight the key principles underlying various partnership models/practices, this study will construct a basic typology: the adoptive vs. transformative models. Obviously, these are abstraction, aimed more at aiding analysis rather than actually depicting every single case of collaboration. By positing this contrast, it is hoped that certain major themes, tendencies, or patterns in collaboration/coordination experiences or approaches will be highlighted. These opposite poles are pure forms and actual cases do not fit any one of them but could probably be located at any point of the range between these two points.

The tools and mechanisms employed by each of these models will be described under Section C2: “Collaboration/Coordination Strategies and Mechanisms”. Finally, at a later section, specific examples of collaboration/partnership and coordination will be discussed. (Part II: Examples of Collaboration/Coordination Arrangements”).
And while there is no one-to-one correspondence between one paradigm with specific tools or mechanisms, nevertheless, it is possible to map out certain mechanisms that tend to fit one or the other partnership paradigm.

a. First set of paradigms: survival (adoptive) vs. transformative

“The trend in non-profits is toward a competition model for the provision of services and possibly privatization of some services. This means that, in order to survive, settlement agencies will have to ensure we provide quality services in the most cost-effective way, that is competitive with the private sector.” [Culture Link, Making the Road by Walking It, p. 21. 1996. Emphasis supplied]

i. Profile of the “survival model”

A distinct tendency in many examples of collaboration/coordination can be described under the typology of “survival models” – those that accept as given the regime of globalization, privatization, decreasing state intervention (“de-regulation”), and re-structuring, including the current version of devolution. The basic motivation of groups employing such models is to survive, to adapt, and if necessary to compete or collaborate as the situation dictates. This approach seeks to make internal changes in how the organization operates, to better respond to the threats and opportunities from the environment. It is not interested, per se, in questioning the policy trends, or the regulatory or legislative framework, or the various socio-economic forces responsible for these trends.

The basic goals are: productivity and competitiveness, efficiency and waste reduction through the elimination of duplication. The tools are sector management at the macro level, or case management at the micro level; organizationally, the mechanisms or processes are downsizing, sub-contracting, diversification (of funds and services, and clientele), relocation or co-location, and even corporate partnerships.

The basic issue for the survival model is to survive. In “Making the Road, by Walking It”, the examples are heavily borrowed from the private sector, both in language as well as in substance: “The trend in non-profits is toward a competition model for the provision of services and possibly privatization of some services” (p. 21). The way to provide “quality services” is to do so in the “most cost effective way, that is competitive with the private sector.” While quality service is still seen as an end, there is no critical assessment of what “cost effectiveness” means in the light of reduced services, unmet needs, barriers to access, or inequitable relations. Further, there is an implicit assumption that there is a need to compete with the private sector. Why should the non-profit agencies need to compete with the private sector? Apparently, for two reasons: one, because there is “shrinking resources”, and two, because the government funders see the private sector as a paradigm of “efficiency”, and it has now become the standard against which immigrant service agencies will be judged. ISAs need to prove themselves better than the private sector.

Essentially, this model undermines the traditional partnership between the government and the community-based service agencies. It challenges the model of state-funded services, delivered through community-based organizations.

There is, further, an inherent contradiction in this approach: “partnership” and collaboration will be pursued through “competition.” In fact, there is a feeling that such partnership is imposed on the agencies as a requirement for accessing much needed dollars.

“The funding programs require partnerships, but the conditions are not conducive to partnerships and collaboration. Forced partnerships by government are a problem.” (Toronto Training Board, “Toronto Training Board Training Environmental Scan”, Appendix F, Feb. 19999).
Survival Tools:

- Some of the tools inspired by these models are **re-engineering and re-structuring** processes, as applied to organizational improvements in the business processes (planning, fund raising, etc.) and administrative mechanisms (personnel administration, purchasing, office accommodations). Such tools aim to reduce elimination and waste, heighten productivity, and generally “do more with less”.

  Re-engineering does address the question of goals and mission of the organization. However, as a tool inspired by the value of competitiveness and profitability, quality of service is more a function of the bottom line. While “focus for results” is being pursued, the immediate impetus for goal analysis during re-engineering is to improve efficiency and productivity. Strategic planning to identify “clear goals” under this model becomes a tool for competition, an obvious corporate approach. There is however little by way of critically analyzing the underlying assumptions or values that should inform the organization, much less the partnership.

- The tools and concepts of **quality management**, with its corresponding concerns for measurability, accountability, elimination of waste and duplication, and efficiency, do enter into consideration and have a valid place in the search for models. But the way these concerns are framed is still heavily skewed towards “bigger bang for the buck” type of accountability, using measurements and indicators borrowed from bottom-line profitability models, rather than from a quality and access of service perspective. In fact, there is an obvious dearth of evaluation data, or even evaluation studies, that point to improved quality of service arising from these re-structuring and streamlining efforts. What is obvious is the actual **reduction** of services and resources for immigrant settlement. With fiscal restraint, the first casualty is always the most vulnerable. “The people who have lost the most in terms of access to services over the last two years of cuts have been immigrants and refugees” (“Profile of Changing World”).

- And while there are examples of collaboration and coordination that identifies **customer-orientation**, or addresses questions of core mission and values, or develops performance-based plans, the thrust still remains the same: how to create a more efficient or cost-effective organization by “doing more with less.” With this program philosophy – for it has begun to be seen as a philosophy, a way of thinking – the pre-occupation is with “less” (resources), not necessarily with “more” or better (service). The impact, regardless of process or intent, has been reduced services. (Richmond, Mwarighwa, Owen, and Community Agency Survey). The newcomer is seen under this model as essentially a consumer, a “customer” – and quite divorced from a “client’s” other roles as potential partner in planning and decision making, and a future “service provider” participating in the body politic.

- **Contracting out** is a primary tool used by the government funders. Through this mechanism, “collaboration” is encouraged usually between smaller agencies and more established agencies, either community-based or mainstream. The coordination role is transferred to the lead agency, who manages the program and acts as sub-contractor as well as liaison between the funder and the other agencies. The latter becomes the “implementers”, but may or may not have any management responsibility. Sub-contracting is a form of privatization in that the sub-contractee can be a private organization; it is also a mechanism for devolution in that it allows the government to be one or two step removed from the direct delivery or management of settlement services.

- Through a related mechanism of **purchase of service agreement**, the funder is also able to exercise control over the scope of service and eligibility criteria within very specific time frames. Some agencies see this required mechanism as merely a means to access much needed funds, and as a result regard government-sponsored partnership as an imposition.
• **Joint efforts, from task forces to mergers or amalgamation:** The aim is to bring several resources together whenever there is some kind of shared interests: common geography, client group, service, funding base, etc. In the process, duplication is minimized or avoided. In itself, these mechanisms could belong to the “transformative model”. However, under the climate of devolution and downsizing, they tend to serve more the goals of the adoptive rather than the transformative model.

• Other examples are discussed under Section C2 of this report.

### ii. Profile of the Transformative Model

At the opposite end of the spectrum is another set of prototypes: the “transformative model of collaboration”. This model challenges the trends of re-structuring in the social service brought about by globalization and seeks creative and alternative means to this trend. They models see the broader picture: it is not just immigrant settlement services that are at stake; it is the whole social and economic system that is in question.

This model approaches collaboration/collaboration in the context of the broader economic and social forces in the environment. Rather than taking these forces for granted, the transformative model examines the adverse impact of re-structuring, devolution, and government withdrawal from the field and seeks to **restore, among others, the essential partnership between government and community.**

This model aims to “transform” the very nature or quality of the relationship, not just to discover or invent new forms or strategies of partnership. In doing so, proponents of this model begin with a critique of the power relations between partners/collaborators. They do not take as given the assumptions behind globalization and its concomitant trends of privatization and de-regulation; and they do not uncritically utilize tools of rationalization and downsizing, even if at times they might be forced to do so.

This model by and large is inspired by goals of access, equity, and participation by newcomer communities (as well as broader society.) While they share some concepts such as accountability with the “survival group”, this group has a different starting point: accountability not primarily to the funders but to the “community”. Under this model newcomers are not simply “clients”, but also partners in planning, delivery, and management.

One of the major issues raised by this model is “the power relationship” among partners where they make explicit the systemic and historical barriers to participation faced by newcomers and address the pitfalls of “partnerships” that simply re-produce the already existing inequitable power structure, whether expressed in the grants distribution system; in policy, planning, and delivery mechanisms; or in governance structure.

#### Transformative tools

The specific tools and mechanisms utilized by the transformative model can be described under the following rubrics: popular participation and citizen engagement by civil society, of which settlement service agencies and immigrant/refugee associations are prime examples. (These are further described under Part III of this report: “Possible Template for Collaboration/Coordination”).

The aim and scope of these mechanisms is to address the root question – values, vision, and goals of settlement. While they recognize the existence of such external forces as the decreasing role of government and the expanding role of the market, these strategies does not start with the assumption that these are neutral or necessarily beneficial to immigrant settlement sector. Rather, the strategy is to critically analyze the advantages or disadvantages of these trends and then to evolve if possible policy and structural alternatives.
The goal of this paradigm is to achieve interdependence for newcomers in relation to the broader society; not merely “delivery of services”, but even more important, empower of newcomers through democratic participation in civil society; not only additional resources, but also equitable power-relations; adequate services, as well as accessible service structure.

The pre-eminent meta-strategy is informed advocacy through action-research, participation in policy development, and broad community action and coalition building across communities, sectors, and regions. (See Section B of Part III for a discussion of emerging and more popular forms of consultation/decision making.) A summary of the basic features of these two paradigms is shown below:

Table 1: Adaptive vs. Transformative Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FEATURES</th>
<th>ADAPTIVE MODEL</th>
<th>TRANSFORMATIVE MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions about globalization/</td>
<td>- Re-structuring, like it or not, is a given; we have to live with it</td>
<td>- Re-structuring will bring problems to our sector and our communities; we need to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restructuring</td>
<td>- There is no fundamental clash of values between re-structuring and our</td>
<td>constantly challenge it and be critical of its influence; we need to seek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>core values/mission</td>
<td>alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- We need to question re-structuring in the light of our values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>- Organizational survival</td>
<td>- Community survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved Service = measurable outcomes</td>
<td>- Improved Service = access and equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partnership based on viability</td>
<td>- Partnership based on values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organizational/sectoral adaptation</td>
<td>- Structural and cultural change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific strategies</td>
<td>- Rationalization</td>
<td>- Coalition building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-engineering</td>
<td>- Citizen engagement/civic participation/community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Productivity improvement</td>
<td>- Advocacy and political mobilization through popular fora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mergers</td>
<td>- Consolidation/review of sector goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Diversification of funding sources and services/clientele (“broader client</td>
<td>- Solidarity with the broader movement for social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>base”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consolidation around organizational core mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared strategies</td>
<td>- Joint project/programming and Networking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Values</td>
<td>- Efficiency</td>
<td>- Equity and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Competitiveness (“to be the best”)</td>
<td>- Democratic participation and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accountability for resources</td>
<td>- Accountability for quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/pitfalls</td>
<td>- Being short sighted</td>
<td>- No practical response to immediate threat of cost cutting at organizational level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Being coopted</td>
<td>- Sometimes no immediate results for its efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Losing its unique contribution as a sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **A second typology is the continuum between “multiculturalism” and “anti-racism”**.

This typology is borrowed from the debate that has accompanied the work around multiculturalism and anti-racism. The fundamental difference between the two is the “systemic” approach of the latter and its focus on structures and relations of power. Multiculturalism on the other hand focuses on cultural differences (rather than power relations), on sensitization to eliminate negative attitude or biases, and celebration of various “cultural” practices rather than empowerment of historically disadvantaged groups. While it is possible to argue that the two approaches are not necessarily contradictory, nevertheless each has its own emphasis.

In this light, it is possible to super impose these categories to the various collaborative efforts:

**The “multicultural mode”** of collaboration tends to favour a “one size fits all” approach, leading to a possible the loss of linguistically/culturally appropriate services, and the de-valuing of the role of ethno-specific service agencies.

Collaboration, under this model, would “integrate” the roles of mainstream agencies and ISAs without regard to the inequitable power relations. Models of services, sets of priorities, and specific delivery strategies will tend to be determined by the needs and values of the dominant group.

**The “anti-racism mode”** parallels collaborative models in the sense that it addresses systemic barriers to equity and access in participation and decision making, not only within settlement services, but also within the partnership relationship itself. This model would generally be more sensitive to the multi-faceted and differentiated needs of refugees and immigrants, based on different social identities (such as race and gender), skills and educational levels, personal circumstances, and stage of settlement the newcomers find themselves (i.e., early, middle, or late settlement period).

In a special way, collaboration and coordination mechanisms under this prototype would critically analyze the role of mainstream agencies vis-à-vis the role of the participating communities in an attempt to enhance community empowerment and participation. The governance structure in relation to the different functions of policy making, program development, and resource allocation would be a special consideration of this model to ensure specific mechanisms for access, equity, and participation are built into the collaboration and coordination structure. In other words, systemic issues of the collaboration and the long-term impact of the partnership (i.e., empowerment rather than just service delivery) are special concerns of an anti-racist approach.

**B2. OVERARCHING ISSUES**

From an analysis of the various responses of immigrant settlement agencies to the threats and challenges of economic re-structuring in general, and the more immediate realities of funding cutbacks, devolution, and downsizing in particular, this study has arrived at certain basic conclusions through a synthesis of strategic issues, defined at the level of policies and principles.

This section presents this synthesis of strategic and policy issues, before proceeding to a discussion of the detailed collaboration and coordination mechanisms. These issues are seen to be overarching concerns that need to be addressed in defining the desired models of collaboration and coordination.
1. Absence of a policy framework or goal congruence

There is an absence of a policy framework that will integrate distinct and sometimes conflicting policy objectives such as: the fiscal objectives of debt-reduction and lower social expenditures through cost savings, the social development objectives of integration and equity, and the economic or labour market objectives.

- Specifically, there is no framework that integrates various goals across the policy domains of population planning, immigration, settlement, labour market adjustment, job creation and training, and broader social services and development, such as health, housing, and welfare. In effect, there is no common definition or vision of what “settlement services” involves. Collaboration and coordination needs such a framework as the essential common ground.

- Nowhere is this policy fragmentation more evident than in the de-linking between immigration policies (i.e., the point system recognizing the education and experience of applicants) and settlement (i.e., the system of assessment and accreditation of newcomers with professional and trades qualifications). From another angle, lack of policy coherence is also manifested in the subservient position of settlement services as “merely a program” without its own legislative vehicle and strategic goals. Instead, settlement becomes a function of immigration and foreign policy contingencies as evidenced in the sudden immigration policy shift towards Kosovo refugees, demanding a quick response from the settlement service sector, without the corresponding adjustment in the service infrastructure or increase of resources to meet both current as well as increased demands from the new arrivals.

If immigration is primarily seen as a vehicle for bringing in “economic inputs”, then services to newcomers will be formulated within a framework of cost-benefit analysis. As the tap of immigration is turned on and off, so does the welcome to newcomers wane back and forth. A truly distinct and properly articulated immigrant settlement policy has not been defined, and will be difficult to do so, unless it is removed from the shadows of an immigration policy framework, one that is driven primarily by labour supply and demand considerations, and by a pre-occupation with enforcement and internal security issues.

2. The lack of a policy framework emanates from a lack of common vision or shared definition of the goals settlement services should ultimately achieve through collaboration or coordination.

- The spectrum of services and programs seem to contract and expand depending on who is defining settlement services: government funders, community service providers, newcomers, or the mainstream service institutions. The vision of community service agencies has generally been integral and holistic, encompassing the breadth of the immigrant’s experience in their new homeland. These agencies argue for a broader definition of settlement with no three-year cap, and which is not artificially “completed” upon acquiring Canadian citizenship. At present citizenship bars newcomers from accessing certain services, and “need for services” is arbitrarily confined within the initial years of settlement.

- Thus, there is no common ground to begin a coherent conversation about the desired outcomes. (“The definitions of settlement services remain in dispute.”) As a result, policies, programs, and priorities are developed, interpreted, and implemented without a commonly understood set of standards, principles, or purpose. Corollary to, and perhaps deriving from, this situation is the lack of a consistent evaluation effort or database.

- The natural consequence of this pattern is gaps in services – even before the advent of budget cuts and downsizing, what some ISA workers call “the social deficit”. The cuts were meant to eliminate waste and streamline operations – “downsizing and right sizing”. But without the
prior definition of the “right shape”, the “right size” might lead to a misshapen settlement services-mix.

- If “form follows function”, effort should be spent in forging a consensus on the values, mission, and goals of settlement services in general (as provided possibly by both mainstream and community based agencies) and settlement services in particular, before any form of collaboration could be seriously attempted. While a system of shared values exist among ISAs, this may not apply to the other partners, such as government funders, mainstream, and now private sector service providers.

3. **As a result, there is no over-all integrated strategy or program delivery structure.** In terms of service planning and delivery structure, there is **no holistic approach that integrates the multi-faceted and differentiated needs of individuals, families, or communities of immigrants and refugees.** Services are fragmented across a maze of programs, service delivery vehicles, and disparate eligibility criteria that make it difficult for newcomers to access services in a helpful way. People feel like they are being “shuffled around” from one service provider to the next, spending precious time looking for vital information, rather than receiving actual services. This problem manifests itself in the following ways:

- **As discussed above, a narrow and arbitrary definition of settlement prevents a holistic approach to addressing newcomers’ needs.** Funders have one definition in terms of eligibility criteria; newcomers have needs outside the scope of such criteria; and service providers are caught in between. At present, both federal and provincial programs follow a definition of settlement that ISA workers find to be too narrow and inflexible vis-à-vis the reality of the settlement process. Thus, reception, referral, information and orientation, interpretation and translation, para-professional counseling, and employment-related services address mainly information and other basic “survival needs”.

  Service providers, sensitive to the needs of their clients, may choose to offer services even when such services are technically “not eligible for funding” (such as counseling service within a language training program). In such an instance, their services are not being acknowledged or supported by funds. Or they may decide to refuse service to a client even when such is required and confine themselves to “eligible clients”, if they wish to make their service “count” in the eyes of funders.

- **The mainstream social service institutions are structured in a way that is not sensitive to the needs or realities of the newcomers.** Eligibility criteria of the funders – both for the applicant ISAs and for the potential client/participants (example: language training) - are compartmentalized to the point of being inaccessible and exclusionary. In general, they are seen to fit the mold of public service institutions but are too rigid for ISAs.

- **The false distinction in eligibility criteria between refugees and immigrants, is another manifestation of a fragmented strategy.** If the goal is to settle newcomers, the distinction between refugees and immigrants – which is important from an immigration point of view – should then be meaningless, from a settlement perspective, once they have arrived in Canada. At present these two groups are governed by different set of eligibility criteria, a distinction that very often unnecessarily excludes refugees from accessing services “immigrants” are entitled to.

- From another angle, the absence of a coherent strategy is reflected in a program structure that does not make proper **differentiation of needs among various communities, as well as within communities, e.g., children, women, seniors, and people with disability, to name a few.** Funding eligibility criteria do not recognize the distinct needs of certain groups and as a result very little need-based service programming is available. Such a situation leads to systemic barriers to access and inappropriate or low quality service.
The gradient of needs among different groups (e.g. by country of origin or refugees vs. immigrants as well as visible minority status and gender issues) require different strategies as well as more coordinated effort. (See, for example, Harvey, Edward B.; Reil, Kathleen and Siu, Bobby, 1999, Changing Patterns of Immigrants' Socioeconomic Integration, 1986-1995 and Their Policy and Program Implications, Research report, 1997-1998: CERIS-funded project). Thus, people with different language or job-related skills cannot be served under one rigid program structure, or set of criteria. Counseling, for example, has been cited as one integrative component in practically all settlement services that needs to be eligible for funding.

4. **Lack of culturally sensitive and linguistically appropriate services and service delivery structure.** This problem is a direct result of the former situation, but given its immense significance, it warrants a separate enumeration. Lack of “cultural or ethnic match” between program participant and service worker is a source of frustration for both sides. This discrepancy is especially true for mainstream service institutions.

Most studies support ethnospecific services and the positive role of community-based settlement agencies. But the needs in the settlement sector have become too complex to be solved by a simplistic model based on ethno-specific service delivery. Furthermore, a positive integration of mainstream services in terms of linguistically- and culturally-appropriate services is key to the development of general service coordination.

*The issue of systemic barriers is one major area where better coordination in planning and delivery can lead to better access and quality of service.*

While it is perhaps of immediate concern between ISAs and mainstream institutions like hospitals and schools, nevertheless, improved collaboration between federal (e.g., HRDC or Heritage Canada) and provincial (like the Ministry of Citizenship) agencies can certainly remove such systemic barriers faced by newcomers from historically disadvantaged ethno-racial and linguistic groups.

5. **Gap in trust:**

Many practitioners and theoreticians in the field have identified the *sine qua non* of real partnership: trust, which must be present at a minimum operational level before any serious collaboration can even begin to shape. Again, the lack of a common definition or vision and the absence of a policy framework contributes to, as well as results from, this lacuna.

- Part of this gap comes from the perception by the ISAs that government in general is more interested in devolution of responsibility - but not necessarily of resources - than in building partnership; in cutting cost rather than in improving quality of services; in expanding the role of certain institutions rather than in opening more doors for newcomers. In fact, ISA workers see the Settlement Renewal as a vehicle of federal withdrawal from the responsibility for settlement services delivery.

- A “climate of crisis and spirit of competition” (Ted Richmond) seems to pervade ISAs. “Planning in a climate of uncertainty” seems to describe the circumstances in which agencies operate, affecting staff morale, productivity, long term organizational stability, and ultimately, quality of service. The uncertainty relates not only to direct program funds, but also to staff salary, supplies, office rent, and other basic necessities for day to day survival.

6. **Unequal power relations**

Closely related to the issue of gap in trust, and perhaps contributing to it, is that of unequal power relations between would-be collaborators: ISAs and the mainstream service agencies, public service institutions, funders, and now for-profit service organizations.
Unequal power relations are reflected in how decisions are made and who controls resources. This perception is present between levels of government, with the lower levels (especially the municipalities) feeling at a disadvantage vis-à-vis their higher-level counterparts. And ISAs, vis-à-vis both government and mainstream service agencies, feel they have very little say in helping formulate policy directions and that their participation in priority setting and program development is negligible. In fact, there is plenty of anecdotal evidence that some government representatives dictate to ISAs even at operational level, such as the wording of a particular “conference theme”. (Example: you cannot use “anti-racism” because that will not be consistent with funding criteria.). Vis-à-vis mainstream agencies, ISAs including community neighbourhood associations, feel they are simply being manipulated and that ultimately the benefits of collaboration do not accrue to their communities.

Given the fundamental unequal relations, ISAs feel that most consultation exercises are a sham, manipulative, and pre-determined in results. This perception persists, in spite of the fact that there is plenty of public pronouncements of the significant contribution ISAs make within the sector in particular and in the social development field in general.

Systemic racism, as a fundamental character of Canadian institutions in general and human services in particular, puts the issue of power relations in a historical and institutional perspective. For agencies that see one of their functions as that of serving as a bridge to mainstream agency services, this issue takes on tremendous significance. How can they open gates for newcomers when they themselves, as a sector, face barriers?

Systemic racism substantially informs the relationship between collaborating parties. Whatever the collaboration strategies or mechanisms will be devised, they will have to address the systemic barrier rooted in various forms of institutional policies and practices. Coordination strategies need to be developed to eliminate the barriers that people of colour, specifically, experience with mainstream institutions. It is an area needing strategic collaboration among ISAs, the various communities, the mainstream institutions, and government policy makers.

7. Unclear roles of the players:

With the lacuna in policy and strategic directions, it follows that the governance structure - role definitions and accountability mechanisms - will be harder to define. And while there is as yet no basic agreement between various levels of government as to roles and responsibilities, re-structuring of the settlement sector and human services in general is going on through devolution, mainly through the vehicle of the Settlement Renewal Initiative and the amalgamation of municipalities. Such re-structuring will have a tendency to determine any outcome in the negotiation between roles. Specifically, as devolution pushes down several notches, community groups are feeling pushed out, resource wise, as they see the role of public institutions (like school boards, hospitals, and community health centers) and the private sector expands.

A critical segment of this debate is around the concept of “differentiation and integration”. In any collaboration or teamwork, each player has a distinct role, and yet is able to integrate towards the bigger enterprise. The tension between these points is one issue to be addressed: as differentiation or specialization progresses, it makes integration more difficult; vice versa, integration can threaten the distinctiveness of each role. The avowed goal of the Settlement Renewal initiative is “interdependence” (i.e., integration). Without a clear definition of the distinctive role of the various players (differentiation), interdependence will simply be seen as cooption of the weaker players by the stronger ones.
• A key issue being raised is the distinction between planning and delivery and the corresponding distinction of roles between federal and provincial/municipal, and between federal/provincial and ISAs. It can be said that the entire Settlement Renewal Consultation has in fact been triggered by this realization that while policies are formulated at the federal level, provinces and municipalities are faced with the challenges of implementation and delivery. The gap as well as tension between these two roles is the fulcrum around which many studies and debates revolve.

• Meanwhile, a new player has arrived on the scene: certain public institutions, competing with the smaller ethno-specific ISAs for funding dollars and heralding new forms of organization and new methods of delivery. Before their specific role – different and integrated presumably – have been defined and properly legitimized within the sector, they have already occupied space de facto.

B3. Trends and Forces Impacting on Collaboration and Coordination Efforts

There are two or three broad environmental forces impinging on efforts towards collaboration and partnership in the settlement sector, i.e., the pre- eminent influence of market forces and the growing role of the private sector; devolution and the shrinking role of the state; and the erosion of social programs brought about by decreased funding. (Some would say, the “assault on the social safety net.”) These trends in turn are the direct offshoots of globalization, which is the re- restructuring of the world-economic system in a manner that allows maximum flexibility for the movement of capital, goods, and investment, unfettered by national boundaries or state regulations, driven by the competitive ethos and motivated by the values of higher productivity and greater profitability for transnational corporations. While obviously economic in nature, globalization goes beyond economics and affects policy directions in the social sector in a very significant way.

Some of the features and characteristics of these trends are described below:

• Fiscal conservatism as demonstrated in the drive towards a balanced budget, deficit-reduction, lower taxes and the corresponding reduction in social services expenditures. To achieve the goals of a balanced budget and lower deficit, it is necessary to cut expenditures. Social services become the vulnerable target of government cut backs. With the elimination of the Canada Assistance Program (CAP), the federal government, under the Canada Health and Social Transfer Act (1996) reduced transfers to the provinces for medicare, welfare, and other social programs by more than $7 billion from 1996 to 1998.

• Devolution and the decreasing role of the state in social services. Devolution, is already in effect with the Canada Health and Transfer Act, is further bolstered by the Settlement Renewal Initiative, whereby the federal government withdraws from direct delivery of settlement services. From there, various partnership mechanisms have been developed, mainly with public service institutions and provincial government bodies, to facilitate the management and delivery of services.

The Federal government seeks partnership and interdependence; at the same time, it seeks to devolve responsibilities and powers. Partnership, seen in this light, is result of devolution; the kind of partnership or collaboration that evolves will necessarily be informed by the goals of devolution. In the interest of devolution, partnership is sought. Thus, the strategies and scope of partnership is being pre-defined by another set of goals. Valid though they may be, the goals of devolution cannot prematurely determine the outcome of the search for partnership models, even if it is granted that the momentum of devolution will necessarily have to be considered.
Devolution, in this sense, is but the natural unfolding of the pre-eminence given to the role of the private sector. As one level of government to the next withdraws from human services, the role of the private sector expands on the strength of the thinking and the value assigned to market forces.

- The growing influence of market forces in the policy area and the expanding role of the private sector in the delivery of social services; rise of competitiveness as an organizational norm for non-profit service agencies

Ontario in its *Future Directions in Social Services, 1996,* signaled an explicit preference for a market-oriented model of delivering social programs through competitive bidding. The obvious effect is that smaller and newly emerging non-profit agencies are unable to compete with more established organizations. Purchase of service agreements and sub-contracting became the formal vehicles for collaboration and “joint projects”, implemented mostly through a competitive process.

With the increased influence of the market forces, there has been growing preference for private sector solutions using rational – technical approaches such as re-engineering, re-structuring, quality of work life, and other efficiency oriented techniques. At present, the key strategy driving many efforts of collaboration and coordination is, fundamentally, a rationalization strategy - rationalization of programs and services, and of organizational structures and processes. The basic inspiration of rationalization is essentially Taylorism, albeit in its more sophisticated form. The motivation is the bottom line: reduce costs mainly through organizational re-structuring, administrative streamlining, and improved productivity.

While co-operation and collaboration is encouraged, the underlying assumption remains to be that of competition, e.g., contracting out is premised on the assumption that the market forces will bring out the “best bid”. Under this scenario, the more established institutions have an edge over the smaller ISAs.

In the midst of all this effort at enhanced fiscal and organizational efficiency, the focus on the social development goals of settlement is blurred. Even the economic development goals of job creation becomes a more distant concern.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

With less and less government, the definition and enforcement of standards for social forces will be more difficult. Under the regime of decreased state involvement, shrinking resources for social investments, and the growing influence of competitive private sector norms, the role of the non-profit service sector is being challenged. Further, the non profit sector’s role is being evaluated against the terms defined by the private sector: “value-added”, productivity, competitiveness are the criteria being applied to assess the contribution of non-profit organizations.

In the midst of all this effort at enhanced fiscal and organizational efficiency, the focus on the social development goals of settlement is blurred. And even the economic development goals of job creation becomes a more distant concern.
C. DETAILED ANALYSIS OF ROLES, STRATEGIES AND MECHANISMS

C1. Collaboration and Coordination Between Various Players
This section discusses in further details collaboration and coordination issues at various levels:

a. between departments at the federal level
b. between federal and provincial/local government levels
c. between provincial/federal funders and ISAs
d. between broader public sector institutions and ISAs
e. among ISAs

COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS

1. At the federal level, there is no organizational structure or policy framework that facilitates effective and consistent coordination and collaboration, either among service domains, between departments, or across the various stages from policy formulation, to program planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Policies are fragmented and programs are not aligned “horizontally” across various service domains: from immigration, to employment and labour adjustment, health, and settlement services. “Settlement has been a matter of program, not legislation,” (Janet Dench in “Who’s Listening”, 1997)

2. There is no effective interface mechanism between various departments responsible for these policy areas. Roles are not well defined, differentiated, or integrated.

Consultations revealed the “confusion over the roles and mandates of CIC and Canadian Heritage and a deep sense of frustration over the decision of HRDC to abandon labour market language training. Surprisingly, given the nature of immigration and its impact on the labour market, and the fact that employment and immigration belonged to the same department until 1993, there are no formal meetings between the most senior bureaucrats of Citizenship and Immigration Canada and Human Resources Development Canada... The Minister of Canada and Immigration is a member of the two main Cabinet committees shaping the government’s social and economic policies. However, the dynamics of these committees and the multitude of their topics on their agenda make it difficult to accommodate in-depth discussion of immigration and protection policy.” (Not Just Numbers, 3.5.)

The relationship between training and education on the one hand and employment on the other has not been defined. In the absence of a job creation strategy, training becomes not only a waste of resources but also a source of frustration for people who are well trained and equipped for the job market, but with no jobs to fill.

3. Understandably, the structure for policy formulation, program planning and development, implementation, and evaluation that weaves policies, goals, and strategies within a consistent system is not in place.

4. Further, the operational mechanisms for a transparent, accountable, and representative process of citizen engagement and participation from various communities has not been established, nor can it be, in the absence of well articulated policy framework.
COORDINATION/COLLABORATION BETWEEN FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL LEVELS:

1. The settlement service structure, at the actual point of delivery, is fragmented, confusing, and dysfunctional by and large due to lack of collaboration and coordination between federal and provincial levels of government.

Federal government calls for partnership, while withdrawing from direct involvement in the delivery of services (i.e., Settlement Renewal Initiative).

The main driving force behind the federal efforts at partnership with the provinces has been the Settlement Renewal Initiative, aimed at devolving responsibility to the provinces, while withdrawing direct federal involvement in the delivery of services.

2. There are two major policy thrusts – intertwined but contradictory - that drive the relationship between the two levels of government: the Federal wants to devolve, while the Province of Ontario wants to cut cost and downsize human services.

The federal agenda towards devolution informs Ottawa’s efforts of collaboration with the provinces as well as with the various service delivery agencies, both community-based and broader public sector or mainstream service agencies.

3. The dichotomy between immigration planning (which takes place at federal level) and actual settlement (which unfolds at the local/provincial level) is the critical juncture where collaboration and coordination should take place – but has not. And this major gap is the source of a multitude of problems that affect refugees and immigrants’ lives: from employment, to access to health services, to language training, to family re-unification.

The immigration policy, through the points-system, simultaneously invite skilled immigrants, but upon their arrival in Canada, rejects them by not recognizing the very qualifications that made them eligible immigrants in the first place. Proper assessment and recognition of the skills and education of foreign-trained immigrants is one critical area calling for coordination and collaboration, involving CIC and HRDC at the federal level; the various provincial ministries responsible for training, apprenticeship, and accreditation; the various regulatory and licensing bodies; employers’ and trade union councils; training and educational institutions; and various ISAs and community groups.

Settlement has no place within the current framework of refugee and immigration policy:

“Integration of newcomers is affected by how immigration and refugee policy is framed. Policies should be developed with a view to promoting integration.” (Canadian Council for Refugees’ recommendations to the Immigration Legislative Review, in “Who’s Listening”, p. 94)

“The Immigration Act appears to be strangely divorced from questions of settlement…Settlement has been a matter of program, not legislation” (Janet Dench, in “Who’s Listening”, p. 94).

4. The municipal government, specifically the City of Toronto, has sought to address issues of equity, access, and participation even before amalgamation. With devolution, its role in the overall service delivery structure and in relation to the various levels of government is under study. Numerous fora and studies have come up identifying both the absence of the municipal role in immigration and settlement planning, as well as the obvious reduction of services and funding by the higher levels of government, and the subsequent downloading of responsibility to the municipal level. Through its still-evolving Social Development Strategy, it is hoped that the City will find a way of integrating settlement services into its overall service strategy, though it will be encumbered by the lack of cooperation from its federal and provincial counterparts.
COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN PROVINCIAL/FEDERAL FUNDERS AND IMMIGRANT SETTLEMENT AGENCIES

“The agencies interviewed believed that they are expected by funders – indeed will be required – to build partnerships with other agencies, both ethno-specific and “mainstream”. One agency in fact referred laughingly to the term “partnership” as the “P” word.” (Ted Richmond, “Effects of Cutbacks on Immigrant Service Agencies”, 1996)

There are as yet no viable structures or strategies for partnership between funding bodies, whether provincial or federal, and the settlement service providers operating at the community level, although a few attempts have been made (e.g., S.E.P.T. and Job Search Programs.)

1. In the midst of the debate and the search for viable models for partnership, and in advance of any consensus on devolution questions, both the provincial and federal governments have embarked on a program of cost-cutting, downsizing, and re-structuring that have adversely affected the ability of service agencies to provide adequate service, as well as negatively impacted on refugees, immigrants, their families, and their communities.

One of the most telling form of this re-structuring is the total overhaul of the funding mechanism from core to project funding. On top of this, there is often a very short lead time to prepare funding proposals/bids.

2. Driven by devolution, the forms and structures of collaboration have been primarily funding mechanisms that allow the funders to channel program funds to various ISAs either directly or through a mainstream/broader public sector agency (e.g., school board or hospital).

3. As such, no partnership model has yet been developed to looked at the dimension of empowering or strengthening the institutional capacity of ISAs to enable them to be a “partner” in the real sense. Rather, the relationship has been more that of “donor-donee”, with the decision-making and control in the hands of the donor. The role of the ISA in planning is not recognized, and its capacity to plan left undeveloped. In essence, most partnership models are seen to be “top down” and hierarchical in its planning approach.

“Forced partnership by government are a problem. Funders foster unhealthy competition between and among the 5 segments (colleges, universities, private trainers, school boards, and community-based trainers) although they talk the language of partnerships.”

“By its actions, the federal government appears to be reluctant to foster partnerships by not giving service deliverers access to each other. The federal government appears to want to retain ultimate control and keep service providers dependent on them by only issuing short-term contracts. The rhetoric of partnership belies the experience of competitiveness. There is little real impetus for segments...to collaborate. Funding programs require partnerships, but the conditions are not conducive to partnerships and collaboration. Instead, by rewarding competitiveness, the government discourages partnerships and collaboration.” (Toronto Training Board, “Toronto Training Board Training Environmental Scan”, Appendix F, Feb. 1999)

COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN MAINSTREAM/ BROADER PUBLIC SECTOR AGENCIES AND COMMUNITY BASED IMMIGRANT SETTLEMENT AGENCIES

1. There is strong concern that mainstream agencies are playing the game of the funders --- they become the overseer and the agent of the funder. The role of “lead agency” in a partnership is seen by many ISA service providers as but another layer in the power relations where they remain subservient. And sub-contracting is nothing more than a way of consolidating this inequitable
power relations. (The Settlement and Education Partnership in Toronto – SEPT – is an example
where critical comments about power relations within the cluster have been aired. On the other
hand, where the lead agency is sensitive and willing to share power, the partnership seems to
work.)

2. These partnership arrangements are very much tilted to the advantage of the “bigger” and more
established service agencies, whether they are community based or mainstream institutions. They
get the credit, they maintain control over the partnership, and they enhance their capability for
further growth and development, or so it seems to the smaller ISAs. (Based on anecdotal data,
among others from the focus group reports from the Integrated Settlement Planning Consortium
consisting of the five networks: CCNC-Toronto Chapter, CASSA, Hispanic Development
Council, and the Multicultural Coalition for Access to Family Services, and the Somali Immigrant
Women Centre; and from the SNISO workshop series on partnership models, conducted from
February to March 2000.)

3. Underlying this perception from service agencies, especially those from newer and emerging
immigrant and refugee communities, is the sense of unequal power relations between the players.
Once again, as in their relationship with funders, ISAs experience disempowerment and
marginalization in these partnership arrangements. Once again, they feel decision making over
priorities and strategies and control over resources elude them. As an example, staff from ISAs
feel their contribution are not valued, i.e., they are seen to be “less professional” or “less trained”
by their mainstream counterparts, even if they have an equivalent level of qualification.
(Workshop discussion on the relationship between school personnel and settlement workers from
ISAs collaborating under SEPT; from the SNISO workshop series).

COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION AMONG ISAs OF EQUIVALENT
SIZE/RESOURCE-BASE

This is perhaps where the most positive partnership experience can be found. It can be found in
various organizational forms, be it a network, an umbrella coalition, or a task force.

1. These partnerships pre-date the devolution exercise and the Settlement Renewal Initiative.

2. They were initiated by the partners themselves, most of them sharing common values and
operating from a more or less equitable footing.

3. The partnerships were not entered into to meet funding requirements. In fact, in some cases,
there is no “funding component” that gave rise or sustain the partnership (e.g. SNISO –
Scarborough Network of Immigrant Service Organizations).

4. The most important element in the partnership is perhaps the shared history of working
together in various fora of advocacy, community organizing, education, and research towards a
common vision of what “settlement” means. From this shared history has emerged a fairly
predictable “organizational culture”: a convergence of values about settlement services, common
appreciation of immigrant and refugee needs, and fairly similar leadership styles. (Examples
would include the networks involved in the Integrated

4. Some more recent successful examples are those that involved small emerging communities
and more established agencies/networks. The mechanism of trusteeship was one mechanism that
allowed the former to access much needed funds. (Examples: OCASI and Roma refugees;
Culturelink and Tibetan refugees; and the Pan-Toronto Project with HRDC.)

5. The biggest problem these partnerships face is the very threat to the existence of their
members. Given the budgetary crunch, the burn out and demoralization among staff, and the
mounting pressure for services from their communities, the partner agencies often do not have the
any more energy or time to devote to partnership building or collaboration.
6. But this is also the source of their strength. In one gathering of service agency workers, when asked why they continue to come together, they responded that it is the opportunity to be with like-minded people, the chance to re-invigorate themselves, the moment to re-connect and exchange stories of their struggle, to re-claim their space and to find their voice again as they “polish” the sometimes fading vision of what settlement service truly means.

C2. Collaboration and coordination strategies and mechanisms

The literature review identified various categorizations of collaboration and coordination (“partnership”) mechanisms used by different authors or studies. This section describes these mechanisms in detail.

1. From “Making the Road by Walking It” (pp. 45 and ff.):

- Cooperation
- Sub-contracts
- Coordinated service webs
- Co-location
- Collaboration
- Buying services (purchase of services agreement
- Partnerships
- Mergers/amalgamations.

In this regard, United Way agencies have explored the following four models:

- **cooperation**, where there are organizations assisting each other on an ad hoc basis
- **coordination**, where organizations in the same sector (e.g., settlement) come together to coordinate, streamline and share services
- **sub-contracts**, where organizations buy services that would be too expensive to provide themselves
- **co-location**, where organizations share office space and/or equipment

Four other models, complementary if not similar to these, are presented:

- **collaboration**, where organizations work together for a common goal or vision, combining influence and power to effect change or combine resources for better services
- **partnerships**, where all involved share power, commitment, risk, profit and benefit, though not necessarily equally (with written agreement or contract defining scope of partnership)
- **mergers/amalgamations**, where two or more organizations are dissolved into one new organization
- **buying services** (administrative or expertise) from another organization.

Some of these options are illustrated through the experience of certain agencies: South Asian agencies coalition, Midaynta, Community Home Assistance to Seniors, Polish Immigrant and Community Services, etc.
2. From the “1996 Community Agency Survey” (“Profile of A Changing World”) forms of partnership identified include:

- Joint programming and mergers
- Corporate partnerships and
- Relocation

3. From “Effects of Cutbacks on ISAs” (Ted Richmond), various agency survival strategies are identified as follows:

- Program and staffing reductions
- Subsidized positions and use of volunteers
- Partnerships

4. From “Not Just Numbers” (3.1):

“There is confusion on the concept of partnership. Treasury Board has identified four definitions of partnership, ranging from consultative to collaborative. (note 2). We advocate different forms of partnership to suit different players.”

Note 2:

“The four main definitions are: 1) consultative or advisory arrangements that seek stakeholders’ input on policies, strategies, and program design and implementation; 2) contributory or support-sharing arrangements that increase or leverage resources or share the resource burden among several parties; 3) operational or work-sharing arrangements in the delivery of services; and 4) collaborative or decision-making arrangements that share power, work, costs, and benefits” (Alti Rodal and Nick Mulder, “Partnership, Devolution and Power Sharing: Issues and Implications for Management”, Optimum: The Journal of Public Sector Management, Vol. 24, no. 3, Winter 1993: 35-37.

D. CONCLUSIONS: A WAY FORWARD

The analysis given above suggests a framework for collaboration with elements of equity, inclusiveness, and democratic participation. These elements or criteria are not just a matter of principle; they are also a question of strategy. It is something that should be done. But it is also something that must be done, in order to make the system work.

Community based service agencies are much valued and much experienced resource for immigrant and refugee individuals and communities. Any collaboration or coordination need to give them a place at the table. However, at present they are also the most vulnerable, especially the less-established ones among them working out of emerging communities.

The federal and provincial governments are in a tug of war: the pull of devolution, and the tug for more resources. Somehow, this has dominated the overall debate and absorbed most of the attention. The discourse need to be re-focused towards questions of adequacy, accessibility, and appropriateness of settlement services.

The lack of a coherent policy framework inhibits effective integration of economic, social, and political development goals inherent in the domains of immigration, labour adjustment and training, human services, and newcomer settlement. A first step is forming a consensus on the scope of settlement services; after that a proper strategy can be formulated. For this to happen, an immigrant and refugee – centred approach need to be adopted, away from the fiscally driven and efficiency-oriented approach to settlement planning and delivery.
The way forward demands confronting some of the inconsistencies in the government’s approach to partnership and collaboration. These contradictions, while present in all areas of the settlement sector, have been highlighted by the Toronto Training Board in the education and training sub-sector (Environmental Scan, 1999). These are:

Basic contradictions in the partnership models being pursued at the education and training sector (Excerpts from: Toronto Training Board, “Training and Environmental Scan”, 1999):

- “The need to be competitive and collaborative
- The need to service more clients with less resources
- The need to achieve high quality outcomes in less time
- The need to support the core business of the organization and at the same time develop alternative resources.

These contradictions continue to pose challenges for the Education and Training Sector, in part, because a vision or societal goal that would unify the sector has not yet been articulated.”

Finally, some guiding principles will be useful in mapping out future directions. Some of these principles are outlined below:

**THE IMMIGRANT AND REFUGEE INDIVIDUALS AND COMMUNITIES**

Any discourse about service coordination or collaboration will not make sense without some analysis of the role of immigrants and refugees in this collaboration, and the impact of such coordination structure, or the lack thereof, on their lives. And while the earlier sections mentioned concerns about policies, structures, strategies and programs at various institutional levels, this brief section speaks to the experience and lived realities of people.

1. **The voices of immigrant and refugee individuals and communities must be heard.** This deafening silence is not just a barrier to better service and coordination. It is in fact the cause of many of the systemic problems. One of the roles of ISAs is to assist them in getting their voice heard. ISAs, as well as Government funders and mainstream agencies, need to give more attention and resources to this role. Collaboration mechanism must be developed to enhance the newcomers’ voice, either directly through their various community associations or indirectly through the ISAs.

2. **The human rights of immigrants and refugees need to be asserted:** the right to basic human freedoms, the right to human services, and the right to participate in decisions that affect their lives. Until this is firmly recognized, in legislation as well as in practice, any coordination system will have no leg to stand on. Immigrants and refugees need not “prove themselves deserving”, nor do they “need to be productive” to claim their human rights.

3. Immigrants and refugees are not merely “to be controlled, counted, and monitored”. Immigration laws are not merely “to be enforced”, and the issue around settlement services are not merely about budgets, roles, and measurable indicators. First and foremost, immigrants and refugees enrich and strengthen the economic, cultural, and social fabric of community and country. Policies and programs must be shaped and coordinated around the appreciation that they are primarily participants in community and nation building – not liabilities to taxpayers; not threats to jobs, health, or security; not problems to be solved. All the jumble of confusing eligibility criteria and bureaucratic requirements can be minimized if there is a recognition from all players that immigrants and refugees, by and large, come here to settle and ultimately make a positive contribution.
4. Beyond the structural and legislative aspects of collaboration and coordination is the more deeply entrenched dimension of racism - systemic, pervasive, and generally still ignored. Legislation and public policy are, unavoidably, formulated in the crucible of public opinion. Politicians are sensitive to the threat of a so-called “backlash” if they sponsor progressive legislation, fearing for their political survival. Immigrants and refugees, in this political equation, are dispensable. To ensure more equitable and democratic collaboration models, the role of advocacy remains critical. This is a role ISAs have played and a role that funders must support. At the same time, political leadership is needed to push beyond the restrictions and challenge the conventional wisdom of a “common sense approach” that excludes, marginalizes, and disempowers newcomers.

THE ROLE OF THE STATE

5. The role of the state in the funding and management of settlement services must be upheld. Whatever will be the outcome of the negotiation on devolution and amalgamation, the state has the obligation to maintain certain policy standards and cannot abdicate its role to para-statal institutions. Above all, market forces cannot be the sole determining factor in policy or program development. Efficiency and cost-effectiveness are valid concerns, for as long as they do not become the sole criteria for decision-making.

THE ROLE OF ISAs, ESTABLISHED/GENERIC SERVICE AGENCIES AND SOCIAL SERVICE INSTITUTIONS

6. Mainstream agencies need to be “integrated” in the sense that they must reflect the diversity of the population in its priorities, structures, and strategies. Along the same dimension, social services and settlement services cannot remain isolated from each other, as though services to newcomers are not “basic social services”.

7. Ethno-specific agencies do have a role, in the light of the barriers to access systemic in institutions and organizations. However, they cannot be resourced in isolation from the rest of the human service sector. Somehow, a way must be found to deliver services in a “seamless fashion”, by connecting through a network various specialized services that respect the differences in needs and capacities of newcomers.

8. Holistic service must be the vision, the goal, and the standard: service that integrates individual, family, and community dimensions; weaves together social, economic, and cultural aspects of settlement (from health to housing, job creation and language training, crisis counseling and civic participation); and ultimately leads to enabling the newcomer to be an active participant of civil society, capable of accessing as well providing service to the community. And this process, for some, may take a whole generation or more, depending on their circumstances. Various players have a role to play in a coordinated program planning and delivery structure.

FINALLY, what will be the impact of this vision on the broader Ontario and Canadian community? If settlement services are not planned and delivered in an integrated and holistic fashion, society as a whole suffers, deprived of the potential contribution from newcomers. If settlement services remain narrowly defined, isolated from the rest of the human services sector, those very human service agencies will turn in upon themselves and become confining, instead of benefiting from the broader understanding of human needs and the emergence of innovative social development strategies and models. For indeed there is a dynamic relationship between service providers and service recipients.

If immigration and settlement are planned and delivered in isolation, then neither immigration nor settlement programs will work; nor will labour market adjustment and training, population planning, and social services delivery, if they are not somehow woven into one cohesive policy framework and delivery structure. In the end, what was originally intended by the current system
– cost-savings and greater efficiency – will not be achieved. If human service institutions are not transformed to be more inclusive and equitable in its structures and strategy, then ultimately not only newcomers, but Canadian society as a whole will be adversely affected.

An integrated vision for settlement service is, ultimately, a vision of the kind of society we want. The goals of a settlement program will best be defined in the context of how we see the entire socio-economic development of society at large. For if settlement is reciprocal and a two-way process, the clearer our vision of the “social union”, the clearer too will be our strategy towards effective and equitable collaboration.

Part III looks at the emerging literature on the social union and various transformative mechanisms for consultation and joint decision making.
PART II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This study selected a number of key documents in the form of reports, research studies, and resource tools which address the question of collaboration and coordination. This section discusses, first, how the review is organized; the basic conclusions from the reviews; and then gives the actual reviews.

This review is organized around the following key questions:

- Who is involved in the collaboration/coordination?
- On what are they collaborating (i.e., what program is the object of the collaboration or coordination)?
- What is the degree of collaboration?
- What level of responsibility is involved (e.g., issues of accountability, governance and authority)?
- Why is this coordination or collaboration taking place (what is the motivation or goal)?
- What problematic issues are raised?
- What are the key lessons or learnings?

The following sections give a detailed description and analysis of each of nine key documents:

1. “Making the Road by Walking” (Culture Link, 1996) is a resource manual that aims to promote collaboration and coordination in the context of cutbacks and restructuring of Federal and Ontario governments service delivery mechanisms.

   The workbook aimed to stimulate settlement agencies to think about restructuring and developing proactive responses by providing an analysis of the changing environment of service delivery. The book suggests strategies, options and examples of change undertaken by some Immigrant Service Agencies (ISAs) in Ontario that provide settlement and immigrant services. These include starting new ventures in order to generate additional revenue for services, cooperative strategies between related services that have to date operated as single entities, internal reorganization and refocusing on core mission and activities of serving newcomers, and coordination, using volunteers more effectively, and sharing office space to reduce overhead costs. The workbook concludes by stating that the key to success is for ISAs to become learning organizations, moved by creativity rather than problem solving, and to see their world in wholes rather than in parts. Examples:


      Who are involved?
      Noah, COSTI and World Vision. Other agencies are also involved -- Family Service Association of Metro Toronto, Metro Social Services, Metro Community Services Hostel Division, and also the Toronto Public Health Department.

      What are they collaborating on, why, and to what degree; levels of responsibility?
      Relationships were developed with other agencies to help provide the staff with the necessary skills and other resources to address the challenges and issues brought by an expanded client base. Due to declining funding, Noah expanded its client base to provide services to refugee claimants. Providing training to address new and more complex needs of client base (new ones consisting of refugee claimants). Areas of training include working with victims of family violence, information on Metro Social Services, accessing appropriate resources and advocating on behalf of a client. Here, the FSAMT, MSS
and MCS-HD provided resources and training to the Noah staff. Training in working with difficult clients was done in association with the Toronto Public Health Department.

COSTI would lend its expertise to Noah and World Vision in providing training for settlement counsellors in employment counselling. Shared funding would be sought from various sources. Since government is bound to transfer more responsibilities to reception centres as settlement renewal is undertaken, the partners are looking into what services of the government’s Adjustment Assistance Program could be shifted to the reception centres.

Lessons/problem areas
Working together was seen as an opportunity for the agencies to make links with new funders and the province in view of impending settlement renewal -- especially as the province has been chosen by the federal government as the preferred partner in the provision of settlement services.

b. Small agency serving "communities of common bond"

Who are involved? A small agency and a mainstream social service agency.

What are they collaborating on, why, and to what degree; levels of responsibility?
The small agency entered into an agreement with the mainstream social service agency to address the former's problem regarding program administration. The mainstream agency acquired the funding for them.
The agreement between the two agencies provides for an advisory committee from the "communities of common bond" and ensures adherence to the small agency's principles particular to their type of service. An outcome is that the mainstream agency began examining its own organization and its accessibility to diverse communities.

Lessons, problem areas
Small community- or ethno-specific agencies entering into partnerships with large mainstream agencies risk losing control of their programs and may find themselves veering away from the actual needs of their communities as the mainstream agency gradually begins to set the types of service, terms, policies and even methods of service delivery. Smaller in size too, they could be wiped out under the current re-structuring. By collaborating with a large institution, they manage to survive, at least for the time being. In the meantime they struggle to ward off threats to their autonomy and maintain their unique (i.e., ethno-specific) approach and competencies.


This extremely valuable study is recent and comprehensive, reviewing nearly 400 publications from Canada, the US, Britain and Australia. Most studies reviewed by Reitz conclude that recent immigrant groups, in spite of significant need, often experience low rates of utilization of health and social services. The review focuses on attempts to improve access to services for ethno-racial groups including immigrants, with particular attention to the role of ethno-specific organizations and ethnic match in service personnel.

Who is involved?
The majority of the experiences and studies reviewed by Reitz involve service organizations, both mainstream and community-based. Outside of the area of settlement services, the most developed work in general health and social services appears to be in the area of health in general and mental health in particular.

On what are they collaborating or what is being coordinated?
Reitz reviews a variety of attempts to overcome barriers to service. The barriers addressed include those related to language, lack of information about services, cultural patterns of help-seeking, lack of cultural sensitivity by service providers, financial barriers, and lack of service availability.

**Why is this coordination or collaboration taking place (what is the motivation)?**

**What is the degree of collaboration?**

**What level of responsibility is involved (e.g. issues of accountability, governance and authority)?**

In a broad sense the collaboration analysed by Reitz involves the response of service organizations towards demands for greater accessibility articulated by ethno-racial clients and their advocacy groups or articulated as policies by government. Generally speaking questions of authority and accountability are defined by the organizational norms of the service institution and the conditions imposed by the funder(s) of the service, both within community-based and mainstream service agencies.

**What problematic issues are raised?**

Reitz emphasizes the complexity of the question of equality of access. Service needs and utilization of services vary according to such factors as ethno-racial group, period of immigration and type of immigration (e.g. refugees); therefore generalizations about immigrants or visible minorities may not be valid. Because of the barriers to access identified in the studies reviewed, research focusing on utilization rates may actually underestimate barriers in access to service. Furthermore, services may be utilized but not be culturally- or linguistically-appropriate; therefore adequate benefits may not be derived from the services.

While many of these recommendations have been implemented to some degree in one or another service agency or jurisdiction, Reitz emphasizes that lack of formal research evaluation of the programs and strategies makes it impossible to draw definitive research conclusions as to their effectiveness.

**What are the key lessons or learnings?**

According to Reitz the a large number of innovations have been proposed by researchers and agencies including: improved outreach and service information; locating agencies in areas of minority concentration; provision of multi-lingual services; "ethnic match" (providing or referring to ethnic-appropriate minority-group service providers); multicultural training and cultural sensitivity; minority service units; inter-agency coordination; less formalized or bureaucratized service delivery; adoption and diffusion of equity policies; community consultation; action research to establish minority group needs; support for ethno-specific agencies; coordination of ethno-specific and mainstream agencies.

Much of the literature reviewed supports the view that racial discrimination is a factor in barriers to service access. Many of the studies support the view that ethno-specific agencies and ethnic match in service provision play positive roles.

Reitz emphasizes the need, particularly in Canada, for further research analysing the quality of services provided to ethno-racial minorities. A preoccupation with equal access to services, in other words, should not distract us from concern for equality in service outcomes.

Section 4 of Reitz’s study entitled “Promising Service-Delivery Models and Management Strategies” is directly relevant to the modeling of settlement services and culturally- and linguistically-appropriate health and social services for immigrants and ethno-racial minorities. It summarizes various recommendations made to improve access to services in the following areas: technical, service organization, decision-making structures, and ethno-specific agencies, and comments on relevant policy initiatives by various levels of government in Canada as well as advocacy organizations.
This report presents a comprehensive model for an integrated, computerized database of settlement service provision in the provision of British Columbia. Implementation of the proposals in this report is expected to be fully achieved by the end of fiscal 1999-2000.

**Who is involved?**

The model of settlement services outcomes measurement presented in this report is based on collaboration between the British Columbia government, Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration and the principal NGO providers of settlement services in the province as represented by the Association of Multicultural Social Service Agencies of British Columbia (AMSSA). Trade union representatives of unionized settlement workers have also been involved in collaborative discussions particularly in respect the relationship between service standards and employee training and remuneration.

**On what are they collaborating or what is being coordinated?**

This is a practical project, which will develop an integrated database to record and evaluate settlement service provision in British Columbia.

**What is the degree of collaboration?**

This project represents a very high level of practical collaboration between NGO settlement service agencies and government funders of settlement services.

**What level of responsibility is involved (e.g. issues of accountability, governance and authority)?**

Data on clients and service provision is recorded at the agency level and integrated and shared through the responsible government ministry. Due respect for client confidentiality is integral to the system norms and operation. Autonomy of NGO service providers is maintained based on their mission statements as interpreted by their community-based management Boards.

**Why is this coordination or collaboration taking place (what is the motivation)?**

The high level of practical collaboration in recording and evaluating settlement services proposed in this model is the product of extensive collaboration between government funders and NGO service providers, and appears to have the full support of the latter. It would appear to be the product of a historical coincidence between two decisive factors: a consensus between funders on and service providers in the province on the need for improved planning and accountability in the field of settlement services, and an opportunity to construct such a system in the process of the implementation in the province of British Columbia of the Settlement Renewal process initiated by the federal government.

**What are the key lessons or learnings?**

The evaluation model that underlies the recommendations of this report is based on a framework derived from the United Way (USA). It distinguishes service outputs which are to be measured at the agency level and service outcomes which require more macro-level research efforts and correspondingly greater resources. It also makes maximum use of current computer technology.

The significance of this collaborative and high-tech approach to recording and assessing settlement services must be considered in relation to the observation by Reitz that Canadian research is seriously deficient in relation to evaluation of service outcomes.

The process leading up to this report and its recommendations appears to have avoided two key pitfalls of a similarly-motivated failed initiative by Citizenship and Immigration Canada at the federal level that took
place several years ago with respect to active and constructive dialogue between NGO service providers and government funders, and respect for client confidentiality as integral to database design.

The success of the collaborative consultation process behind this study suggests that it may be easier to coordinate settlement service delivery when only one level of funding authority is involved.

**What problematic issues are raised?**

While the report is uniformly optimistic, a critical observer could identify at least two areas of potential concern. First, past attempts at integration of computer-based human service delivery monitoring and evaluation systems consistently have proven to be more financially burdensome and practically difficult than originally envisioned. Second, the evaluative model integral to the proposed system depends on macro level research of outcomes for which there is no current financing or planning.


This annotated literature review by two researchers from the University of Toronto Department of Health Administration focuses on reports related to the coordination and integration of health services, including selected reports from the Province of Ontario as well as reports from other provinces and related health agencies and associations. The first volume presents the analytical framework including a review of theoretical literature on coordination and integration (Volume I, Appendix D). The second volume contains the summaries of the reports. While dated, this report is extremely comprehensive, and contains valuable attempts at theoretical generalizations on the question of service coordination and integration. Consideration of the rational and evidence-based approach to coordination of health services outlined in this report in relation to the turbulent history of health care reform in Ontario in the past decade provides a sobering reminder that all attempts at coordination and integration of health and social services are ultimately implemented by governments driven by particular fiscal and political agendas.

**Who is involved?**  
*On what are they collaborating or what is being coordinated?*

The report was commissioned by the government of Ontario. The focus is on the practices of health care providers, planners and funders in Canada and particularly in Ontario including government ministries, district health councils, hospitals, community health centres, and other service providers with respect to coordination and integration of services.

**What is the degree of collaboration?**  
**What level of responsibility is involved (e.g. issues of accountability, governance and authority)?**  
**Why is this coordination or collaboration taking place (what is the motivation)?**

This study provides a useful framework for assessing recommendations for coordination not only in the field of health services but more broadly in social services, including settlement services. The categories of analysis used include: jurisdiction, source of evidence, scope of services considered, committee composition, mandate and terms of reference, summary of relevant recommendations, governing instruments recommended, and who would have to act on recommendations. Motivating the study was a common perception among those who have analyzed health policy that, with so many different system elements, the Ontario health care system omitted necessary components and duplicated others.

The report does not propose a model of coordination or collaboration but rather identifies a variety of possible mechanisms including task forces and committees, assignment of integration and liaison functions to individuals and/or organizational units, stimulating direct contact among service providers and planners, development of procedures and legal requirements, use of vertically-integrated information systems, and various levels of organizational integration.

**What problematic issues are raised?**
What are the key lessons or learnings?

An important paradox is highlighted in this study. Recommendations from higher-level bodies tend to take as a point of departure the assumption that coordination and integration of services will provide efficiencies and cost-savings; in other words that the same level and quality of services can be maintained with a reduction in public expenditures or that a higher level and quality of services can be provided by maintaining existing levels of public expenditures. No empirical evidence for this view, however, was found in the literature reviewed. More locally based needs assessments however tend to focus on gaps in services or barriers to access to services, suggesting the need for greater public expenditures to achieve the desired level and quality of services.

Furthermore, the report is quite clear about the fact that coordination and integration of services is not only a goal but also a functional process with its own costs. Therefore rather than assuming that coordination and integration automatically yield cost benefits, we must provide justification for the increased costs associated with greater coordination and integration. Appendix D of the report, “Theoretical Insights related to Coordination and Integration”, suggests that greater coordination and integration is required where work elements are highly interconnected, when tasks are more complex, and where there are multiple components in the service delivery system.

Continuing with Appendix D the report identifies mechanisms for accomplishing coordination at the individual level including mutual adjustment through informal communication, direct supervision, standardization of work processes, standardization of work outputs, and standardization of work skills. At the organizational level coordination mechanisms include hierarchical authority, rules and procedures, planning and goal-setting, vertical information systems, lateral relations, custom, and feedback. Custom may be interpreted as consensus on values in relation to social service standards and feedback as responsiveness to individual and group client concerns.

As with other studies concerned with the coordination or integration of health and social services, this report identified the need for better data as a basis of decision-making. It was observed that local bodies feel they have inadequate data, while existing central databases are perceived as uneven, fragmented or inappropriate for planning purposes.


6. COSTI and OCASI, 1999, The Development of Service and Sectoral Standards for the Immigrant Services Sector: Discussion Document. Limited circulation report prepared by consultant Saddeiqa Holder for a project funded by the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation through the Newcomer Settlement Program.

Who is involved?
These two studies represent collaboration among NGO settlement service organizations and refugee rights groups in Canada through the leadership of their respective umbrella organizations. Government funding of the studies and of the umbrella organizations and agencies conducting the studies also represents a level of government and NGO collaboration in developing appropriate service standards for settlement work in Canada.

On what are they collaborating or what is being coordinated?

What is the degree of collaboration?
Based on broad consultation with their member agencies as well as commissioned research, these two reports propose quality standards for the delivery of settlement services in Canada. The standards in turn are derived from a long-term and holistic vision of the settlement process for immigrants and refugees. Settlement counseling and services as outlined in these reports is a multi-faceted process including such varied factors as language and employment training, appropriate information referral for access to mainstream services, culturally- and linguistically-appropriate service provision, anti-racism, and education on citizenship and human rights.
What **level of responsibility** is involved (e.g. issues of accountability, governance and authority)?

**Why** is this coordination or collaboration taking place (what is the motivation)?

The initiative for these studies came from a deep concern among NGO settlement agencies that federal devolution of responsibility for settlement services (Settlement Renewal) could lead to an abandonment of national standards in the area of settlement services.

What are the **key lessons** or learnings?

These documents propose standards for settlement services, which can be applied at the agency level and considered in training of settlement counselors. In the context of the report British Columbia, 1998, they are relevant to both outputs (at the agency level) and outcomes (at the societal level). In the context of the report by Deber and Kent, V., 1989, they are relevant to various levels of coordination on both the individual and the organizational level.

These documents provide evidence that in recent years in Canada the community-based providers of settlement services, through the advocacy activities of their umbrella agencies, have taken the leadership in defining standards of service for the settlement sector. Indeed this leadership dates back to the publication by OCASI in 1991 of Janis Galway’s *Immigrant Settlement Counselling: A Training Guide*.

What **problematic issues** are raised?

The initiatives by these two umbrella organizations to define standards for settlement services have, to date, provided little that is useful on the important issue of evaluation of the quality of service provision. Furthermore, the issue of the administration of common standards remains vague in these documents.

7. Saddeiqa Holder, 1998, **The Role of Immigrant Serving Organizations in the Canadian Welfare State: A Case Study**: A Doctoral thesis submitted to OISE.

Drawing upon an interdisciplinary body of literature this thesis investigates the role of immigrant serving organizations in the Canadian welfare state. Comparative literature on the voluntary sector, international perspectives on settlement services for immigrants, and state/minority relations in Canada are reviewed to illuminate salient research questions. A case study was undertaken guided by the following research questions: what is it that the organizations do, including both their service and non-service functions; what is the impact of the organization on clients and other stakeholder groups; what is the agency’s relationship with government, its primary funder; and lastly, what are the implications of the study for analyses of the welfare state?

Who is involved in collaboration?

In Saddeiqa’s work collaboration is between mainstream and ethno-specific to deliver skills training programs to newcomers. This model is a slight variation of Agard (1987) who proposes ethno-specific agencies team up with community-based agencies to deliver services on the basis of a purchase of service agreement. The idea is for a mainstream agency to retain the traditional delivery responsibility but contracts the specific tasks such as training or outreach to an ethno-specific partner.

On what are they collaborating or what is being coordinated?

Degree of collaboration and responsibility?

The ethno-specific agency is contracted to deliver a job training program by a mainstream (community college) intermediary as the initial recipients of a government contract. The degree of responsibility as defined in a service contract is to provide training and conduct outreach in order to attract trainees. Similarly, the level of responsibility as defined in the contract is only for service delivery and not overall management of the program.

The collaboration analysed by Saddeiqa between a college institution and a large ethno-specific agency. The college did not have staff with enough knowledge of the specific communities the training program
was geared for. By contracting to an agency the college saves money because workers in the community partner are paid much less, plus the community agency has a much more effective outreach to the client community than the College partner. In exchange, the community partner gets money and recognition in the community.

**Issues & Lessons:** A key issue that needs to be raised is whether the College partner has sufficient understanding of client needs; whether the college partner is taking advantage of its stature to gain contracts with government, which it then subcontracts, to a community group at a cheaper price; and whether the status of the College is too dominant to allow for an equitable relationship with its ethno-specific counterpart. The second and related issue is the government practice of contracting to mainstream public sector institution to avoid direct contracting to community groups. It raises many questions on the implications of this “collaboration approach”, specifically: who benefits from the arrangement and to what extent are newcomers served?

8. Usha George and Mwarigha M.S., 1999, *Consultation on Settlement Programming For African NewComers: Centre For Applied Social Research, Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto.*

The goal of this study was to consult with service providers – mainstream and African ethno-specific agencies – in order to recommend effective and affordable models of settlement service delivery for African newcomers in Toronto within the confines of the Immigrant Settlement Adaptation Program (ISAP). The study recommended a model of service delivery that is based on three basic features: Needs Based - Newcomer needs must be the focus of settlement services, with culture and language as important considerations. Specialization – The current model of settlement service delivery, in which one settlement counselor provides all services, should give way to specialized services provided at three program levels. Case Management – effective one-on-one counseling to ensure follow-up of newcomers who enter the settlement service delivery system. The study recommends: provision of appropriate information and referral upon arrival at the airport, development of a comprehensive brochure for African newcomers to provide information about the existing service system, and design of a three levels of program delivery encompassing reception and basic services, labour market services and specialized settlement services. The study concludes by stating that the major long term strategy for African newcomer communities should be the development of community leadership and cooperation.

**Who is involved?**
The consultations on settlement programming in the African Communities involved different stakeholders including: newcomers, existing service providers, African ethno-cultural organizations race relations organizations, umbrella organizations and religious organizations to gain opinions on the best model(s) for service delivery

**What are the collaboration issues?**
The study consulted with service providers and African ISAs. While ISAP funding guidelines limit the areas of settlement funding, many service providers favour a holistic approach to serving the interests of the African newcomers. Newcomers consulted by the study stressed the importance of having a coordinated system of services that integrates ethno-specific and mainstream services. This combination was favoured as a means of optimizing both access and quality of services for newcomers. Responses from the African community for a collaborative model of service delivery ranged from the need to establish a service board to coordinate priority setting and services to establishing an African council to broker funding to African service agencies as well as organize planning of services. Both recommendations are unlikely to receive funding support from ISAP because of the strict funding guidelines of their settlement services program. In the end the study recommends a three level program service delivery model that will be administered or “coordinated” by the funder through a competitive bid process.

**At what level of responsibility does the partnership take place?**
Responsibility in this model is assigned on the basis of service delivery capacity. The three levels of service recommended in the study are designed to give responsibility to different service delivery agencies drawn from both mainstream and ethno-specific agencies. Viewed purely in terms of service delivery, the level of coordination, and hence responsibility are defined primarily by the funding agency. In this context,
collaboration between agencies is a, first, a means to accessing funding and then, secondly, a mechanism for serving newcomers. The inclusion of a governance and policy making body are excluded by the confines of the existing service/client focused settlement funding system.

**Key Lessons:**
The major goal of any settlement strategy should be to provide the range of services that will jump-start newcomers and their communities to become empowered and independent residents in Canada. Newcomers demand services that are sensitive to their culture and responsive to their needs. Newcomers want services that are well coordinated so that they do not have to waste time hunting for services in a forest of service providers. Many service providers, both mainstream and ethno-specific, now recognize the need for some form of coordinating intermediary at the local level to set priorities based on changing newcomer needs on the ground. Funders are still wary of providing financial support towards the development of such an initiative because it falls outside their strict program and project funding confines. Many funders prefer a settlement services system that is client/service provider based, rather than a holistic capacity and newcomer community development model.

9. **Carl E. James: Perspectives on Racism and the Human Services Sector:**
   **A Case for Change:**
   This book provides an analyses of the racism in the immigration system, including settlement services, the justice system and human rights law, and the delivery of health and social services. Another task is that of raising awareness of the outdated values and myths that still prevail in the human service sector. The book looks at the challenges human service institutions face in service delivery in the context of an economically, ethnically, and racially stratified society. What structures must be in place in order to respond effectively to the diverse needs and expectations of a changing population, and of racial minorities in particular. The book suggests ways to guide and support organizational change.

**Who is involved in collaboration and for what collaboration?**
In a multicultural add-on model, an organization merely designs new initiatives to translate documents, or recruit staff, board members and volunteers from minority communities. Collaboration is primarily through establishing links with constituency groups, who may operate in a totally non-supportive organization. In Multicultural anti-racism approach, collaboration between mainstream and ethno-specific groups, the mainstream agency could act as a broker among community, institutions and government to identify and inform unjust practices, advocating for new policies and programs, supporting external alliances and coalitions and working collaboratively with ethno-specific groups.
PART III

A POSSIBLE TEMPLATE FOR COLLABORATION/COORDINATION:
A SOCIAL UNION FRAMEWORK


The search for a social union is to society what the settlement experience is to the individual. While settlement is, at one level, a highly personalized experience it is also at the same time a truly collective experience that can only be understood at the societal level. The “settlement journey” will only find fulfillment if there is a corresponding “point of arrival” at some collective goal. The newcomer will “arrive” and find a home only if society has a consensus of what “home” means for everybody. Creating the society we want is both a pre-requisite as well as the goal of every newcomer.

In a sense the search for “the social union” is the search for a model of partnership among newcomers, funders, and service providers, from whatever sector. Hence, the artificial separation between settlement services and social services will be resolved if everybody – newcomers or native born – see themselves as actively involved in the creation of the social union.

This section is an analysis of a model of “partnership” that addresses the gap in the current settlement partnership models, i.e., it provides a partnership model that includes the component of fundamental values. It looks at issues and themes relevant to the search for partnership models, specifically: establishing common values and purpose, ensuring equity and participation, and enhancing transparency. It presents a comparison of various models or structures that address questions of policy and management coordination, data gathering and monitoring, interpretation and enforcement. In particular it tries to integrate social policy, federalism and democratic engagement principles within a framework of:

- diversity and consistency
- governmental collaboration/ joint rather than unilateral action
- transparency and accountability
- inclusivity
- equity.

This book explores whether new intergovernmental mechanisms are needed in the context of creating the social union. It argues that new institutions are required to provide processes and mechanisms:

- for increased collaboration and joint rather than unilateral processes; and
- to respond to the public's demand for increased transparency, accountability and citizen engagement.

The author suggests/proposes 1) functions to be performed by new institutions in the social union; 2) criteria for evaluating/assessing these institutions; 3) and models upon which these new institutions could be based.

1. **Functions to be performed** by new institutions in the social union i.e.,
   - priority setting, planning, vertical management of sectoral and cross-sectoral issues, and policy coordination
   - data collection, monitoring and reporting to the public
   - interpretation, dispute settlement and mediation
   - promoting adherence/enforcement

2. **Criteria for evaluating/assessing** these institutions i.e.,


- **consistency with the social union's**
  - **core values**
    - sharing, equity, compassion, individual responsibility
    - federalism that provides for collective action to pursue these values and for flexibility to respond to local priorities and circumstances
    - citizen participation and public accountability
  - **purpose** that was defined as
    - addressing the interrelated concepts of social cohesion, economic union and human development
    - providing a framework for managing the interdependence of governments as they address these concepts
  - **social policy, federalism and democratic engagement principles** that emphasize
    - diversity and consistency
    - governmental collaboration/ joint rather than unilateral action
    - transparency and accountability
    - inclusivity
    - equity

  This evaluation criterion favours models that are collaborative, help governments address interdependence through federal-provincial and interprovincial mechanisms, are transparent, inclusive, accountable and effectively balance consistency and diversity.

- **efficiency and effectiveness** - striving for optimal policy outcomes in a timely manner and with the least possible transactions costs; desired outcome for the social and economic union is increased positive integration

  This criterion favours models that encourage a convergence of interests among governments or include explicit mechanisms to deal with divergence.

- **ability to achieve** - the likelihood that the institution could be implemented in a relatively short time frame

  This criterion favours models that are incremental, build on existing institutions, allow for different approaches to different sectors, do not require immediate constitutional agreement, can build from consensus-based decision making to rules-based decision making, and readily adaptable to the Canadian historical and cultural context; would not preclude evolution to a structural model later.

3. **Models** upon which new institutions could be based

  - **status quo** - tends to be informal, ad hoc with minimal structure, limited functions such as consultation, some policy coordination and information sharing about the behaviour of players, involves limited number of players, largely intergovernmental

  - **incremental** - adds some structure and system to the process largely by building on existing institutions, expands number of functions to include activities to influence behaviour such as joint data collection, monitoring and interpretation, expands players to include public and NGOs, somewhat less intergovernmental

  - **structural** - has very formal and structured processes and decision-making rules, requires creation of new institutions, includes formal decision making and enforcement functions that are intended to direct behaviour, tends to limit the number of players, particularly the public, and may involve such other institutions as the courts.
The table below summarizes these models:

### Table 2: Social Union Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODELS</th>
<th>FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>priority setting, planning, vertical management of sectoral/cross sectoral issues, and policy coordination</th>
<th>data collection, monitoring and reporting to the public</th>
<th>interpretation, dispute settlement and mediation</th>
<th>promoting adherence/enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status quo</strong></td>
<td>First Ministers'/Annual Premier's Conferences, Provincial-Territorial Ministerial Council/ Federal-Provincial-Territorial Council on Social Policy Renewal</td>
<td>European Community</td>
<td>Commonwealth Grants Mission in Australia</td>
<td>Canada Health and Social Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incremental</strong></td>
<td>recommendations of the MacDonald Commission concerning FMCs; Australian Council of Australian Governments; expansion of the functions of the FPT Council on Social Policy Renewal</td>
<td>Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Canadian Institute for Health Information, German Council of Experts</td>
<td>International Labour Organization, Agreement on Internal Trade, Sector Councils</td>
<td>Canada-wide Accord on Environmental Harmonization, European Social Charter, FMC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
<td>Council of the Federation, European Community-based models, ACCESS</td>
<td>Oregon's benchmarking process, Australia's performance monitoring system</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. CONSULTATION MECHANISMS: FROM THE CONVENTIONAL TO THE TRANSFORMATIVE


More creative and inclusive consultation mechanisms are necessary in developing effective forms of collaboration and viable coordination mechanisms. This section explores some of these forms and mechanisms for consultation.

Mechanisms for involving citizens range from traditional consultation, often limited to one-way communication, to methods of engagement that involve dialogue, deliberation and choices. [The Canada West Foundation’s “Meaningful Consultation: A Contradiction in Terms,” (1997), and Kathy O’Hara’s Citizen Engagement in the Social Union (1997).

Table 3 (next page) describes the more traditional/conventional method and summarizes the relative advantages and disadvantages of some of the more traditional mechanisms. Table 4 summarizes citizen engagement mechanisms that tend to be more democratic and equitable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TOOLS</strong></th>
<th><strong>POSITIVES</strong></th>
<th><strong>LIMITATIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Election</strong> as the most widely-used consultative mechanism</td>
<td>Inclusiveness; moderately successful in re facilitating access to information and discussion of issues</td>
<td>Individual participation, low levels of influence and impact, and minimal capacity for agenda setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referendum</strong> as increasing popular consultation mechanism where all voters can participate</td>
<td>Representative and inclusive; can focus discussion on a single issue; (in theory) can achieve a high degree of closure</td>
<td>Limited opportunity to broaden the range of choices or to refocus the terms of discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative hearing</strong> generally conducted by special or standing committees composed of members of a legislative assembly</td>
<td>Allows for a focus on a particular issue or set of issues; a forum for airing informed opinion (although generally by experts and those most affected); potentially having an impact on outcomes; permits dialogue, reflection and modification of views</td>
<td>Weak at ensuring broad representation and allowing for introduction of new options; being Ottawa-based, they are seen by many as inaccessible, formalized, in some instances, intimidating; remains exclusively the purview of members of the legislative committee conducting the hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Royal Commission</strong> with long tradition of use in Canada but only since 70s did citizen engagement become a feature of such process</td>
<td>Can address a broad range of issues; excellent opportunity for informed opinion to be heard, issues to be discussed and new options/perspectives to be introduced and considered</td>
<td>Tendency to exclude citizens themselves from the deliberation process and some levels of discussion; ultimately commissioners’ views and judgment that are affected and reflected in outcomes; tend to be costly; recommendations seldom fully implemented seriously hampering closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituent survey</strong> where elected officials use mail or telephone surveys to provide constituents an opportunity to express their views between elections on a variety of issues</td>
<td>Timely, can achieve focus on specific issues and low cost</td>
<td>Limited opportunity for learning/education around issues; no opportunity for dialogue or consideration of alternative options; not representative; limited opportunity for individual influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion poll</strong> as pervasive in modern political systems, based for the most part on random sampling</td>
<td>Representative, with high degree of issue focus, allowing tracking of opinion changes over time</td>
<td>Measure immediate “top of the mind judgments/opinions; preclude informed debate/diaglogue/emergence of options; do not lead to decisions directly; limits chances for individual participation to impact on outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town hall meeting</strong> involving open discussions between political leaders, decision makers and members of the public</td>
<td>Issue relevance can be high, with informed opinion heard</td>
<td>Representation is fair to poor as participants are pre-selected in a screening process; discussion can be highly structured/manipulated, inhibits dialogue and formation of new options; limited capacity for influence and closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus group</strong> generally bring together small group of people with certain or a mix of characteristics to uncover opinion</td>
<td>A marginal improvement over opinion polls for increasing participant knowledge of issue, discussion, dialogue, emergence of</td>
<td>However education, dialogue and option creation are not their main concern; not highly representative, normally involve only a small number of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy conference</strong> brings together large number of people to serve educational or professional development purposes</td>
<td>Excellent issue focus and airing of expert opinion</td>
<td>No in-depth dialogue, discussion of issues, creation of alternatives/options as most participants are just observers to the process; no opportunity for consensus to develop/closure to be achieved; moderately representative, involving those with vested interest in specific policy area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy roundtable</strong> involves smaller number of invited participants generally representing groups and interests discussing policy issues</td>
<td>Can provide excellent opportunity for learning, education, dialogue, formation/consideration of options; even consensus building; individuals can have impact on proceedings; can achieve some measure of closure in some instances</td>
<td>Tend to be unrepresentative due to small number of participants involved, who are generally selected for their expertise or interest on an issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Citizen engagement: mechanisms and methods

These represent either improved variations of, or distinct alternatives to the traditional forms; still unfolding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>POSITIVES</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliberative democracy</strong></td>
<td>Main strength is in its representativeness, ability to encompass learning, education, dialogue, debate, reflection, option and opinion development, individual influence and participation, and depending on how results are organized and reported, a degree of closure</td>
<td>Expense and logistical organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combines opinion poll, policy conference and roundtable; participants chosen at random, opinions surveyed prior to and post conference/roundtable; for several days, group is involved in conference/plenary/workshop/small discussion/focus groups; critical is how discussion of agenda issues is managed/structured for dialogue to reach meaningful conclusion; debate/discussion should not be stifled by overly prescriptive agenda/process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Televoting</strong></td>
<td>Much improved access to information; informed opinions can be taken</td>
<td>Does not facilitate dialogue; no opportunity to have alternative options brought forward and considered; representativeness is compromised when random samples are not part of process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>builds on opinion poll; participants either self-select by registering as voters or are asked to participate as part of randomly selected representative sample; receive educational material presenting facts, opposing views/options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study circles</strong></td>
<td>Excellent opportunity for learning, education, dialogue, exchange, formation of informed opinion and individual participation</td>
<td>Representativeness not a strong point; questionable degree of real influence on policy decisions until outcomes of individual study circles are knit into a broader coalition perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– small groups of people learning about, discussing, deliberating/developing options and preferences concerning policy issue or set of issues; spans weeks or months; generally professionally facilitated; 3-step process: individual reflection; what others say about the issue; identification of actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen jury</strong></td>
<td>Opportunity for dialogue and formation of informed opinions as well as options and alternatives is good within the group</td>
<td>Unrepresentative due to small size of group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– randomly-selected number of people deliberating and deciding on a particular issue for a short period; hear expert opinion and testimony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search conference</strong></td>
<td>Do allow people to “argue about issues in the knowledge that they share the common goal of developing strategies for the future” [O’Hara]</td>
<td>Questionable is its applicability in the context of a group of ordinary citizens who may or may not share responsibility for implementing the resulting plans; not clear whether this has been done in a way that “ordinary citizens” have been included as participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to facilitate strategic planning/participation of those responsible for implementing strategic plans in the overall planning exercise; emphasis on getting to broadly agreeable “action plans”; less emphasis on hearing and questioning expert opinion, on unstructured dialogue, debate and reflection; since differences in perspectives/views do not interfere with achievement of common goal/strategy, they usually remain unreconciled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In Imagine Democracy, (Stoddart, c. 2000) Judy Rebick describes her experience with “small group democracy” as a methodology for citizen empowerment and democratic participation.
APPENDICES:

APPENDIX 1: THEMATIC ABSTRACTS AND SOURCES

This appendix gives a summary of various resources/tools that can be utilized to seek various forms of partnership or collaboration.

The table below provides abstracts and description of various sources (e.g., project or task force/committee reports, resource manuals or tools, and research studies) organized thematically according to some of the partnership issues being explored by the Consortium project i.e., public participation, local governance, the concept of the social union, and access & equity. As a research tool, the table provides information for accessing cited documents whether direct from the publisher/distributor or through an internet website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description (from book reviews and publisher abstracts)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Participation</strong> 1. This report fulfils the one-year mandate of the Legislative Review Advisory Group to advise the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on the best future direction for Canadian immigration laws in light of present challenges, emerging trends and available research. It goes beyond the confined areas of statutes in its examination of policies and programs that shape and give effect to laws. The report is the result of many months of consultations with people involved in all aspects of immigration, inside and outside all orders of government, of the consideration of more than 500 written submissions, and of much study and discussion. In an effort to be true to what we heard, we have concentrated on people, rather than numbers, in the preparation of this report.</td>
<td>Report to advise the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration</td>
<td>Trempe, Robert, Susan Davis and Roslyn Kunin. 1997. Not Just Numbers: A Canadian Framework for Future Immigration. [on-line]. Available: <a href="http://cicnet.ci.gc.ca/english/about/policy/frag/etoc.html">http://cicnet.ci.gc.ca/english/about/policy/frag/etoc.html</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This innovative study examines the state of 368 community health and social service centres across Canada. The authors analyze the goals, operations and funding of the centres, and based on this information, they propose a conceptual framework for “active communities.” This study is a useful reference tool for community centres and for anyone interested in the development of multi-service, community-based health and social services in Canada.</td>
<td>Reference Tool – available from CCSD</td>
<td>Robichaud, Jean-Bernard and Claude Quiviger. Active Communities. 242 pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This handbook is intended: • To help us define our expectations from a consultation process, so that we can demand that we are treated fairly and taken seriously, and that the process is fair for all affected members of the public; • To help us decide when it is in the interests of our cause and our group to participate in a consultation; • To help us make the most of the process if we decide to participate; • To contribute to the spread of high-quality consultation throughout all levels and departments of government activity.</td>
<td>Resource Tool</td>
<td>1989. Maynes, Clifford. Public Consultation: A Citizens Handbook. Ontario Environment Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. An empirical analysis of the partnership between the savings and loan branches of the Desjardins Movement and the local development corporations of one Montreal neighbourhood finds that this partnership is institutionalised via a local association for investment in employment (SOLIDE—société locale d’investissement dans le développement de l’emploi). The model for this association is the union component of Quebec’s social economy, the Solidarity Fund of the Quebec Federation of Labour (QFL). Such partnerships between the traditional and the new wings of the social economy have two</td>
<td>A study in the journal Liens social et Politiques</td>
<td>Malo, Marie-Claire and Moreau, Cedriane. &quot;Local Development Corporations and the Caisse Desjardins: What Kind of Partnership?&quot; In Liens social et Politiques. Spring 1999. [on-line] Available:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Government

|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|

1. The consortium, which includes the City of Chatham and its public library, the County of Kent, the public and separate school boards, a community college and two area hospitals, has become a model of public sector co-operation and fiscal responsibility. Project

|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

2. Finding industrial pollutants in the groundwater in 1989 was the impetus for Woolwich Township, near Kitchener-Waterloo. To help anticipate or prevent problems such as this from recurring, community members organized a visioning day and a coordination committee. Project

|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

3. More and more, governments are calling upon citizens and local communities to assume responsibility for social services and primary health care. This thoughtful book provides a clear and well-documented historical study of the role of local governments, taking the reader beyond the purely ideological debate by analyzing the existing conditions. It is also unique in that it deals with Canada as a whole and sets out the arguments for and against giving local governments a larger part to play. It is a mandatory reference tool for all those concerned with the role of local authority in the provision of health and social services in Canada. Project

|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

4. Describes process of multi-sectional consultation. 
- To assist in the development of a constructive and meaningful Canadian position for Habitat II, CIDA worked with the CUI to conduct a series of pan-Canada consultations on international issues in local governance. Project

|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

strategic dimensions. One is to renew the community base of the older organisations, for example the Caisses Desjardins, and the other is to strengthen the economic dimension of the new organisations, of which the local development corporations are an example.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This 42-page paper examines the Canadian experience with citizen engagement, and applies this experience to the renewal of Canada’s social union. It builds upon the work of other advisory and research bodies to provide both a resource and a focus for discussion, useful to citizens in and out of public or political service.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Order from CCSD <a href="http://www.ccsd.ca/pubsoopol.html">http://www.ccsd.ca/pubsoopol.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This paper provides an overview of Canadian social policy. It begins by discussing the question &quot;What is social policy?&quot; followed by a presentation of the major objectives, principles and values that underlie our social security system. It also examines the themes that have influenced the development of our system and traces its growth, describes the basic features of social programs, including a short discussion of current social spending, presents some of the major influences and players involved in social policymaking in Canada, and discusses some of the pressures and challenges confronting the social security system today.</td>
<td>Paper - available from CCSD</td>
<td>1993. Hess, Melanie. <em>An Overview of Canadian Social Policy.</em> 112pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Order from CCSD <a href="http://www.ccsd.cs/pubsoopol.html">http://www.ccsd.cs/pubsoopol.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This study reports on the results of a series of roundtable discussions held last year by CPRN with federal and provincial officials, academics, and experts from non-governmental organizations. These roundtable discussions considered the definition of the social union, including its purpose, values and principles. They also looked at how outcomes in the social union could be measured, what new institutions are required to carry out the functions of the social union, and how citizens could become engaged in the construction of the social union.</td>
<td>Study – available from CPRN</td>
<td>1998. CPRN. <em>Securing the Union.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renouf Publishing Company Limited 5369 Canotek Road, Ottawa, Ontario K1J 9J3 Tel: (613) 745-2665 Fax: (613) 745-7660.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"We need to have a framework for thinking through social policy renewal, and in particular, the linkages between the social union, the economic union, and social cohesion in Canada" said Kathy O’Hara, author of the study and a former Research Fellow at CPRN. "Moreover, we have to demonstrate that federalism can evolve by maximizing its capacity to respect both our commonality and our diversity in the interest of all Canadians."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Health care delivery systems in western nations are undergoing major restructuring. This project examines how three health care organizations in Greater Vancouver respond to government policy initiatives aimed at making health care services equally accessible to diverse client populations; and aims to identify micro-organizational forces and macro-structural factors that facilitate or hinder organizational response to multicultural patients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This project examines settlement programs delivered by three large non-governmental immigrant service organizations and the effects of restructuring and ‘settlement renewal’ on the ability of these organizations to service the growing needs of refugees and immigrants. Principal results from archival, interview and focus group data are that restructuring has made funding less stable and services less responsive to the increasing problems of poverty and unemployment experienced by clients. At the same time restructuring is opening new possibilities for partnerships with government while expanding the role of NGOs in social advocacy.</td>
<td>Project – RIIM/CERIS</td>
<td>1999. Creese, Gillian; Timothy Welsh, Arthur Ling, Fiona Angus, Emily McNair. <em>Government Restructuring and Settlement Service Organizations in Vancouver.</em> RIIM/CERIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This project is working with German, Chinese and Korean congregations in Greater Vancouver to ascertain their role in providing settlement services and aiding integration for new immigrants. A church directory has been compiled for each group and correlated with the changing residential map. Interviews are underway with leaders of 20 Chinese and 20 Korean congregations; work with 10 German churches is complete. The German churches serve immigrants of the 1950s and 1960s in particular, and permit examination of integration of the second generation – and integration of the churches themselves as multicultural institutions. The Chinese and Korean churches in contrast are serving large and continuing arrivals of new immigrants with pressing economic and social needs.</td>
<td>Project – RIIM/CERIS</td>
<td>2000. Ley, David; Edward Hui, John Zimmerman, Laura Beattie, Jumy Kim, Won Lee, Stella Lai. <em>Settlement Services and Immigrant Churches.</em> RIIM/CERIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How can services or programs be designed so that they are socially and culturally viable, as well as responsive to changing community needs? That was one of the central questions at a national conference. Included in this report are practical discussions of the common objectives of such services, the diversity and range of services available, the benefits and pitfalls of community involvement, and the obstacles to establishing services. The report also addresses broader issues such as the role of community-based services in stimulating social change and future policy directions in this area.</td>
<td>Report - available from CCSD</td>
<td>1986. <em>Community-Based Health and Social Services.</em> 92 pp. Order from <a href="http://www.ccsd.ca/pubhealt.html">http://www.ccsd.ca/pubhealt.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceris Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Research Initiative – Connecting Researchers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Website</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Policy Research Initiative (PRI) seeks to strengthen the policy research capacity in Canada. This site provides a service to the wide range of people interested and involved in public policy research and development.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Networks Community. This is an online community of more than 3500 Canadian non-profits and social activists.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Website</strong></td>
<td><strong><a href="http://community.web.net/">http://community.web.net/</a></strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: EXTRACTS ON DEVOLUTION AND GLOBALIZATION

From *Metropolitan Toronto Social Policy Context in Overview of Policies and Trends* by the Canadian Urban Institute. pp.41-42 (n.d.)

This section presents a summary of the points on Devolution of Provincial Social Service Responsibilities based on the above mentioned document:

1. Even though the Provincial-Municipal Social Services Review Committee and the Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS) appear to have a preference for considerable devolution of program design and implementation to large municipalities at least, overall policy direction has been leading to an integration of many of MCSS’s programs with those of Health and other ministries.
   - some others wanting to have more professional standards, their own delivery networks and a higher degree of provincial control are not disposed to devolution to municipalities
   - some in the professional social service community will also oppose this, seeing that smaller urban centers, especially, will not be as sensitive to social needs as the provincial government.

2. The consensus that social services should be delivered on a more local or community basis does not mean that the municipality will necessarily be the agent of delivery.
   - compromise solution: delivery carried out locally by a special purpose body with a more direct accountability link to a provincial ministry than to a municipality.

3. In the case of devolution of considerably greater authority to municipalities for the design and development of social service programs, this will happen not as a massive transfer, and not at the same time to all municipalities.
   - implementation will likely be done in a phased manner and to regional or large municipalities
   - characterized by experiments in devolution of specific programs on to individual regions.

4. Another constraint to devolution to municipalities: belief in some provincial and non-government circles that the Ontario municipal political system does not lend itself to the development and maintenance of priority setting in the context of fiscal restraint.
APPENDIX 3:


This excerpt addresses the question of governance – e.g., amalgamation – and related issues of equity and the roles of public and private sectors. Reference is made to three issues of Studies in Political Economy on the issues of globalization, re-structuring, and state regulation (see bottom of this section).

“Globalization has created new spatial relationships on a variety of scales. Together with the spatiality of global capitalism came an array of new governance institutions and mechanisms, as well as redrawn internal and external boundaries of states and other governance institutions. This is partly a consequence of the changing role of nation states and of systems of nation states. Particularly urbanization and regionalization are among the dynamic material dimensions of globalization. These processes establish distinct complexes of social relationships and of political forms of governance on all socio-spatial scales. This vision defies much of current globalization discourse both of the aggressively boosterist neoliberal Right (which sees only bliss in globalization) and of parts of the traditional defensive Left (which fetishizes globalization beyond any strategic usefulness). It allows us to pose new questions about the incongruence of different levels of market, state and society. It has also presented policy makers with new sets of challenges and opportunities, and has led to new arenas of social struggle.

For political economists relationships of spatiality and governance are of central concern as the (national) state has undergone multiple processes of restructuring which begs the general question of political form in a changing economic environment. Especially, what has been termed the rise of civil society and the emergence of a post-Fordist economy, has led to the necessity of reexamining the spatiality of state and politics.

Studies in Political Economy examines these new relationships in a conference and theme issue of the journal with a particular interest in questions of (local) state theory, new strategies of international politics and possibilities of local action. Studies in Political Economy is a Canadian scholarly journal providing detailed analysis of current issues and informed commentary on topics in Canadian and international political economy. Contents and themes of recent issues have included Restructuring States (Summer 1999), Globalization (Spring 1999), and The State and Regulation (Autumn 1998).”