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Settlement Service Standards:
An Inventory of Work-in-Progress and Future Steps

1. Introduction

The work of settlement service provision, accomplished primarily through voluntary community-based agencies (i.e., governed by a voluntary Board of Directors drawn from various communities such as ethnoracial communities, networks of service providers, etc.) has evolved from early uncoordinated and ad hoc service responses to a network of agencies who deliver services with varying degrees of professionalism and sophistication. The recent computerization of the sector, initiated by the federal government, is one facet of the increasing complexity of settlement service provision. Another is the concern of service deliverers with standards for service delivery and the related interest in evaluation.

This project was intended to further the work accomplished through an earlier project on service standards, undertaken by OCASI (Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI) and COSTI (a large Toronto based multiservice agency), and funded by the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation’s (now Ministry of Citizenship) Newcomer Settlement Program.

The end product of the earlier project was a discussion paper on service and sectoral standards for the non-governmental settlement service sector and included a draft set of service standards. The discussion paper was made available electronically and discussed at the 1999 OCASI Professional Development Conference at Geneva Park, Ontario.

Subsequently one of the agencies that participated in the Steering Committee of the original project, Ottawa Carleton Immigrant Services Organization (OCISO), used the draft service standards as the basis for developing their own agency standards and service manual. COSTI utilized material from the project as the basis for developing an evaluation framework for its programs. Both of these agencies also developed databases for recording service information that would meet both their own and funders’ reporting requirements.

But what are the practices of other agencies in the sector? This project was intended to answer that question by compiling an inventory of work in progress in the area of settlement service standards and related resources. Another goal of the project was that of promoting sectoral engagement, as well as identifying barriers to, supports for and concerns with the process of establishing standards.

2. Background to the issue

2.1 Social and political context: emphasis on accountability by Western governments

As was discussed in the research paper “Defining settlement services and minimum standards”, that was written for the COSTI/OCASI project, the issue of standards and outcomes in service
delivery has arisen in many Western welfare societies in response to critiques of the welfare state and as a result of developments in management theory, such as Total Quality Management (Martin & Kettner, 1997). Thus, for example, accountability measures for governmental programs and services have been legislated in the United States (Kurtz, Netting, Huber, Borders, & Davis, 1997) and emphasized by the government of the United Kingdom as a way of displaying accountability in the public sector (Davies & Shellard, 1997).

2.2 Canadian context

Concern with accountability was evident in Ontario in the early 1990s. For example, in 1992 a Provincial Auditor directive suggested that the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship’s objectives for grant recipients be focused on results rather than activities, and, where practicable, should be measurable (Ontario Ministry of Citizenship, 1994).

At the federal level the question of standards for settlement services has figured prominently since the federal government initiated Settlement Renewal (1995), a plan to devolve responsibility for the delivery of settlement services to lower levels of government and/or local co-ordinating bodies. The attempt to specify standards spoke to devolution by outlining core services that should be funded no matter what level of government administered settlement program funding. Thus there were two distinct interests: 1) service deliverers’ desire to ensure comparable service delivery across the country; and 2) funders’ desire to put into place an accountability measure to maximize the impact of settlement and integration funding expenditures (Citizenship & Immigration Canada, 1996).

More recently, in 2000, Treasury Board has established a performance measurement framework for evaluating the federal government’s grants and contributions. These have been translated into CIC’s Contribution Accountability Framework (CAF) (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2001) which will be discussed in 5.2 below.

3. Key issues in developing service standards

3.1 Utility of standards

From a community perspective the development of standards can provide legitimacy by clearly communicating the sector’s goals and activities and providing assurance to stakeholders and critics concerned about quality of service. Clearly articulated standards will result in commonly held understandings and will facilitate cross referrals and partnerships among agencies. Standards will also provide direction for fledgling agencies and should operate as a checklist against which existing organizations may review their programs. At the same time standards should not operate as constraints upon agency flexibility and autonomy. Velinka Nevrencan, at OCISO, tells of how, upon reviewing reports from the data base, in which services provided had been recorded, they realized that there was a large number of requests for legal assistance. With this hard data they were able to make a case for having a part-time legal aid lawyer housed at the agency.
It is a commonly held belief that if the sector does not develop standards for itself, then funders, notably Citizenship and Immigration Canada will do it.

3.2 Understanding settlement and settlement services

Key issues in the development of standards are those of defining settlement and settlement services. If the desired outcome of settlement service provision is the settlement and integration of immigrants, these have to be defined so that we know when the state of being settled has been achieved. We also need to know what services assist or lead to successful settlement. On the latter point, there is some consensus on the part of government funders and community-based service deliverers that things such as language provision, information and referral, employment orientation, and so are generally useful.

Other aspects of the definition of settlement services have been hotly contested by government and community-based service deliverers. For administrative and cost-saving purposes governments, especially at the federal level, have wanted to define settlement services as those services required by immigrants with particular immigration status, during an initial period of time after arrival. For their part, community-based service deliverers argue that delineating a time period is artificial because services may be required by immigrants later on. Frequently the example is used of workers who secure employment shortly after arrival, without acquiring English or French language skills. Many years later a period of unemployment may occur when that worker will require supportive counselling, assistance in filling out forms, employment counselling and language training. Community-based service deliverers also advocate for access to services independent of immigration status.

On the question of defining settlement and integration there have been many attempts in the community literature (see for example: Galway, 1991; Canadian Council for Refugees, 1998) and there are commonalities in the many definitions that exist. In general, settlement is seen to consist of stages immigrants pass through as they adjust, adapt, and integrate to the new society (e.g., Lam, 1997). Programs and services required may differ at each stage (and may vary depending upon the characteristics of the immigrant group). At a minimum, linguistic competence, economic and social participation are seen to be key. A key element is the understanding that the process of adaptation involves change on the part of the host community as well.

A useful entry point to the field of immigrant services is provided by Cox's (1985) attempt to formalize a model (Fig. 1) for planning welfare services for immigrants. The model begins with an understanding of migration as a process consisting of four stages: pre-movement, transition, resettlement, and integration.

---

1 In terms of mental health resettlement may be understood as a process which consists of stages of emotional and psychological adaptation (Sluzki, 1979) that are not necessarily progressive in that there may be relapses to earlier stages (Hulewhat, 1996).
Figure # 1

(From: Cox, D. 1985. Welfare services for migrants: Can they be better planned?)

1. The Migration-Integration Process

1.1 Stages in Migration-Integration

Pre-Migration       Transition       Reception-Resettlement       Integration

1.1.1 Factors influencing migration-integration

Cultural background of group

Factors influencing migration-integration:

- Nature of migration
- Nature of previous contact with host society and pre-arrival attitudes
- Prevailing host society attitudes
- Welfare development in ethnic group
- Economic status of group
- Nature of social problems
- Welfare development in ethnic group and host society
- Nature of ethnic group development

Socio-political-economic context on arrival

Motivation to migrate and decision-making process

Levels of Intervention

| Information-counselling services | Immigration laws | Refugee services | Community | Community | Welfare service |
|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------| Delivery policies |
| Selection processes              | Pre-departure preparation | Reception-resettlement policies and practice | education | development work | and structural development |
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At each stage there is a series of variables affecting outcome: the socio-economic-cultural-political background of the group and the nature of its migration (i.e., voluntary or involuntary); the nature of previous contact with the host society and consequent pre-arrival attitudes, on both sides (e.g., past colonial history); the socio-economic-political context upon arrival (e.g., periods of recession and unemployment); the prevailing host society attitudes (e.g., racism); the nature of ethnic group development (i.e., the presence of informal or formal community institutions in the new society); and the economic status of the group.

These variables influence a) the nature of social problems or needs that will be experienced by different immigrant populations; and b) the kind of the social safety net (that is, welfare and service entitlements available for immigrants).

An example of the impact of socio-economic context is the decision by Western governments, concerned with deficit reduction, to decrease expenditures on social programs including programs and services for immigrants and refugees. The influence of political forces is demonstrated by the welcome given by Western governments in past years to refugees fleeing from former Communist regimes (Whitaker, 1991).

In terms of community structures, many researchers (e.g., Breton, 1964; Opoku-Dapaah, 1993) have linked the presence of community institutions (e.g., media, businesses, cultural and service organizations) to easing the transition to a new society, especially in cases where social and economic dislocation may be severe.

Cox does not identify variables at the level of the individual that impact on the immigration experience. For example, level of literacy or illiteracy (Social Planning Council of Peel, 1993) or adolescent age at time of migration may be a risk factor (Canadian Task Force on Mental Health Issues Affecting Immigrants and Refugees, 1988; Barwick, Hampson, & Synowski, 1996). Gender is another factor that, in combination with other variables, may affect the post immigration experience.

Clearly settlement is a complex process in which many variables, pre and post migration, individual and societal interact.

### 3.3 Accountability and evaluation

Service standards and accountability are connected in the sense that standards are means of ensuring consistency in service delivery and are thus an accountability measure: it is possible to point to standards to say that the following services are being delivered in the following way(s). With respect to evaluation, standards are helpful in that standards are determined by outcomes; that is, having gone through a process of identifying desired outcomes and the activities or services that would achieve said outcomes, evaluation is made easier. Desired outcomes are

---

2 Resettlement during the period of adolescence may be stressful primarily because key peer relationships may be lost as a result of migration and may be difficult to form in the new society.
explicit. Service activities are specified and evaluation asks whether services are appropriate and whether outcomes have been achieved.

As Neuwirth (1996) points out, successful settlement or integration measured at the societal level is distinct from that measured at the level of the individual seeking assistance from the immigrant serving organization. Governments are very much interested in the former—how immigrant groups fare as a whole, immigrant integration in the long term, what constitutes successful integration, and the factors that contribute to successful settlement and integration (including the provision of settlement services). Obviously there are many factors that contribute to successful overall settlement and integration, for example, the state of the economy, the attitude of host society as well as individual characteristics such as level of education, occupational characteristics and English or French language abilities.

4. Issues from the National Settlement Conference

4.1 Professionalism: values, standards and training/professional development

Services and sectoral standards are seen to be key to the professionalism the community-based sector aspires to. Professionalism has been a conflictual issue in other human service areas, most notably social work. Many are concerned about exclusionary practices and the abuse of power to control who can use certain professional designations. From the perspective of settlement service delivery, professionalism is important in espousing the values of the community-based immigrant service sector and in validating the work that is done, to funders, to other service deliverers, and stakeholders (clients, the community, etc.). Professionalism is also seen as a stepping stone to higher wages for settlement workers.

Accreditation of agencies and/or accreditation of workers are two of the mechanisms for professionalism that are being explored in the sector, the former being an idea that is largely undeveloped. The accreditation of workers has apparently been successful in British Columbia where the British Columbia Settlement and Integration Workers’ Association (BCSIWA) of multicultural service practitioners has been formed:

The Association is committed to the professional development of its members, and has taken a lead role in the development of the Occupational Competencies for the field. Each course focuses on particular competencies from the Occupational Competency documents which were identified and approved by practitioners in the immigrant and multicultural services fields and five other social service fields of practice including early childhood, child and youth care, community justice, women's services and services for community living. [http://www.douglas.bc.ca/ce/cecfcs/cecfcs5a.htm](http://www.douglas.bc.ca/ce/cecfcs/cecfcs5a.htm)

The training is provided by Douglas College that offers a certificate upon completion of the courses. Training and orientation of workers is necessary for several reasons. In recently arrived communities, settlement workers may be recruited because of their language capacities and knowledge of a particular immigrant community. These workers require training in the skills
and methods of human service delivery as well as an orientation to the service delivery infrastructure. In other instances training may be required for replacement workers where staff turnover may be high due to low wages.

Accreditation of agencies is seen to be a two edged sword, on the one hand, conferring credibility on agencies, on the other instituting another level of bureaucracy. One respondent suggested that accreditation of agencies only be pursued if there are assurances of increased funding to those agencies who go through a process of accreditation, whether it be some form of peer review or formal accreditation by an accrediting body. Otherwise, the investment of resources in accreditation would not be worth it. A few agencies in the sector are accredited. In Alberta, one agency was accredited through an American family services organization. Employment training organizations, under the auspices of ACTEW, are also exploring the accreditation option.

5.  Related initiatives

Appendix II, an annotated bibliography, provides a series of initiatives and resources from the immigrant service, other community-base service providers and government sectors. These resources are relevant to the process of defining service policies, procedures and standards. Some of them also serve as an introduction to understanding performance measurement issues and the development of indicators.

5.1  Community initiatives

At the present time there are several initiatives in service standards and related issues underway.

At the national level, led by the Canadian Council for Refugees (CCR), there have been attempts to spread the message of national standards, to advocate for the need for a national training institute and to secure agreement on values for the sector. This national emphasis had its origins in an earlier concern during Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s (CIC) Settlement Renewal initiative that newcomers be entitled to the same services across the country, despite individual accords signed between the federal government and provincial governments.

In their discussion, the CCR has drawn on the OCASI-COSTI work on settlement standards, as well as the work done on by AMSSA on competencies in British Columbia, and the CCR’s own best practices paper.

OCASI’s Splash and Ripple project (OCASI, 2001) has increased the level of awareness of the importance of defining desired outcomes for the non-governmental sector.

At the local level, as previously cited, some of the more established agencies have developed or are in the process of developing databases to track service delivery. In the case of OCISO this has been linked to the use of standards. In the COSTI case service delivery is tracked, and short and intermediate term outcomes. The COSTI initiative has included developing a database that can be used by two other service agencies, Rexdale Women’s Centre and Abrigo. That project
was not without difficulties. Despite similarities in programs, agencies were engaged in different activities, determined in part by the characteristics of their client group. So for example, an agency serving primarily newcomer women, with comparatively low levels of education, and English, and young families require more services to become employment ready. In contrast an agency that is serving highly educated males, with high levels of English will be delivering different types and numbers of service. Woodgreen Community Centre in Toronto has also developed its own database.

5.2 CIC’s Contribution Accountability Framework (CAF)

CIC’s CAF, being implemented in various phases, has had a substantial impact on service providers as they pilot and implement electronic data collection systems in order to provide information that will allow for judgements about accountability and worth of programs to be made. A major concern of service providers has been the issue of client confidentiality since data will be collected along with identifying information. This issue has dominated discussions with service providers.

CIC’s concern with correlating client characteristics with service requirements is valid, however it has been less obvious why identifying information about clients is required. CIC has argued that it allows them to track secondary migration and ensures that CIC monies are not being utilized to provide services to clients who are “illegals”.

Thus far the performance measurement component of the CAF has been laid out for each of CIC’s core programs Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Program (ISAP), Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC), Host, and Resettlement Assistance Program (RAP). The questions to be answered include:

1. What are total inputs to program delivery
2. What are total service outputs?
3. What is the cost efficiency of the programs?
4. How many clients are served?
5. What is the profile of the clients?
6. What are client usage patterns?
7. What is the efficiency of service access and delivery?
8. How many service hours are spent on each client for each service?
9. How long do clients participate in a given program?
10. What measurable progress towards settlement, adaptation, and integration do clients make from start date of service access?
11. Are the types of services provided as intended in the program, and as committed in contribution agreements?

Most of the questions focus on outputs with the exception of question 10, which begins to ask about the effectiveness of the programs. It would appear, judging from the third edition of the CAF Performance Measurement and Evaluation Framework (CIC, 2000), that indicators required to answer this question have not been finalized.
The Evaluation Framework for Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Program (Goss Gilroy Inc., 2000) clearly sets out standard evaluation questions alongside indicators, methods, and data sources. The following are the major issues and questions to be addressed:

1. Program rationale: To what extent does ISAP programming remain relevant to government priorities and the needs of newcomers to Canada?
2. Program delivery: To what extent are the design and delivery of the program appropriate?
3. Activities and results: What has been achieved as a result of ISAP?
4. Program objectives: What progress has been made toward achieving the ISAP objectives?
5. Cost-effectiveness and alternatives: To what extent does ISAP involve the most appropriate, efficient and cost-effective methods to meet its objectives?

An external review of the evaluation framework was conducted for CIC and the author of the report recommends, among other things, that the collection of identifying information be abandoned (Stephenson, 2001). She also recommends that a collaborative process involving managers, direct service workers, clients and CIC personnel be initiated to identify desired client outcomes and indicators of settlement and integration. It is also not obvious from the document that a variable such as discrimination will be built into the model as a factor that impacts on settlement and integration. One key informant, commenting on the CAF, remarked that she had no problem with the ISAP goals as formally articulated, the question is what should be the standards to deliver the services to meet the goals?

6. Feedback from immigrant serving organizations

6.1 Survey results

Survey results are summarized and presented in Appendix 1. As can be seen from the responses, few agencies have a formal set of service guidelines, protocols, standards that detail services to be provided. A variety of means are utilized, such as client feedback, funders’ guidelines, needs assessments, and intake forms. There appears to be an interest in service standards from the perspective of:

- record keeping so that standardized data is collected and meaningful comparisons can be made
- common policies around confidentiality and consent forms for release of information

The following responses indicate that for some respondents government funding and any sorts of guidelines must always be accomplished/negotiated in light of client needs:

“There are settlement services that may go well contracted “13 hours of service” per family unit. Sometimes the circumstances and staff availability dictates what additional service we provide.”
“Our settlement service is mainly driven by client demand and we try to live with and in funders’ fluid requirements and guidelines.”

“Barriers relate not so much to service guidelines but to the limitations on flexibility and creativity re program development and enhancement, due to funder requirements and constraints.”

“There are occasions when the settlement workers feel that they must make decisions that are in the best interests of clients but not in keeping with procedural guidelines and there needs to be some affirmation for settlement workers that guidelines just that and that they are not to be used to fetter or undermine circumstances of exception.”

“Service guidelines, protocols, procedures” all of those are very formal, bureaucratic names for determining our scope of operation. We have to fulfill the contractual agreement of course, but also have to be guided by compassion and desire to help if we can.”

“Our mandate is to assist whoever “knocks” on our door, even if he/she does not fall within the funders’ guidelines. As best we can each case is treated individually and a different approach may be used.”

Thus in promoting or developing service standards, it is important to emphasize that standards should not constrain service delivers’ responses to clients and should be viewed as a minimum or baseline for service delivery.

It is interesting to note the degree to which funders influence service delivery. 50% of respondents cited funders’ guidelines as a method for determining service delivery. This is not necessarily a bad thing. For example, a newly formed agency might benefit from funding program officers’ assistance in setting up programs. On the other hand some forms of funding, specifically purchase of service contracts, are not neutral. Under this type of arrangement funders specify what services are being paid for and may influence an organization’s service delivery methods. In this context might it be argued that the community-based sector is merely an arm of government--a quasi-non-governmental agency.

The most mentioned barrier to developing service standards is that of resources, human and otherwise required to develop them.

Another worrying trend has been the perceived tendency for federal governmental departments, in the current period of a contraction of government services and in the context of the Canadian Human Resources Development Commission fiasco, to “micro-manage” grants and program funding.
6.2 Key informant interviews

The following points were made by key informants and were selected to provide a sense of how people are thinking about these questions:

- For some agencies the interest in standardization stems from a concern that they might be compared unfavourably to another agency whose numbers are higher.
- Until recently agencies have not utilized information collected for planning purposes.
- It is difficult to define intermediate and long-term settlement outcomes.
- There is a need for a common understanding of concepts such as “client-centered services” and a clarification of its importance. There are those who take a counsellor-directed approach.
- “Let me give you an example of why we need to establish a common code of behaviour. I know of a woman who wanted an abortion and got two very different responses from two different agencies. What is our responsibility in this case? We need commonly agreed values to guide service delivery.”
- “We need to design databases that give us what we want as well as what funders want.”
- “We need to increase awareness, provide training and implement standards.”
- Accreditation of workers would ensure training for workers who have appropriate language skills but little social service experience. Professional designation might also help with the retention of workers in a low wage sector, and in the long term may aid in pushing for increased wage levels.
- Standards need to be developed for the continuum of services, that is, pre-arrival orientation and LINC, as well as post-migration programs and services.

7. Future work

7.1 Suggestions for future directions

The following are suggestions made by survey respondents and key informants. As can be seen there are some common themes but there are also differences, suggesting that some forum for discussion for future directions may be helpful.

- OCASI should allocate a portion of the Geneva Park Professional Development Conference to the development of standards, and databases.
- OCASI should take the lead in working democratically with agencies and CIC to determine standards that should then apply to Ontario agencies.
- We need a combination of strategies to advance this agenda: work on national standards, at the provincial standards level, and local initiatives by individual agencies or groups of agencies.
- Develop a national pilot project on service standards, and focus provincially on the development of a database that is simple, user friendly, and can be used across agencies.
- Use the Extranet to further discussion.
• Thus far the agenda has been a funders’ agenda, we need to set our own agenda, and be accountable to ourselves. One way is through the accreditation of agencies. This should precede accreditation of workers.

8. Conclusion

Since the 1999 OCASI/COSTI project NGO familiarity with the language of standards and evaluation has grown considerably and standards and accountability measures are seen to be of interest to service deliverers as well as funders. A few agencies have secured funding (from government, from fee-for-service programs) to develop databases (cost to one agency was $25,000.), service standards and an agency manual. In Ontario, with few exceptions, agencies have been unable to pursue the development of standards, largely because of resource issues. Some agencies have halted further work for fear that it might be made redundant because of CIC’s work in the area of data collection and evaluation. Nonetheless agencies see the importance of these issues and cited such as things as Board and agency interest, as available supports. They would be grateful if other agencies (OCASI, larger agencies) could develop databases, standards, and so on that could be customized for use by agencies lacking resources.
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APPENDIX I – SURVEY

Summary of responses to questionnaire

1. Please circle the statement (a) or (b) that best describes your agency:

(a) Our agency has written service policy and procedures used to direct settlement services

(b) Our agency does not have written service policy and procedures, however we use informal means for determining what services we will provide and how.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (a)</th>
<th>No (b)</th>
<th>In process</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of responses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If you chose statement (a), would you be willing to share those policies and procedures on a confidential basis with OCASI, for possible inclusion in an inventory to be published on-line?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Require Board approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of responses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you chose statement (b), please provide examples of the mechanisms (e.g. funders’ guidelines, needs assessments, intake forms, etc) that you utilize to guide service delivery (i.e., determining what settlement services will be provided and how)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Funders’ guidelines</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Intake Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of responses</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other responses:

- We are working on new policies and procedures
- We have a written policy re: general counselling, but utilize informal means, such as ISAP and NSP guidelines and intake forms to guide service delivery
- Agency Information System, Service Plan, a variety of reports
- Client’s verbal feedback to services, staff sharing of experiences at team meetings and service coordination within the agency
- Statistical forms
- We work within the parameter of services set by funding guidelines. Our services reflect the needs of the community, which are detected through formal and informal means such as focus group meeting, formal survey, client feedback, program evaluation, etc.
- In-house assessment forms, intake forms, in-house attendance guidelines and policies
- Community needs assessment through regular client focus groups and program advisory committee, intake procedures, client and service data management system, agency internal policies, e.g. community development, anti-racism, bi-annual strategic planning
- While we do not have a specific policy for settlement, we do have agency-wide procedures for program evaluation, future program development and strategic planning. For settlement we do have intake forms and participant survey evaluations are done to determine needs and future directions.
- Follow funders’ guidelines and refer to NSP criteria of definition for NSP clients
- Client needs assessment, in house and external administrative guidelines, intake forms and case management guidelines and forms developed by us through the years, internal protocol, and program guidelines as established by the financing bodies
- Board of Directors program guidelines; intake forms, needs assessment, community consultations, funders’ guidelines.
- Program guidelines (CIC developed); intake forms; needs assessments
- Community, information from other programs, operational plans/ agency strategic plans, client surveys
- Consent forms, confidentiality forms
- Client intake and assessment, goal setting with clients
- Our agency facilitates the private sponsorship of refugees. We do not and are not usually involved in hands-on resettlement, the Church is. We offer referral services to refugee inland claimants. We also give advice and direction about the overseas process.
- Responses to emergencies of our clients or members; (we provide little help with employment or housing, otherwise a full range of services)
- We develop many of our own tools
- We are guided by the need assessment in delivery of the settlement services. Our intake forms make it easy to assess clients’ needs and to involve them in program planning. Usually this takes place during the first visit. It includes a brief orientation, including the
purpose of the settlement program and information on other complementary programs our agency offers.

• We operate from the “empowerment” perspective and involve clients in program/action planning.
• Funder’s guidelines are applied in the following: eligibility criteria, documentation and reporting terminology.
• ISAP contract specifies services, we use CIC ISAP guidelines manual, plus we use the training manual (OCASI) and the Service Standards document as guidelines. We are currently developing a Manual for our staff using the best of what is available and will pilot a new “intake model” this fall and winter if all goes well.
• We work on this model. I will include our intake form. We also have a list of professionals that we refer to, or use as advisors.
• We have funders’ guidelines, yearly programs plan, intake forms, log sheets, etc.
• Results from evaluations of programs conducted by our organization; Board of Directors’ input; community needs assessment and clients’ input.
• Questionnaires for groups
• Evaluation forms

c) Additional comments you may wish to add

• We have a complaint policy, anti-discrimination policy, implementation plan. Policy for using the computer services and other services
• Overall, programs and services are guided by agency mission
• It would be useful if OCASI could organize a forum on development of policies and procedures to see if there is uniformity in the sector.
• We do not receive funding from the government for settlement services, but we service clients in that aspect
• We also provide needs assessment during our initial meeting and establish which services will be provided by our organization vs. refer out to other community, social, government, private organizations
• We have been discussing the revival of the settlement workers association in Niagara. Some of the issues that have surfaced in additional to service protocols, guidelines and best practices is the need for a software tool that will help minimize the amount of time settlement workers have to spend in documentation, case notes and statistics. For those agencies that are only NSP funded we do not have access to the same computer technology made available to ISAP providers. When gathering statistics we are comparing apples and oranges and this does a real disservice in terms of capturing valuable data. Otherwise funders rely on Census or immigration data that is not reflective of communities. It would be great to see some tools available and some standardization for comparative analyses.
• We adapted from CCR
• I glimpsed through the draft of “The development of service standards”. I believe that this development is long overdue in the sector. The benefits are undoubtedly clear and too numerous to count. Yet on the other hand, the infrastructure of the sector just cannot
hold up to develop it, except the comparatively larger service organizations, i.e. with +80 employees. The least to consider is that funder leaves a lot of room for service agencies to follow or enforce. (Do they explicitly appreciate or acknowledge such effort anyway?)

- Although many of our clients are recent immigrants, and the information we provide does help them to settle, we are not actually a settlement agency, and so we don’t have service standards that specifically focus on settlement
- Our mandate is to assist whoever “knocks” on our door, even if he/she does not fall within the funders’ guidelines. As best as we can each case is treated individually and a different approach may be used
- There are settlement services that may go well beyond the contracted “13 hours of service” per family unit. Sometimes the circumstances and staff availability dictates what additional service we provide
- Our organization does not receive ISAP or HOST funding. However we do assist newcomers with integration and settlement needs on a daily basis.
- At this point in time, we are in the process of developing policies and procedures for best settlement practices that are to be implemented with the opening of the Newcomer Information Centre
- Our settlement service is mainly driven by client demand and we try to live with and in funders’ fluid requirements and guidelines. We are actually in between, we have some written policies and procedures like: Conflict of interest guidelines; policy manual for volunteers; training manual for some program areas. We also do periodic needs assessments and consultations with other services in the community.
- There are written guidelines followed regarding the maintenance and confidentiality of clients information
- Useful to also know how to set up protocols for service delivery beyond the basic parameters of confidentiality and safety issues.
- We assist, advise and follow-up with church sponsorship undertakings, contacts with CIC
- Our agency does not provide settlement services but does assist many newly arrived immigrants and refugees with settlement issues. Support for cultural interpretation still seriously lacking.
- The service provision for immigrants must be a client driven and not a funder driven process; only then we will be able to reach the objectives of being instrumental in adjustment and integration of newcomers into Canadian society. We also believe that these two processes should not be mutually exclusive, and that OCASI should lead in advocacy/education, utilizing and putting the fine research we already have on immigrant issues in proper context to help build a more equitable partnership between funders and community agencies serving immigrants.
- Our client-centered approach and process is used for all clients, not just settlement
- Our agency does not provide settlement services
- We do not have written service guidelines. However, certain protocols are set through out Personnel Policies and contract letter (eg. confidentiality, etc)
- A lack of continuity in settlement service delivery makes it difficult to set operational standards that can be tested accordingly.
4. Please identify any barriers you have experienced in utilizing or developing service guidelines, protocols, procedures, etc.

- We are in the process of starting writing service guidelines and procedures
- Up to now we have not experience any barriers
- Barriers relate not so much to service guidelines but to the limitations on flexibility and creativity re: program development and enhancement, due to funder’s requirements and constraints.
- Changing priorities and rigidity of funders’ guidelines make it difficult to utilize the service guidelines in place.
- Limited resources
- Reconciling clients’ needs vs. reporting requirements in terms of stats info, time allocation, etc
- There are occasions when the settlement workers feel that they must make decisions that are in the best interest of clients but not in keeping with procedural guidelines and there needs to be some affirmation for settlement workers that guidelines are just that and that they not be used to fetter or undermine circumstances of exception. We see a need for standardization in areas of record keeping and data collection. We have approached OCASI to ask them to look at developing a provincial IT tool. Currently agencies in Niagara are struggling to put together regional statistics and we are measuring apples and oranges. Other agencies do not have the resources to develop databases. All are collecting different information in different ways. I believe it would be extremely useful to have standardization not only in policy and protocol but also in practical tools such as information collection and record keeping. Some agencies are not utilizing consents to release information etc.
- Lack of resources (staff, dollars, time). The complexity of the service and the lack of a common understanding. The lack of consensus on service and program definitions
- The major barrier is still the necessary financial resource to develop it. Our agency did try numerous funding sources but got rejected. e.g., as recent as two years ago, we applied for funding from the Trillium but we were rejected. Our Agency learnt about a comment made by one of the review panellists; “Your agency is already doing a good job, why do they need the funding to develop service procedure?” Good news? Bad news? Sad news.
- Since our organization as a community agency has service policy and procedures we tend to use it effectively so far as most of the program at the agency at some point or other have to deal with newcomers
- Staffing: not sufficient staff (time) to develop written material. Staff turnover could be a factor too
- The main challenge is that the procedure involves clients, staffs, board members, committee members, and resource persons, who are of diverse backgrounds. It will take a lot of efforts to come up with something that are practical, feasible, ethical and acceptable to all. These efforts require much time and resources, which most social service agencies lack, and hence they are the main barriers.
• “Service guidelines, protocols, procedures” all those are very formal, bureaucratic names for determining scope of our operation. We have to fulfil the contractual agreement of course, but also have to be guided by compassion and desire to help if we can
• No resources
• Lack of support and resources (external) i.e. other service providers
• Time allotment through funding, the need outweighs working hours, to somewhat the resources due to lack of experience. Have the known networking resources updated with valid contacts.
• Lack of time to sit down and develop written and formal policy and procedures; when you deliver front line services, responding to the immediate demand, the delivery of the service is the priority.
• Never enough time. Juggle between service and developing procedures
• The high level of demand for services at our agency that occupies all of available staff time and a good deal of volunteer time also. Being under-resourced for the numbers we see and range of issues we deal with. Lack of space for groups programming.
• Financial constrains, human resources constrains
• Time and resources
• Hard to meet all of the funders’ requirements when program operated under several grants
• The main barrier in developing more written guidelines, procedures and standards is lack of funds to employ staff to specifically perform this task. This should be done in an ongoing basis.
• Lack of resources (financial and staff) to invest in developing protocols. Still grappling with the issue of how we define “settlement” before we can draw up protocols
• Little need (small organization). Bureaucratic – if you have guidelines you become constricted by those guidelines. No experience of guidelines actually aiding to our work. We have membership, board and other guidelines in our by-laws
• Staff time to document and prepare guidelines; lack of financial support to do it; staff already super stressed in meeting accountability requirements; burn out syndrome; changes in government guidelines and expectations
• Main barrier is timeframe to try and fulfil all of the mandates of various contracts: serving clients, collecting stats, maintaining updated database, performing technical duties, etc.
• Lack of time both for developing formal service guidelines as well training and supervision.
• Funding staff/management resources to develop – process can be long with full Board, management, staff involvement, but worth it
• Biggest barrier is time … Change is also a barrier – when people have been doing the job for so long, change do not happen without challenge.
• We try to reference together with the staff and other resource people for the more unusual situations. The barrier here is finding the time for busy people to sit down together.
• MIAG Settlement Sub-committee provides a forum to: Identify settlement needs in the Peel Region, e.g. training; Identify settlement issues, discuss funders’ guidelines, etc. Communicate with OCASI and other regional provincial or national entities
• Lack of human resources
• For a small community it is sometimes difficult to get ideas from other SPAs who are larger and are talking about large volume of client and therefore have different set of standards and ways of doing things. Limited resources for needs assessment surveys, program evaluation
• The main barrier we face is isolation that leads to fewer newcomers settling in our area, and this results in little or no funding to provide settlement services to the clients. The current criteria that uses numbers only to justify funding for settlement services instead of need makes it difficult to secure operational grants to provide decent settlement services.

5. Please identify any supports that have been useful in guiding service delivery decisions regarding what settlement services will be provided and how

• If you have any templates that you will be willing to share with us, I will appreciate
• Staff work groups (e.g. job developers, employer outreach). Program Co-ordinators’ Group. Board/staff Strategic Planning group
• Knowledgeable board members. Open discussion among staff and standing committees
• As of now we do not have funding for settlement
• ISAP guidelines, past experience, client feedback (both anecdotal and survey questionnaire)
• CCR Best Settlement Practices
• Our Computer Information System. Reports on Outcomes Identification
• We have to rely a lot on different periodicals; reports sent in to agency from all sources, government, umbrella groups like OCASI, agencies, media, business, etc. That is to say, there is no standard or formula to guide, except the agency mandate. (sounds awful eh?)
• Most OCASI guidelines have been most effective
• Our weekly staff meetings are essential. The on-going communication between staff members and the accessibility of our E.D. The structure of our organization is relatively flat and that gives us a great deal of freedom in taking initiatives regarding settlement delivery decisions/services
• We have a checklist of essential services that have to be covered as per contract. Anything above is practically at discretion of staff member who work with clients
• Our organization utilizes its mandate/mission in determining which settlement services will be provided by our organization
• The Discussion Document distributed by OCASI has been excellent in initiating discussion and an opportunity to look at and evaluate our current tools
• Settlement staff, management, some external expertise
• In office, E.D., guidance, experience. In community, other colleagues, the web, the call centre
• The Immigrant Settlement Counselling Training Guide and various conferences our staff participated in over the last several years have been also useful in our service delivery.
• Client feedback; consultation with other service providers
• The determination of our staff and the dedication of our volunteers.
• Our in-house system of compiling statistics allows us to analyze and pinpoint emerging issues and trends
• Contacting other organizations; needs assessments; Advisory Committee
• Interested in a shared info resource, of common guidelines- success/failure stories
• Partnerships with other agencies have assisted in providing some settlement services. However, the partnerships have no written guidelines and depend on the funding resources, grants, etc. Most partnerships last for as long as the funds are allocated.
• Funders guidelines; OCASI Training Guide; OCASI Standards document
• Mainly experience – we found some services, such as housing or work assistance too difficult, time consuming or ineffective, as people were unwilling to follow our suggestions in these areas. Discussions with other more experienced agencies and funders
• OCASI: great support. CCR, Refugee training by Francisco Rico. Extranet site: best new tool available for settlement counsellors, updated available information
• The expertise of our staff and dedication to settlement issues is the driving force in the ISAP program delivery. The staff extreme vigilance of new issues emerging and the agency’s dedication to newcomers’ communities has enabled us to develop new programs to support integration of newcomers into our community.
• Board support and staff commitment to providing client-centered services
• Being able to access other service guidelines. Being able to contact other agency staff. Having a central agency like OCASI that can act as a ‘clearing house’ for ideas or resources
• We are working on a manual pulling together the best of the best that is out there and localizing it.
• Having staff that has many years of experience avoids some of the ‘trial and error’ tactics.
• Project proposals, program plans for the year and staff meetings.
• MIAG Settlement Sub-committee
• Government statistics; training and information provided by OCASI
• Networking with other SPOs staff; a workshops of some sort at the Geneva Park Conference will be helpful.
• The main support for our work has been OCASI. Through forums, newsletters, resources and via internet we have been able to get support and establish networks to assist us in our work. We have also created a regional network for local support and to share resources.
Appendix II

1. Recommended Resources for Information and Consultation: an Annotated Bibliography

The following resources from the settlement service sector and other related sectors are relevant to the process of defining service policies, procedures and standards. Some of them also serve as an introduction to understand performance measurement issues and the development of indicators.

Most of these resources are available at the OCASI office and on-line if indicated.

1.1 Resources specific to the settlement sector

• Toward Meaningful Citizenship for New Canadians. Creating Outcome Measures.

  In October 1998, the Calgary Mennonite Centre for Newcomers (CMCN) embarked on a project called Outcome Measurement for Community Development. The goals of the project were: (a) to develop a Community Development Performance Framework for CMCN, (b) to devise Information Gathering Tools for desired outputs and outcomes, and (c) to develop materials that will help staff, partners, funders, other agency personnel and community stakeholders to better understand newcomer-oriented community development. This report documents the highlights of the project.

  The document indicates that “It is important to recognize that the community development approach is a relatively new way of pursuing settlement work with immigrants and refugees. Typically, services have focused on individual needs. These individual services have been evaluated using a standard casework logic that starts with a presenting problem, leads to an intervention, and then some identifiable outcome or change that supports the efficacy of the intervention. The community development approach, on the other hand, uses a different methodology and philosophy—and thus requires different reporting systems that will capture its distinctive outcomes and activities more fully.”

  It is important to note that the document clarifies that “Outcomes related to changes in the individual newcomer are important, and should still be documented in community development work. These changes may refer to change in A-S-K – or attitudes and actions, skills and knowledge- of the individual. It is also important to note the changing roles than an individual newcomer plays in the community and society.”

  Available at the Calgary Mennonite Centre for Newcomers, #201, 3517 17 Ave S.E.,
  Calgary, Alberta, T2A 0R5, Tel 403-569-0409.

This document reports in the results of a joint COSTI-OCASI research project that has been underway since January 1998, aimed at developing service and sectoral standards for community based immigrant serving organizations. At the service level it includes: 1. A list of core services (basic necessary services), 2. Minimum standards for core services (minimum norms for programs) and 3. Clients outcomes (benefits or changes for individuals during or after receiving the service). At the organization level it outlines basic organizational standards in a format that allows for a simple and basic agency assessment.

The objective of Document is to generate ideas, elicit input and provide feedback on the suggested standards as well as develop recommendations for further development and implementation.

The document is available at http://extranet01.settlement.org under Research Reports.


The focus of this workbook is specifically on organizational change and reengineering in settlement so organizations can keep up with what's happening at the political and economic level. The experiences described in this workbook grew out of interviews and a series of group discussion with people from settlement agencies who were asked to describe, among other topics, the issues faced by the settlement sector; the impact of change on people in the sector and strategies to deal proactively with these changes. The workbook is geared primarily for settlement staff. However, since options for settlement workers depend on the state of their respective agencies and management, much of it attempts to speak to management and board as well.

This workbook is available at http://ceris.metropolis.net/frameset_e.html


The purpose of this document is to present an overview of settlement services and in particular to identify some of the elements that are generally agreed to make for successful settlement programs. These elements, or "best practices", flow out of the CCR understanding of the nature and challenges of settlement and of the role of settlement services in the process. For this reason "best practice guidelines" are preceded by a detailed account of the context in which settlement services are offered.

Available at www.web.net/~ccr/bpfina1.htm.

This is one of six occupational competency frameworks for different community social service sectors. The framework describes the key purpose of the sector and the broad functions and activities practitioners carry out in order to fulfill that purpose. Performance indicators, knowledge specification and value statements are also provided. It was developed through a process that involved asking experienced practitioners and supervisors a series of questions about what they do, how they do it and why. The document indicates that “The occupational competencies described in this framework represent the ‘best practices’ in the sector.

The document is available at [http://www.taskforceontraining.bc.ca/ocp.htm](http://www.taskforceontraining.bc.ca/ocp.htm)


This document reports on the results of a feasibility study into a service delivery model that would link settlement service providers in a geographical area. The basic components of the model are: the use of a case management model that is client centres in that the client determines the service plan with the assistance of a case manager, if desired; the use of a holistic assessment tool that focuses upon the family including children; and a service agreement or service protocol among service providers detailing procedures for interagency cooperation and coordination of service.


Responding to What is Outcome Measurement, the Introduction to this book indicates that ‘It is an approach to planning and managing projects that encourages us to be clear both about what our projects are DOING and what they are CHANGING. Outcomes measurement largely stems from a global change on the way governments work’.

This handbook is organized around nine terms – Situation Assessment, Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes, Impact, Enablers and Constraints, Indicators and Outcome Measurement Framework. This resource takes the users through the terminology, concepts and examples to guide them in the application of Outcome Measurement inside their organizations.

This document is presented as a “work in progress”, a framework within which standards can be developed relating to three key areas: Client Services; Settlement Sector Workers and Settlement Organizations.

The document is available from the Canadian Council for Refugees website at [http://www.web.net/~ccr/](http://www.web.net/~ccr/)


This report presents an evaluation framework for Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Program (ISAP). It also provides input to the development of a performance framework for monitoring ISAP services. The report includes the program profile including a description of the program models prepared for this framework; an outline of evaluation issues, questions, indicators and data sources; a detailed description of methodologies and data sources; recommendations and options for the evaluation strategy and information for the development of a performance reporting framework.

This report is available at [http://integration-net.cic.gc.ca/sp/caf](http://integration-net.cic.gc.ca/sp/caf)


The purpose of the project was to review and comment on two of the Evaluation Frameworks that have been prepared by Goss Gilroy Inc. Management Consultants for Citizenship and Immigration Canada for evaluation of the Host Program and the Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Program.

This report includes suggestions and recommendations for addressing some of the issues and concerns raised by the SPOs. It also includes recommendations for an evaluation process that makes appropriate and realistic demands on the SPOs and provides practical, useful results for improving the effectiveness of the programs.

• **Revisioning the Newcomer Settlement Support System.** Integrated Settlement Planning Research Consortium (ISPR), June 2000.

The ISPR’s research study was directed toward the development of strategies for coordinated and collaborative models of settlement service delivery in Toronto, in order to provide more
efficient access to those services, by maximizing existing information and service resources; addressing system barriers and inequities; and more effectively linking generic and ethno-racial settlement service supports.

In its recommendations, the ISPR consortium concluded that the opening premise to a successful settlement support system for newcomers is the need to build a capacity to do integrated planning at the community level. The ISPR provided recommendations in the areas of Settlement Service Provision, Planning and Systems Integration and Coordination, Funding Settlement Services and Immigration and Settlement Policy.

The study is available at www.settlement.org.

• **Prized Knowledge: a study of family support and family counselling services in six immigrant and refugee serving organizations.** Prepared for the Family Support/Family Counselling Phase II Committee by White Rock Family Therapy Institute, December 1999.

This report provides an overview of family support and family counselling services offered by six immigrant and refugee serving agencies in the Lower Mainland (British Columbia). Based on Appreciative Inquiry methodology, it examines “promising practices” across the six agencies, compares service delivery models and puts forward a set of “provocative prepositions” about future development and transferability of services. The objective of this study includes the identification of indicators of success and the provision of an assessment of current promising practices; this including reference to outcome studies in the field of counselling in general and in the context of serving immigrant and refugee families in particular.

The study was funded by the Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration, Community Liaison Division, Ministry for Children and Families and the Vancouver Foundation. It is available at www.amssa.org/publications/reports.htm#prized.


The Citizenship and Immigration Canada Contribution Accountability Framework for services to immigrants and refugees has five components. This document deals primarily with the first component: Performance Measurement, and begins to address the second component: Evaluation. Its purpose is to ensure the accountability of departmental expenditures, monitor service delivery and evaluate the effectiveness of contribution programs in meeting the settlement needs of newcomers.

The document features a brief introduction that includes background information on the Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Program (ISAP) and an overview of the framework. Section 2, Program Profile, describes ISAP as a national program, Section 3 outlines the
evaluation questions and associated indicators, methods and data sources. A discussion of each method, with suggested data sources, can be found in Session 4. Section 5, Evaluation Challenges and Strategy, outlines a proposed evaluation strategy, provides suggested options and a preliminary costing of those options. Section 6, Performance Reporting, provides input to revisions to the current performance reporting for ISAP. It provides an overview of the information that needs to be captured by SPOs and reported to CIC, in order to strengthen performance reporting.

The document is available at http://integration-net.cic.gc.ca/sp/caf/e/index.htm

• **Communication Report to the Performance Measurement Advisory Committee (PMAC)**. Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), Contribution Accountability Team. March 2001.

This special report was created to address key issues arising at the first CIC Performance Measurement Framework Advisory Committee meeting, and inform on next steps. It indicates that “national Settlement working groups are preparing definitions and services standards for LINC, ISAP and Host.”

The report is available at http://integration-net.cic.gc.ca/sp/caf/e/index.htm

• **Contribution Accountability Framework (CAF). Questions & Answers**. Prepared by the Contribution Accountability Team (CAT), Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), April 2001.

Through a Questions and Answers format, CIC provides a detailed update on the work of CAF. On the issue of Performance Measurements the document indicates that “CIC wants to implement a performance measurement system based on standardized indicators that will provide consistent and reliable data”.

The document is available at http://integration-net.cic.gc.ca/sp/caf/e/nwes/9a4-20.pdf


• **The View from Toronto: Settlement Services in the Late 1990's**. Timothy Owen, COSTI, Toronto. Presentation at the Vancouver Metropolis Conference, January 1999. Available at www.riim.metropolis.net/event/National%20Conference/Ncpapers.html
1. **Resources from other related sectors that are relevant to the Settlement Service sector**


  In its Background, the document states that “the standards and guidelines were designed to be inclusive, acknowledging the diversity of case management models, approaches, settings, and professionals in the long-term care community”. It indicates that “the standards and guidelines are intended to provide guidance for quality case management in community long-term care. They are designed to address the full spectrum of settings and specialties involved in this case. It is expected that individuals will use these standards and guidelines providing case management services, and educators, researchers, and administrators will reference them. The standards are not legislated: rather, their strength lies in their use by individual and other working in the field of case management.”

  Available from the Ontario Community Support association, 970 Lawrence Avenue West, Suite 104, Toronto, Ontario, M6A 3B6, Tel 416-256-3010, e-mail: ocsainfo@ocsao.on.ca. You can also visit [www.ocsa.on.ca](http://www.ocsa.on.ca) or the Ontario Case Managers’ Association at [www.ontcasemanagers.on.ca](http://www.ontcasemanagers.on.ca).

- **Accreditation Program Manual.** Family Service Ontario. (date not available)

  Family Services Ontario (FSO), an association of 48 agencies providing counselling services through professional social workers, was the first human service organization in Ontario to adopt the use of standards. For sixteen years now the association has utilized a voluntary accreditation system that accredits agencies according to their compliance with standards for program delivery, governance, etc.

  In order to be accredited agencies must submit documentation, including references, and complete a survey of staff and Board members. This material is reviewed through a peer review process by a team of trained volunteers. A site visit then takes place. Agencies are usually reaccredited every five years after another review. Agencies pay a fee for accreditation, usually as a percentage of their membership fees.

  This Manual includes the objectives and the structure of the accreditation program, the accreditation process, as well as the policies and procedures of the Family Service Ontario’s accreditation program. In the chapter FSO Self-Study: Requirements for Accreditation there are detailed standards in areas of Agency Organization, Agency Programs and Services, Agency funding and Facilities and Agency Administration and Staff.

  For information to obtain this Manual contact Family Service Ontario, 1243 Islington Avenue, Suite #802, Toronto, Ontario, M8X 1Y9, Tel. 416-231-6003.

Voluntary organizations are receiving increasing recognition for the role that they plan in Canadian life. Although their contributions are evident in most communities, they have yet to be systematically documented. In 1999, the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy, Canadian Policy Research Network, Health Canada and the Coalition of National Voluntary Organizations undertook a joint initiative to enable researchers to begin documenting the contributions of voluntary organizations working in the area of health.

One of the two papers commissioned, this Discussion Paper was prepared to provide guidance about how to measure the economic and social contributions of voluntary health organizations. The specific objectives of the paper are to review the literature on measuring health outcomes; consider the feasibility of measuring the inputs, outputs and outcomes of health nonprofits; and recommend what can be measured to determine the contribution of health nonprofits to Canadians’ health and/or the health care system.

The document is available at the Canadian Policy Research Network site, [www.cprn.org/cprn.html](http://www.cprn.org/cprn.html)

• **Standards, Self-Assessment and Peer Review Manual for the Operation of Older Adult Centres in Ontario.** Produced by the Older Adult Centres’ Association of Ontario (OACAO). November 1996.

Presented as a How-To Manual, its provides direction on Governance – Board operational models; Organization Structure and Processes – efficient and effective operational frameworks; Management of Resources; Management of Records and Reports; Centre Services – tailoring program and services to community needs, and Evaluation – how to conduct regular monitoring processes.

This Manual is available from OACAO, 1185 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Ontario, M3C 3C6, Tel 416-426-7038, website [www.oacao.org](http://www.oacao.org).


As of January 2220, 400 United Ways across the country (USA) were asking programs they fund to identify and measures their outcomes – the benefits or changes the programs want participants to experience as a result of their services. This report represents a systematic effort to determine the extent to which programs have profited from outcome measurement, as well as to identify barriers to both measurement and use of the results.

This report is available at [http://national.unitedway.org/outcomes/publctns.htm](http://national.unitedway.org/outcomes/publctns.htm).

This Manual (BHO) defines healthy organizations as those prepared to manage change in a creative, innovative, productive manner without sacrificing quality. It provides community health centres with tools and resources to assist them in achieving excellence. In its Overview, the Manual states that "in order to make the BHO process manageable we have divided it into five activity areas called 'building blocks'. These five building blocks are essential to the life of a healthy organization. Within each of these building blocks the BHO process has been designed to provide a step-by-step review of the elements essential to an efficient, effective and healthy community health centre. The five building blocks are: Governance; Management; Administrative Systems and Practices; Community Capacity and Programs and Services. This Manual provides the basis for an accreditation process. Although designed specifically for CHC in Ontario, the information and resources are a valuable contribution to any other community-base service sector.

To obtain this Manual contact The Association of Ontario Health Centres, 5233 Dundas Street West, Suite 410, Toronto, Ontario, M9B 1A6, Tel 416-236-2539, e-mail mail@aohc.org.


This article summarizes the history of performance measurement in the non-profit health and human services sector and defines key concepts in outcome measurement. Next, it reports on activities in five key areas and describes 30 lessons the field has learned from those who have led the way. Finally it identifies seven pressing challenges that lie ahead. Available at www.unitedway.org/outcomes/ndpaper.htm


The purpose of this review was "to assess the current accountability relationship between the ministry and children's aid societies and propose any changes to ensure a clearer focus on child protection." Although dealing with a mandated service, this document addresses issues that could be of relevance for the settlement sector, such as changes for a streamlined monitoring and measurement of performance based on outcomes and the use of information technology and available knowledge to make decisions and continuously improve management and delivery of services.
• **Building on Strength: Improving Governance and Accountability in Canada's Voluntary Sector.** Panel on Accountability and Governance in the Voluntary Sector, Final Report, February 1999

In its Executive summary and Principal recommendations, this document indicates that "the goal of our report is to enhance the effectiveness and credibility of the voluntary sector in its ongoing role of strengthening civil society. Our proposals are far-reaching, and are directed to a variety of audiences, including voluntary organizations, the sector as a whole, foundations, corporations, and federal and provincial governments." It indicates that "At the end of the millennium, voluntary organization are facing an environment in considerable flux. Changing government roles, increasingly diverse populations, and new social and economic realities are requiring the sector to broaden, deepen, and adapts its approaches - and to do all of these at one." The Report includes recommendations to the audiences mentioned before, in areas such as capacity building; organizational governance and stewardship; program outcomes, fundraising, access to the Federal Tax System and others.

This Report is available at [http://www.vsi-isbc.ca/eng/reports.cfm](http://www.vsi-isbc.ca/eng/reports.cfm). You are encouraged consulting this site for more recent developments, research and reports on issues of relevance to the voluntary sector.


The Introduction of a summary of this book states that "this book is the first to present state-of-the-art theory and practice regarding outcomes measurement in human services with a specified focus on social work. The book expands on the National Symposium on Outcomes Measurement in the Human Services sponsored by the Center for the Study of Social Work and the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services. The Symposium was held at Columbia University in November 1995".


In its Background, the document states “Three reasons were identified for developing provincial standards for Community Support Services: Increased quality and decrease risk; greater accountability to the public and consistent with the Long Term Care Act.”

Regarding Indicators, the document expresses that “After much investigation, it became evident that the development of indicators in the health and social service fields is in its early stages. Currently, there are a variety of different ideas and concepts being developed and tested. As a result, there is number of different approaches and definitions for indicators. This document has followed a logical progression for the development of indicators. It is recognized that this approach as with other approaches will need to be further tested and revised. However, the basic concept of what is important to be measured and what should be the expected results still be valid no matter what terminology or approach is used.”
