

# IMMIGRANT SETTLEMENT AND INTEGRATION: CONTRIBUTIONS THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS

**JAMES FRIDERES** is a professor emeritus at the University of Calgary. He is currently working in Afghanistan with the Ministry of Education. He is working on a book regarding immigrant integration and is actively participating in the Calgary Local Immigration Partnership (CLIP) program.

**MILTON ALFONSO ORTEGA** is the head of the Alberta Association of Immigrant Serving Agencies (AAISA). During the last 15 years, he has worked on a variety of research projects in the social and policy fields. At the advisory level, he has been involved with several committees with Partnership for Prosperity (P2P); is member of the Immigrant Research West Board of Governors; member of the Council for Canadian Refugee's (CCR) - Migrant Worker Working Group among others. Milton holds a Bachelor's degree in International Relations from Universidad San Francisco de Quito, a Master degree in Public Administration from Portland State University, and he is a Ph.D. candidate in Public Administration and Policy from the same university.

Under the Constitution Act, 1867, jurisdiction with regard to immigration is a joint responsibility between the federal and provincial/territorial governments. Under the *Canada-Québec Accord relating to Immigration and Temporary Admission of Aliens*, Québec has sole responsibility for the number, selection, francization and integration of immigrants. As such, it creates its own policies and programs. Elsewhere in the country, the federal *Vision Plan* sets out the shared responsibilities between federal and provincial/territorial governments with regard to policies and programs available for newcomers. Under this plan, the partners discuss immigration levels, continue to develop economic immigration programs, implement a Pan-Canadian framework for settlement outcomes and develop principles and guidelines for partnership models of settlement.

The idea of partnerships for municipalities and NGOs was not considered a priority by Government until recently. Until then, the development of organizations that helped new immigrants proceeded in an ad hoc manner. The reticence of Government in supporting NGOs was and continues to be based on the fact that many NGOs have very different objectives and goals than government. Some want to influence immi-

gration policy, some want to provide help to new immigrants regardless of their legal status, some want to expand their organizations and their influence and some are interested in all three (Renshon, 2011). Nevertheless, most NGOs carry out their activities with the commitment to ensure that newcomers are helped to become part of Canada's mosaic and make a substantive contribution to society. Overall, their purpose is to help newcomers traverse and master Canadian political and economic institutions so that they can build a successful way of life above the poverty line and will also make them feel more at home in Canada and take on an attachment and commitment to Canadian society.

## OPTIMAL DEVELOPMENT OF NGOS

If NGOs are to be utilized by any country to develop the human and social capital, they must meet the demands from the people within the country. Since the government is not always able to meet all demands, the need for NGOs comes into existence. However, which NGOs will be given the responsibility to guide the human and social capital of immi-

grants is determined by a combination of economic and political considerations. For example those whose voice is weak and whose interests are long term, rather than immediate needs, are more likely to be dismissed (Clark, 2011). However, as Fernandez (1987) and Garilao (1987) have shown, the NGO sector is in a much better situation to articulate the needs of the newcomers, to change attitudes and practices related to discrimination and to nurture the productive capacity of immigrants. In Canada we find that the NGO sector concentrates on operating projects sanctioned by Government, using federal/provincial funds. Moreover, while NGOs may help individuals in urban centres, it does little to bring its experience to bear on the government's policy making. In short, the activities of the NGOs do not achieve a significant multiplier effect on its own efforts (Bratton, 1990).

In addition, the relationship between government and NGOs is a tense relationship, fraught with a sense of distrust. While there is the potential for strong collaborative relationships between NGOs and the State, it rarely happens. In many cases the NGO prefers to keep separated from Government. In other cases the Government feels that the target group to be dealt with by the NGO is highly selective and narrow. Nevertheless, the World Bank has shown a strong relationship between a projects success and the participation of NGOs.

## NGOS AND NEWCOMER INTEGRATION

Recent studies by Dustmann and Frattin (2013) and Gibney and Fisher (2014) conclusively reveal that immigrants make both an economic contribution to society as well as a cultural contribution. As such, both NGOs and the government have responsibilities to enhance the contribution. The government however, needs to focus more on the coordinating and funding role in which NGOs can effectively and efficiently carry out their activities. In turn, NGOs need to build government capacity if they are given the resources and authority to fulfill their roles. NGOs can reveal how a system is thriving or failing but unfortunately many NGOs do not involve the government in their work. Moreover, even when NGOs are successful, government tends to dismiss "old" programs and focuses on developing new programs and thus withdraws their funding even though they may have been successful programs.

Until recently, while there was an acknowledgement that provinces/territories needed to take a greater role in planning for and guiding immigrant settlement and integration, there was little interest in developing partnerships with local agencies. Nevertheless, under the *Vision Action Plan*, it identified the shared objectives in immigrant settlement and integration and how the activities would be coordinated provincially. From there, Citizenship and Immigration Canada began to develop a policy of LIPs (Local Immigration Partnerships)

and in turn created such entities. When the Local Immigration Partnerships were first introduced in 2008, the idea was that they would build on the activities that were taking place in the community. The various local organizations had shown that they were able to innovate and develop customized approaches to immigrant settlement and integration. These LIP organizations were flexible and dynamic, adapting to local geographic and demographic variations. They also were able to focus on different immigration goals (e.g., attraction and retention to integration), focusing on issues varying from employment to housing to health, targeting specific ethno cultural groups on broad issues such as cultural diversity and dealing with the co-ordination of the activities of a variety of settlement organizations to help newcomers obtain rudimentary settlement services (CIC, 2013).

Canada has experienced a substantial number of immigrants with an accompanying increase in diversity and these demographic changes have increased the challenge of integrating newcomers with different socio-economic status, ethnicity and religious affiliation. These challenges are differentially felt among municipalities across the country. While the large number of immigrants is seen as a national issue and must be dealt with by national policy, it is directly felt and addressed at the local and municipal level. As a result, local governments bear the largest responsibility for addressing issues of how various social services are dispensed, e.g., health, education, police, to newcomers. As noted by NGOs, as integration becomes linked with the production and allocation of these goods and services, the question of who gets what, when and how, integration is now evolving into a new stage.

## THE SETTLEMENT AND INTEGRATION SECTOR – GOVERNMENT RELATIONS AND THE NEW VISION

The nature of the NGO-government relations range from those where the government holds all the power to where the government and the NGO are equal partners focusing on joint programs. In between there are many different types including coproduction (where the NGO assist the government in providing a service), contracting (where NGOs are paid for their services) and complementarity (where NGOs offer their specialized knowledge to target groups.)

Through the last five years or so, the Canadian Immigration System has undergone a significant change. The fate of new "modernized approach" is partially a matter of administrative reforms of the settlement and integration sector that are required to stimulate enhanced organizational effectiveness and service improvement translated into performance outcomes. In part, the rise of the modernized approach, largely supported by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), is explainable by the fact that the immigration system had sup-

posedly led to disappointing poor immigrant economic outcomes including low incomes and poverty, as well as social outcomes such as inability to achieve long-term integration and impact on social cohesion (Burstein, 2010). Equally important, however, was the fact that CIC increased program funding for immigrant settlement and introduced a renewed vision on how settlement services can be delivered through a new set of terms and conditions.

The modernized standard approach, as in much of nonprofit field, relates the organizational efficiency and effectiveness by means of its performance. Cost efficiency is the final and major determinant of the legitimacy of service provision. Unlike the conventional way to measure accountability for inputs, the current process means obeying the rules on spending, program delivery and staffing; the new model gives accountability for outputs or performance an unforeseen role in the procedural controls over management. By subordinating the performance to the logic of profit gains, this process is largely evaluated on the “best bang for the buck” with finances being the primary benchmark for measuring success.

The appeal of this approach is that it leads to evaluation mechanisms concerning how the sector performs, as well as to trace the inefficiencies involved in the delivery of services. It is neither surprising nor disturbing, therefore, that this approach has resulted in a reformulation of the practices in the sector. CIC has adopted a national approach to programmatic development and contracting as demonstrated by the launch of its first national Call for Proposals (CFP) in 2012. Previously, each region and program had a separate CFP. However, today the main objective is to standardize the evaluation of individual proposals, facilitate national consistency, replace individual CFPs and reinforce the attention to program outcomes (CIC Annual Report 2013).

Rather than strengthening the sector, the consensus among the advocates of this model stresses the need to incorporate performance outcome measures as legitimate device. As Burstein (2010) states, the -integration and settlement- sector has both challenges and strategic opportunities to improve outcomes. From a clinical perspective, it is positioned to holistically help clients put together a “complex array of services/programs” to foster short term settlement and long term integration outcomes.

Curiously enough, while governance and decentralization ideas dominated the scholarly works and policymaking circles around the globe, CIC bet on the resurrection of centralized governance model. The repatriation cases of Manitoba and British Columbia set the stage for the revival of this approach. There is a widespread assumption that this approach could help create identifiable consolidated regions across Canada; equalize regions in terms of level of activity, consistency of approach and efficiency across governmental units and; increase the involvement in direct delivery of programs.

Thus, a more careful discussion of these three components that integrates this seemingly positive strategy is needed.

Participation of other levels of government in the immigration system remains a very organic issue. While the federal and provincial/territorial governments have been working on a joint vision for immigration that includes a work plan for service delivery and national framework for settlement outcomes, coordinated efforts are still being tested. Alberta's federal/provincial co-management model -that is characterized by engaging both levels of government in planning, system development and resourcing- has become an attractive model worth exploring and may be even pursuing.

The new realities, largely created by new immigration trends and the growth of cities, demanded all levels of government re-examine its capacities, structures and how to govern. The attempt to invigorate local governments, in particular at the municipal level, inevitably implies a political process and administrative adjustment. While the political process is about the political will and choice to embrace an initiative, the administrative one poses the question of administrative capacity. CIC found in the LIPs initiative a way for the local governments to respond to the implicit mandate to attract, integrate and retain immigrants. An important underlying concern brought by some local communities is the way in which LIPs has challenged and competed with similar projects that have been long established and demonstrated positive results in response to the overwhelming emphasis of one fits all type of model.

This special issue on *Partnering for Success: Facilitating Integration and Inclusion* reveals that while the federal and provincial/territorial governments have given some priority to partnering with a variety of agencies that deal with newcomers, there is still considerable hesitancy in providing the kind of support needed to ensure integration and inclusion of immigrants. By adopting a neutral “point system” for assessing the skills necessary to integrate, it then also insists on developing counter policies that keep newcomers from full participation, e.g., refuse to acknowledge foreign credentials, have no programs to determine foreign qualifications. The papers presented in this special issue address some of these issues as well as the needs of services for newcomers.

In the present volume, the authors address the need for local and regional partnerships as well as how to evaluate the outcomes of these partnerships — both formal and informal. The authors also assess how the Provincial-Territorial secretariat is working and how well it has been able to coordinate work among the various stakeholders. Other authors have chosen to look at the changing, some might say devolutionary, relationships between provinces and the federal government; specifically at Manitoba and British Columbia. Finally many of the authors have chosen to focus on the role of how specific Service Provider Organizations have intervened in the sup-

port to integrate and create a sense of inclusion. Whether it is the process of preparing potential immigrants prior to their arrival in Canada to the role of churches in immigrant settlement, the authors look at who needs the services, who does not get the services and what specific types of services are needed by different immigrants. Nevertheless, all of them point out that settlement and integration sector plays an important role in helping immigrants find work, settling into Canadian society and achieving a sense of inclusion. It should be noted that a recent ground breaking and innovative workshop in Alberta was undertaken to identify service gaps, assess the trends and needs of the existing settlement agencies as well as to understand what these patterns and programs mean in terms of immigrant integration. With the involvement of government, NGOs and the private sector, new ways of dealing with immigrant integration are being discussed. Whether or not they evolve into policy and programs has yet to be determined but a new perspective has entered the scene.

## REFERENCES

- BRATTON, M. 1990. "NGOs in Africa: Can they influence Public policy?" *Development and Change*, 21.
- CANADA. 2013. *Local Immigration Partnerships*. Ottawa. CIC.
- BURSTEIN, M. 2010. *Reconfiguring Settlement and Integration: A Service Provider Strategy for Innovation and Results*, the Canadian Immigrant Settlement Sector Alliance-Alliance canadienne du secteur de l'établissement des immigrants (CISSA-ACSEI).
- CANADA. 2014. *Local Immigration Partnerships: Outcomes 2008-2013*, Ottawa, CIC.
- CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION CANADA, 2013. *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration 2013*, Ottawa.
- CLARK, J. 2011. *The Relationship Between the State and the Voluntary Sector*. ([www.gdrc.org/ngo/state-ngo.html](http://www.gdrc.org/ngo/state-ngo.html)) accessed August 21, 2014.
- DUSTMANN, C. & T. FRATTINI. 2013. *The Fiscal Effects of Immigration to the UK*. London, Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration.
- FERNANDEZ, A. 1987. "NGOs in South Asia: People's Participation and Partnership." *World Development* 15 (Supplement): 39-50.
- GARILAO, E. 1987. "Indigenous NGOs as Strategic Institutions: Managing the Relationship with Government and Resource Agencies" *World Development* 15 (Supplement): 113-120.
- GIBNEY, H. & P. FISHER. 2014. *Immigrants in Iowa: What New Iowans Contribute to the State Economy*. Iowa City, The Iowa Policy Project.
- RENSHON, S. 2011. *A Statement of Principles for American NGOs dealing with Immigrant Assimilation*. Centre for Immigration Studies, Washington, D.C.