

Western University

From the Selected Works of Neil Bradford

May, 2011

Local Immigration Partnerships Gathering Momentum: Early Successes, Emerging Challenges, and Recommendations for the Future.

Neil Bradford
Caroline Andrew



***LIPs Gathering Momentum: Early Successes,
Emerging Challenges, and Recommendations for
the Future***

**Neil Bradford, Department of Political Science, Huron University College,
University of Western Ontario.**

Caroline Andrew, Director of the Centre on Governance, University of Ottawa.

With the collaboration of Marisa Casagrande and Amy Ratcliffe

March 2011

Funded By:



**Citizenship and
Immigration Canada**

**Citoyenneté et
Immigration Canada**

INTRODUCTION

This report of the start-up phase of the Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs) has been prepared for the Ontario Region of Citizenship and Immigration Canada by Neil Bradford (Huron College, University of Western Ontario) and Caroline Andrew (University of Ottawa) with research support from Marisa Casagrande and Amy Ratcliffe. The report is divided into three sections; an opening section which situates the LIPs in terms both of Canadian political and policy practice and in terms of emerging trends in international policy analysis. The second section looks at the development of the LIPs through the lens of a number of critical transitions and the final section outlines our recommendations for the future development of the LIPs. Our decision to offer a full discussion of the intellectual and policy contexts informing the LIPs was to highlight the innovative characteristics of this initiative. Viewing the LIPs as a very promising policy initiative, we interpret the LIPs as a social innovation in the making. As such, it is important to frame a discussion of their emergence and potential in a broader intellectual and policy context.

PART 1: CONTEXTUALIZING THE LIPs: SOCIAL INNOVATION IN THE MAKING

In recent years, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) has been an innovative organization, pursuing new approaches to policy and governance that emphasize strategic partnerships and community connections. In 2005, the first Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement was signed with CIC playing a leadership role in recognizing the important role of municipalities in attraction, settlement and integration of immigrants. In its settlement programming, CIC has recently introduced “Community Connections” to strengthen relationships between host society and institutions and newcomers. A flagship initiative of both the COIA and Community Connections is the LIPs wherein CIC enables and facilitates strategic partnerships among municipalities and local stakeholders to develop and implement collaborative, coordinated, and comprehensive plans for settlement and integration of newcomers.

With each of these innovations, CIC is working smartly to maintain and renew Canada’s historic global leadership in welcoming immigrants through creative and robust immigration policy. Moving beyond traditional bureaucratic systems that compartmentalize problems and centralize control, CIC now explores alternative design and delivery frameworks that value community, respect municipal leadership, and leverage the knowledge and experience of newcomers themselves.

Indeed, CIC is engaging with some of the leading edge ideas, models, and practices that scholars now term the “new public governance” (Osborne, 2010). This approach responds “to the increasingly complex, plural and fragmented nature of public policy implementation and service delivery in the twenty-first century” (Osborne, 2010: 9). It is distinguished by five key departures from the familiar structures and routines of government administration:

1. A new ethos of engagement and participation in policy development and implementation, foregrounding values of mutual respect and shared responsibility among government and community-based actors.
2. A new inter-governmental ‘architecture’ for tackling complex, interdependent problems through policy collaboration and program alignment.
3. A new set of planning practices that tap different types of policy knowledge, often combining the technical expertise of governments with the ‘lived experience’ and tacit understandings of actors on the ‘front lines’.
4. A new focus on networked relations that join together diverse communities of interest in governance tasks, emphasizing “bridging” social capital that invites wide participation and ongoing connection.
5. A new metric for assessing progress and reporting success focused on community-driven results that transcend specific departmental mandates or single sector priorities, encompassing both ‘soft’ community development outcomes (eg. durable partnerships or shared understandings) and ‘hard’ sector performance outcomes (eg. higher employment or improved language skills).

Against this backdrop of new research and practice, our report investigates the crucial start-up phase of the LIPs, taking stock of the challenges and opportunities, as well as the strategies and tools deployed by the local partners and government actors to make progress. Our methodology involved working with five sets of data and information: first, document analysis of all the completed LIP Strategic Plans and Work Plans, identifying key priorities and cross-cutting themes; second, an analytical review of the state-of-the-art scholarly literature about new governance models and community-based public policy to situate CIC’s innovative approach with the LIPs; third, a more focused set of six regionally diverse LIP case studies based on an iterative series of key informant interviews conducted over a four month period moving through discussion of each key stage in the LIPs’ evolution, from initial community convening to council formation, from strategic planning to project implementation, and finally, to issues of evaluation and learning. Seeking to capture the localized dynamics of the LIPs process, we have organized our case study findings into a place-based analysis of how the key players are working through these various transitions. Finally, we have been able to conduct various forms of participant-observation as the LIPs roll-out. We have been involved in two major province-wide gatherings of LIP representatives and government policy-makers, while also participating, in various ways, in the LIPs in our own cities of Ottawa and London.

Drawing together these different methodologies, we view the LIPs as a *living experiment* in the new public governance – embracing collaboration, responding to community rhythms, and forging relationships across levels of government and public, private, and voluntary sectors. Our report is therefore structured to deepen understanding of the LIPS

as social innovation, and to convey both the real opportunities in moving forward as well as the challenges to progress.

THE LIPS: A PROMISING INNOVATION

Through the COIA – itself an innovative agreement embodying many of the principles of the new public governance – CIC in 2008 and 2010 issued Calls for Proposals (CFP) in partnership with the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration to strengthen the role of local communities throughout Ontario in serving and integrating immigrants through Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs). Proposals were invited from municipal governments, regional governments, or established community organizations with extensive experience serving immigrants in the community. As the CFP elaborated:

Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs) is the mechanism through which CIC supports the development of local partnerships and community-based planning around the needs of newcomers. LIPs seek to engage various stakeholders in the partnership development process including employers, school boards, boards of trade, levels of government, professional associations, ethno-cultural organizations, faith-based organizations and the community and social services sectors. LIPs is a stepping stone towards communities ultimately incorporating the focus of newcomers into the overall planning agenda (CIC, 2010).

In support of these objectives, CIC further established parameters for the role of the LIPs and outlined expectations about their work. In the terms of roles, it was made clear that the LIPs were a ‘convening and steering’ body with a mandate to forge strategic partnerships capable of developing community plans to improve access, coordination, and effectiveness of immigration programs and services. With this charge, the LIPs *would not* provide direct service delivery to clients, nor make funding decisions on behalf of CIC. In executing their convening and steering role, LIPs were mandated to establish a Partnership Council, to produce a strategic settlement plan, to mobilize relevant partners to lead on specific priorities identified by the community, and to report progress on implementation.

The CFP generated interest at the community level throughout the province, signaling that the LIP model resonated with local stakeholders. In 2011, 34 LIPs are ‘up and running’, moving through the partnership formation and strategic planning stages toward implementation of priorities, and nine more have been approved for funding.

To set the stage for the more detailed analysis that follows in this report, it is useful to encapsulate the impressive range of themes in Canadian immigration settlement and integration policy that the LIPs have the potential to advance:

- Bring new energy to the “two way street” ideal of Canadian multiculturalism that emphasizes the mutual engagement of host communities and mainstream organizations with newcomers and their representative associations. By focusing

on strategic community planning, the LIPs underscore that the host community has a crucial role to play in immigrant settlement and integration.

- Enhance the civic participation and active citizenship of immigrants by involving them directly in community planning and thereby connecting them to different sectors of community leadership.
- Practicing joined-up government that combines stakeholder planning and representative democracy through leadership roles of both municipalities and community immigration settlement networks.
- Practicing place-based policy that respects local contexts for action while putting the needs of immigrants first and taking a holistic view of their needs and capacities.
- Providing an ‘institutional focal point’ to host new conversations across governments, departments, and sectors, thereby offering a single access point for the public to a local immigration ‘system’ of services, programs, and spaces for discussion.
- Providing a community platform to identify policy gaps and engage the policy resources of all three levels of government in design and delivery of comprehensive, coordinated, and seamless services for all immigrants.
- Strengthening local awareness of immigrant settlement and integration challenges through policy research and public education.
- Demonstrating the value of local, and often tacit, knowledge and lived experience in the design and delivery of effective and accessible human services.
- Building the capacity to become a longer-term multi-sectoral community planning mechanism bridging economic, social, and cultural development, and responding to evolving pressures as local populations and economies change.
- Building a wider provincial ‘community of practice and learning’ in immigrant settlement and integration policy by connecting all the LIPs through a network for exchange of ideas and experience and for strategic policy leveraging on a province-wide basis.

The LIPs thus represent an exciting institutional experiment and promising social innovation. However, with such creativity also comes risks and challenges. Indeed, the broader context for Canadian immigration policy is uncertain (Biles, et al., 2008). Global economic transformations, the increasing ethno-racial composition of newcomers, and fiscal pressures on governments and service providers, all combine today to produce complex challenges for immigration policy makers and community actors alike. In a turbulent, fast changing environment, careful thought and strategic support are needed to

ensure that the LIPs reach their full potential. Our report aims to help CIC strengthen its capacity to support the local partnerships as they convene, plan, and implement.

THE NEW IMMIGRATION POLICY CONTEXT: CHALLENGE AND CHANGE

One of the world's most diverse countries, Canada has always been an immigrant society open to new arrivals from a huge range of regions and cultures. The Canadian ideal of multiculturalism puts ethno-cultural diversity at the heart of the political community where all citizens regardless of origin can express their traditions and values without discrimination. At the same time, the expectation is that people from different places will seek to participate fully in the economic, social, and political life of their new country. Ideally, Canadian multiculturalism plays out along a "two way street" as newcomers and their communities engage and mutually learn and adapt in contact with one another (Bradford and Andrew, 2011).

The 1971 federal multiculturalism policy statement set out the key principles and goals: recognition and accommodation of cultural diversity; removal of barriers to participation by new Canadians; promotion of inter-cultural exchange; and acquisition of official languages by newcomers. Further progress came in the 1980s. The 1982 Charter of Rights and Freedoms affirmed the value multiculturalism and entrenched protections against discrimination for racial and cultural minority groups. In 1988, the Canadian Multiculturalism Act was passed, making Canada the first country to adopt such a law, and declaring diversity a "national asset" and a "basis for leadership in an increasingly complex world of economic globalization" (Rimok and Rouzier, 2008: 201).

For all these reasons, Canada has long been held up as an international model of a vibrant multi-cultural nation-state, managing a complex equilibrium between diversity and unity. While other countries face public backlash against immigrants and encounter the "progressive's dilemma" in sustaining public support for immigration, Canada has maintained its "diversity advantage" (Banting, 2010; Stren, 2009).

However, the last decade or so has revealed worrying trends (Richmond and Omidvar, 2003; Bradford and Andrew, 2011). These include: declining economic outcomes for recent newcomers, especially racial minorities, despite higher levels of education than earlier immigrant cohorts; more complex, specialized settlement and integration needs as immigrant source countries move from Europe to the Global South, placing increasing burdens on front line settlement organizations; an increasing urban-rural divide in immigrant settlement, with a dramatic increase in racial minorities in the largest Canadian cities and a growing concentration of immigrants in high poverty neighbourhoods; and finally, a concern that insufficient emphasis was put on cross-cultural exchange, giving rise to ethnic enclaves or parallel communities.

By the turn of the millennium these trends and concerns posed a series of critical questions about the adequacy of Canada's existing approaches to immigrant settlement

and integration. A host of commentators, academics, practitioners, and policy makers asked whether the prevailing government immigration policy framework was sufficiently attuned to the evolving and differentiated challenges confronting recent immigrants ‘on the ground’ across communities. Established approaches were perhaps too top down in design, too centralized its delivery, too siloed in vision, and too short term in operation (Richmond and Omidvar, 2003).

In this context, the new public governance has emerged as a promising alternative to traditional ideas and practices. In a geographically sprawling federal state like Canada with many localized identities, innovative approaches that balance diversity and unity will also necessarily be place-based and multi-level. Problems, needs, and capacities will all vary by locale and their complex interactions demand collaborative policy responses from multiple actors.

While these new policy approaches and governance frameworks have only recently gathered momentum in Canada, they have long been prominent across other OECD countries (Bradford, 2011). A large body of research brings into focus three key success factors for communities and governments to work well together in developing comprehensive solutions tailored to local contexts (Osborne, 2010).

‘Relational Leadership’

A different style of leadership rooted in mutual respect and trust-building is crucial for more joined-up policy approaches that empower community voices and that recognize both the diversity and the interdependence among actors in relation to the tasks at hand (Sandercock, 2004). Such leadership enables partners to come together in authentic dialogue (listening and learning more than declaring) to create a narrative about their community and its priorities, establishing the context for joint planning and project implementation (Healey, 2010). Relational leaders help frame problems for collective action and they work not from positions of credit or blame but from shared ownership of problems and common accountability for progress. Importantly, this kind of leadership, focused on relationships as the foundation for policy innovation, not only requires often unfamiliar skills of facilitating and enabling but also engaging new people with diverse experiences and perspectives – reaching out to previously excluded groups and providing them a ‘seat at the table’. Moreover, given the complexity of the policy problems at hand, it also depends on governments finding constructive ways of working together across departments and jurisdictions. Working in isolation, or worse, at cross-purposes leads nowhere (Gross Stein, 2007).

Research reveals that often the most effective partnerships emerge through the successful negotiation of conflict and identification of workable trade-offs. Immigrant settlement and integration involves balancing unity and diversity and it is important to acknowledge creative tensions as communities air their differences and frustrations. Robust partnerships learn to handle conflict and channel it constructively to new understandings and patches of common ground. Relational leadership thus builds “network power”. The focus shifts to “the ability of networked agents to improve the choices available to all of

them as a result of collectively developed innovative ideas” (Booher and Innes, 2002: 226).

‘Shared Accountability’

The place-based multi-level governance framework finds its momentum and direction through community-based networks (Torjman, 2007). It emphasizes the benefits to both governments and citizens when public policy taps local knowledge and leverages local assets. Such localized and networked relations can produce context-sensitive policy targets and progress indicators to guide policy and fine-tune programming or service delivery. In turn, communities are often best-placed to monitor performance and propose course corrections (Quinn Patton, 2010). The common vision and animating purpose here is shared accountability where the different partners, having agreed to a joint action plan, commit to implementation through a strategic division of labour expressing the different comparative advantages in problem-solving among participants. In this way, reporting relationships become less about filling in standardized forms and more about capturing the value of collaboration and learning about what works where through “reflexive practice” (Healey, 2010). Different types of knowledge are combined – from the technical to the experiential – to inform context-sensitive evaluation. Importantly, the principle of shared accountability ensures that local actors will not be held responsible for outcomes beyond their capacity and reach. Rather they will work with and through government partners to identify broad-based solutions (Bradford, 2009).

‘Blending Knowledge’

Finally, our understanding of the LIPs as a social innovation can be enhanced with reference to the literature on the geographies of tacit knowledge (Gertler, 2003). Tacit knowledge is different in form and content from more traditional policy knowledge that emphasizes technical or professional expertise. Tacit knowledge refers to experiential understandings that are rooted in the practices, and flow from the relationships, among locally situated, front line policy actors. Rather than presented in formal reports, tacit knowledge is often conveyed through narratives and stories told from the perspective of service users and providers. Geographers have described the role of learning regions, communities of practice, and knowledge enablers in generating and sharing such tacit knowledge that turns out to be a valuable input to public policy when problems are complex and multi-faceted (as in the case of immigrant settlement and integration). The shared governance and accountability processes that are at the heart of the LIPs combine elements of each of these three tacit knowledge configurations: creating structures for dialogue at regional or local levels, bringing together communities of practice around newly articulated policy issues, and valuing leadership that facilitates the development and distribution of experiential and community-based knowledge.

Indeed, across the entire start-up phase of the LIP councils and strategic planning, actors have made use of a varied set of knowledge forms. Initial deliverables included literature reviews and inventories of existing services, with many of the inventories completed in collaboration with the Welcoming Communities Initiative researchers, engaging both

local university scholars and community-based researchers, and hearing the stories and experiences of newcomers themselves. Some LIPs conducted further community-based research; Hamilton's LIP, for example, studied the informal sector and argued for its significance and inclusion in policy and service deliberations.

The meetings of the Councils and the great variety of executive structures, tables or committees for specific sectors, such as health, education, settlement services, and policing, also tapped experiential and tacit knowledge. Discussions of agreed upon gaps in services saw representatives from different sectors join the conversation to describe their work and aspirations. Potential solutions, in the form of enhanced or enriched projects, new partnerships or new funding arrangements, all emerged through exchange of tacit knowledge about how different sectors worked and how collaboration between sectors could produce concrete improvements. Facilitating such rich blending of knowledge stands out as an innovative characteristic of the LIPs Councils, giving policy voice to broad and varied sectors of the community.

BRINGING COMMUNITIES IN: FEDERAL SETTLEMENT AND INTEGRATION LEADERSHIP IN THE 21st CENTURY

The principles and practices of relational leadership, shared accountability and multiple forms of knowledge do not dispute the importance of robust reporting on performance and outcomes. But by placing communities at the centre of policy planning and change processes, they are a reminder that local voices require a say in striking the proper balance between upward and downward accountability, in assessing what risks might be worth taking to solve complex problems, and in deciding about what counts in assessing outcomes – both measures of community progress and policy effectiveness.

Thus, for governments, relational leadership, shared accountability, and blended knowledge pose several challenges. Public servants must still lead but not in command and control style (Public Policy Forum, 2008). As *partners*, they use their tools and resources to leverage the ingenuity and insight of communities. Yet, existing structures for public servants emphasize vertical and hierarchal relationships through functionally specific policy departments and reporting protocols. Career incentives remain more tied to project ownership than collaboration with other governments and community organizations. Relational leadership will require cultural change in government, balancing two equally legitimate values: ministerial accountability for policy performance through vertical reporting relationships and community-driven planning that informs priorities and guides resources. Maintaining this balance is not easy and experience in other jurisdictions suggest that formation of a governmental *community of practice and learning* can build organizational capacity and shift organizational culture (OECD, 2010). Indeed, the federal government's Federal Family on Community Collaboration is an example of such a learning and mentoring network (Bradford, 2009).

More broadly, the place-based, multi-level governance framework envisions a somewhat different role for the federal government in orchestrating community-based policy

planning and action. The 2006 External Advisory Committee on Cities and Communities wrote that “the leadership role of the federal government be one of facilitation and partnership with other orders of government and civil society, to deliver locally appropriate solutions of national consequence playing out at a local level” (EACCC, 2006: viii). Seeking national leadership that is “enabling, deft and integrated”, the Committee called on the federal government to “serve as a leader in ideas and as a convenor and facilitator, bringing people, governments and institutions together to help design solutions to be chosen and applied locally” (EACCC, 2006: 22).

In short, the federal government’s policy leadership extends beyond funding to include a variety of ‘softer’ process contributions that enable local communities to access the information, build the knowledge and forge the networks crucial for durable progress. The federal government has an important “metagovernance” role, supplying the framework within which the partners can come together and work effectively together across sectors, departments, and jurisdictions (Bradford and Andrew, 2011). Indeed, a consistent message from both the scholarly research and practitioner reflections on collaborative governance stresses that effective government ‘facilitating and framing’ is as important to successful outcomes as the more frequently referenced strong local communities and social capital.

CIC’s work through the COIA and its Community Connections program theme speak directly to the dynamics of place-based policy approaches and multi-level governance. Within the evolving CIC repertoire, the LIPs represent the leading-edge of Canadian practice in relational leadership, shared accountability, and blended knowledge. Rooted in unique community-based partnerships across Ontario, the LIPs are facilitating bottom-up planning and mobilizing a range of immigration sector and mainstream organizations in the implementation of more coordinated and effective solutions to settlement and integration challenges. As two leading collaborative planning theorists summarize: “Diversity is the hallmark of the informational age ... [it] provides the building blocks for a network to create new conditions and solutions (Booher and Innes, 2002: 227).

We now turn to the findings and lessons from our study of the evolution of the LIPs. Each LIP remains ‘a work in progress’, experimenting with different structures and tools to bring the partners together for planning and action. As living policy experiments, the LIPs must navigate their way through a series of transitions – from convening to partnership, from partnership to planning, from planning to implementation, and from implementation to learning. Our case study analysis highlights the opportunities and challenges arising at these critical moments, and the strategies pursued by the LIP partners.

PART 2: VOICES FROM THE FIELD: A LIPs PROGRESS REPORT

Introduction

Two aspects of the LIPs are most striking. First, is the *place-based character* of the process. Partnerships, plans, and priorities all reflect local settings – the previous community history and experiences, the leadership dynamics and relations across sectors, and, of course, the particular immigration pressure points across the attraction, settlement, retention, and integration continuum. Second, is the importance of strategic thinking and action at *key transition points* in the institutional evolution of the LIP. From this place-based and dynamic perspective, the LIPs are properly understood and analyzed as community-driven, ‘real time’ experiments in multi-level collaborative governance.

PLACE MATTERS: “Unique configurations of common elements across space”

As noted above, CIC mandated several common elements in the design of the LIPs. Federal funding is available for formation of a partnership council with broad representation, a community strategic planning process to develop an action plan, and development of a process for project implementation. Consistent with the principle of bottom-up planning and action, however, LIP applications were left relatively open in regards to who might come forward, recognizing that local leadership in immigration varies across places. In some cities it might be the municipal governments taking the initiative, while in others, community agencies or neighbourhood networks could be the drivers of collaboration.

For baseline reference on the crucial start-up work, we have analyzed all of the LIP agreements across Ontario capturing patterns of similarity and difference across localities, and drawing lessons about good practices in establishing the foundation for multi-level collaborative governance. Critical issues to consider include the size and structure of partnership councils, the relationship between the sectors represented, the planning processes and the results in terms of action plans and implementation vehicles. More broadly, differences arise between LIPs in the cosmopolitan Greater Toronto Area (GTA) and those in the rest of the province where greater attraction of newcomers is a major challenge. The Table below summarizes trends in Toronto and the GTA as compared to the rest of the province. It should be noted, however, that we are looking at broad trends and that there are important variations outside the GTA. For example, not all the LIPs outside Toronto are led by municipal governments although this is clearly the dominant pattern.

Comparing Ontario LIPs : Key Structures and Processes		
	Municipalities/Counties outside Greater Toronto Area	Greater Toronto Area
Decision Making Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal government (or subcommittee)administration of LIP • Promote agreement by consensus between council members • Municipal government has final 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local service provider/ community organization administration of LIP • Promote agreement by consensus between council members • 50%/66% majority voting

	say	structure
Demographics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low population density • Desire to increase diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High population density • Better manage high levels of diversity
Geographic Scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipality/County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood/Community
Employment Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifically identified sectors where “skilled labour” is needed • “Attract and retain” newcomers to fill vacant positions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally work towards “better labour market outcomes” (e.g. partnering with local business council or increased labour market preparation)
Settlement Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City wide initiatives • Focused broadly on immigrants/newcomers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood level initiatives • Focused on specific ethno-cultural groups

As mentioned earlier, our examination of the LIPs is based on a number of different kinds of material, including a set of six regionally diverse case studies. We chose the case studies to reflect three major categories; the GTA, other urban, and rural and remote. This geographical categorization is related to another, very similar, categorization in terms of the principal orientation to immigration which emerged during the conversations with the lead organization in the six cases.

- *Attraction and Retention.* The first category is where relatively few newcomers and services exist. Here, LIP processes are predominantly geared towards recruitment and retention.
- *Capacity-Building.* A second category is characterized by having many newcomers but relatively few services. In this unbalanced context, LIP processes are predominantly geared towards building service and agency capacity.
- *Coordination.* A third category already sees a relatively balanced ratio of newcomers and services. In these communities, LIP processes seem to be more concerned with coordination of services and partnership building. The main objective is not to create new services but more so to nudge agencies towards greater alignment.

Following this logic then, partnerships in the first category tend to be directed towards attraction and retention while the second category is directed at capacity-building and the third at coordination.

The case studies were Toronto West Downtown, Peel, Hamilton, Kingston, Huron County and Thunder Bay. Before turning to the case study material it is important to briefly describe the six communities.

West Toronto

West Toronto is a cluster of 21 neighbourhoods located in the western part of downtown Toronto bordered by Yonge Street, Parkside Drive/Keele Street, Lake Ontario, and St. Clair Avenue West. With a long history of as a reception area for newcomers, in 2006 the 119,472 immigrant community made up 43% of the total population (Statistics Canada, 2006). Of this largely diverse community, 35,613 new immigrants have been in Canada less than 10 years and 21,897 have lived here for less than 5 years.

Peel

The Regional Municipality of Peel (also known as Peel Region) is located to the west and northwest of Toronto and is part of the Greater Toronto Area. After Toronto, it is the second largest municipality in Ontario and consists of three municipalities; the cities of Brampton and Mississauga, and the town of Caledon. Peel Region has a growing population jumping up over 17% to 1,159,405 in 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2006). While many of the recent immigrants are of Asian origin, its diverse immigrant population makes up almost 50% of the total population.

Hamilton

Hamilton is a port city located at the west end of Lake Ontario in southern Ontario with a long history of manufacturing and as a hub of industrialization. According to 2006 Census the population of Hamilton was 504,559. While one quarter of Hamilton's population are foreign born, almost 40% of Hamilton's foreign born population settled here prior to 1971. Like other centres across Ontario, immigration to Hamilton has changed dramatically over the last 40 years - a steady but emphatic decline from the "traditional" source counties of Western Europe to a steady increase from countries such as China, India, Pakistan, Philippines and the Middle East. Peaking at around 4,500 in 2005, immigration flows to Hamilton has been averaging around 3,500 arrivals per year for the last five years.

Kingston

Kingston is located halfway between Toronto and Montreal in eastern Ontario where the St. Lawrence River flows out of Lake Ontario. The Kingston Census Metropolitan Area has experienced a small 1.6% increase in population between 1996 and 2006 for a total population of 152,358 (Statistics Canada, 2006). While immigrants make up just over 12% of the total population, it is a pretty homogenous community with only 5.8% of the population being of visible minority.

Huron County

Huron County, sometimes called Ontario's 'West Coast', is located along the shores of Lake Huron. This vibrant rural community is the most agriculturally productive county in

Ontario and a leader in numerous areas of agricultural technology and innovation. Huron County has a population of 59,325 (Statistics Canada, 2006) however, between 1996 and 2001 the County experienced a small decrease of 0.87% of its population. Immigrants make up only 10% of the total population and while it is home to seven different ethnic groups, the majority of its small immigrant population is of western European origin.

Thunder Bay

Thunder Bay is located on the north shore of Lake Superior, and is considered to be the gateway to northern Ontario. With a population of 122, 907 in 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2006), up 0.8% from 2001, the Census Metropolitan Area is comprised of five Sister Cities and through which economic development, education, friendship, goodwill, education, and tourism are promoted. It is the largest municipality of north-western Ontario and the second most populous after Greater Sudbury. Its diverse yet small immigrant community make up fewer than 10% of the total population.

THE LIPS: INSTITUTION BUILDING THROUGH TRANSITIONS

Pre-LIP Activity:

Looking more closely at the six communities in our study, the significance of pre-LIP activities emerges as particularly significant. Indeed in five of the six case studies the community had already come together to collaborate on issues related to newcomers prior to the LIP call-for-proposals. These early efforts were then significant for the nature and shape of collaborations that would take place once LIP funding was received.

In Kingston, for example, a stakeholder's meeting, organized by the Executive Director of the Kingston Community Health Centre, took place one year prior to when the LIP CFP was announced. This health centre would eventually become one of the lead organizations in the Kingston Immigration Partnership (KIP) and its executive director key to negotiating and securing the LIP contract.

In Toronto West, a community with a large number of agencies and services, the need for community collaboration emerged almost two years prior to the LIP CFP. In this community, eight organizations had come together to form a steering committee which then applied for United Way funding in order to hire a part-time staff member to lead the initiative. Broad invitations to members of the settlement community resulted in a large Council with over 100 participants and 60 organizations, mostly from the settlement sector. Indeed, once LIP funding had been approved, the Council had already put together a strategic plan outlining over 80 strategic directions. Prioritizing these directions became the starting point for the new LIP council.

In Peel Region, the Regional Government and the Peel United Way came together to co-chair the LIP. These organizations had connected in 2006, a few years prior to the LIP initiative, to produce various influential reports including "Poverty by Region" and "Success by Six" and to lead a community collaboration around newcomer issues. While

the Peel Newcomer Strategy had already been developed prior to LIP funding, LIP funding was valuable for its continual refinement.

The Thunder Bay Multicultural Association had led efforts to form an immigration partnership prior to LIP funding. This organization then became the lead once LIP funding was provided. In Hamilton, a specific collaboration on newcomers had not existed. However, Hamilton had experimented with a series of cross-sector community collaboratives addressing issues such as poverty prior to the LIP call for proposals. These provided lessons, a basic framework, as well as potential community leadership capacity.

What became obvious in our discussions is the significance of these early efforts in shaping the nature of dialogue and relationships that would then influence the development of the LIP. Certainly pre-LIP activity in the different communities set patterns for the 'place specific' development of the LIPs.

Setting the Transitions

CIC directed the LIPs to move through four stages of activity: initial convening and partnership council formation; development of a strategic plan; identification of priorities for implementation and mobilization for action; progress reporting and outcomes evaluation. Moving through the stages involves LIP leaders and partners acting strategically to manage successful transitions. Each stage foregrounds particular tasks and functions in institution-building, calling for a quite broad range of substantive knowledge and process management skills from the key players (at both the local community and government policy levels).

What follows is an analysis of our six LIP case studies, focusing on the challenges and opportunities arising at each transition, the strategies adopted by the key players, and the main issues arising in progressing across the stages.

The research methodology used for this study emphasized the experiential knowledge of LIP leaders as they considered each transitional phase of the LIP policy life-cycle. The following section seeks to capture the themes and lessons learned from these discussions. Iterative discussions with key LIP players over a four month period allowed for a particularly rich understanding of the leadership structure and dynamics. In each of the six LIP case studies, it is clear that the presence of a well-functioning leadership team was integral for providing momentum and organizational capacity. The leadership structure and team may have differed in its name, in its form, and in whether it corresponded to the formal lead role recognized in the LIP proposal or not, but it acts as the central driver of the LIP.

LIP leaders made clear the integral role that a small leadership circle provided in maintaining direction, focus, and momentum through an organic planning process with many action items needing to be carried out between Council meetings. While Council might endorse key decisions, it is often this small official or unofficial work-team that is

charged with making the needed connections with staff and the community in order to move forward.

TRANSITION 1: COMMUNITY CONVENING TO COUNCIL FORMATION

There was large variation in terms of how Council membership was selected. While in most instances, a leadership core had come together to respond to the call for proposals, decisions on how to expand the breadth of these relationships to form a Council differed according to place-context and the type of LIP community. In Toronto West, an open call was made to all settlement organizations in the community. In Thunder Bay, most members have come via invitation but membership is open to anyone interested. In Huron County a lack of settlement organizations combined with strong existing relationships around issues of economic development informed the invitations that would be made to different sectors. In Peel, the two co-chairs made decisions about the steering committee formation, seeking broad sector engagement as well as representation from lead settlement umbrella agencies such as the LINC and ISAP table. Service providers are to be represented by the Chairs of these tables but are welcome to sit on any of the working groups in the Peel LIP.

Key decisions were also made about the kind of skill-sets needed at the table and whether discussions would be better served for example, by subject expertise, practitioners, or executive membership. Each of these skill-sets may bring a different “kind of energy to the table.” In Peel, they have found that the partnership council table needs strategic thinkers who are committed to the big picture and not thinking only about “what is in it for me.” But while the council table may need executive level membership, the standing committee does not. Furthermore, the nature of this membership may need to be reconsidered depending on the stage of the LIP. Leaders in both the Peel and the Kingston LIP noted a need to rethink the nature of their members when moving towards discussions on implementation.

A series of challenges regarding membership arise depending on place-context and the type of LIP community. In those communities with a large number of service providers such as Toronto West and Peel, membership decisions need to balance tensions between efficacy and representation. Seeking to be inclusive of settlement organizations, the Toronto West LIP membership grew to a significant size but this was thought to impede efficacy at times. Conversely, as service providers in Peel were not invited to sit on the steering committee structure, they have expressed a feeling of mistrust and exclusion, stemming from not feeling well represented by LINC and ISAP umbrella agencies. The communication, or lack thereof, between the Chair of these agencies and the service providers themselves, is seen as the source of the problem.

Further challenges stem from not being able to secure representation from various sectors or organizations. In some communities, garnering the support from the business community remains a challenge, while in others it may be greater municipal involvement or that of the LHINs which becomes a central preoccupation. Institutions and institutional relationships matter here. For example, Peel’s regional governance structure and the

funder's consortium which exists in Peel, were seen as key to providing policy and funding capacity. Moreover, this support is cemented further by its two co-chairs (The Region of Peel and Peel United Way). Political support is also evident in the Huron LIP where the County plays the lead role.

To some extent, it may be said that membership, at least in its early stages, seems to reflect the type of LIP community and the relative emphasis it has placed on issues of attraction and retention, capacity-building, or service coordination. Many of the relationships around these objectives had already been formed prior to the LIP. But efforts to broaden membership beyond pre-established relationships may well depend upon a series of other factors stemming from leadership perceptions around the main role, value, or longevity of the LIP. And here, there seems to be large variation as well. This will be explained in greater depth in the following section; but it is important to note that the goal to broaden the nature of Council representation seems to have been taken up in varying degrees across the six communities.

The LIP leader in Hamilton eloquently explained that the significance of the LIP is precisely “to broaden sector representation in recognition that the integration process is a two-way process which needs the sectors beyond settlement to help do their part in creating a welcoming community.” He observed “addressing immigration and creating a welcoming community means combating stereotypes and stretching traditional boundaries, which is why it is important to seek broad sector involvement.” These broader and longer-term objectives were not taken up uniformly across the six communities. In some cases, the objectives of the LIPs seemed to be more pragmatic, even narrow. For example, in Toronto West, the LIP was seen as an opportunity for coordination among settlement providers. Leaders seemed to take a more short-term perspective which focused on developing a strategic plan. This perspective serves then to inform the nature of discussion and collaboration. During one of its meetings, for instance, the school board raised the issue of low completion rates for its ESL classes but the discussion was deemed to be a “provincial issue” and outside the scope of the LIP mandate. While this shorter term perspective may be changing as new funding agreements are made in Toronto, its original position may have also affected key governance decisions. Not sure of the longevity of the LIP funding, Toronto West did not create a traditional executive council structure, but opted instead to give an independent consultant a key role in providing the momentum, conducting meetings and setting the agenda.

Key Learnings

- Place-context and type of LIP community were important determinants of both the processes of council formation as well as the nature of council membership.
- Large variation in leadership perceptions about the main objective, value, and longevity of the LIPs were also important determinants of these processes and structures.

- LIP leaders sought to balance a series of tensions in making decisions about Council membership; most notably, the balance between representativeness and efficacy.
- Key decisions were also made about the type of skill-set needed at the table depending on the LIP phase.

TRANSITION 2: COUNCIL FORMATION TO STRATEGIC PLANNING

The following section is organized along two main themes. The first emphasizes the process aspects associated with strategic planning. These processes are key to understanding the daily experiences and directional energies of the LIPs and serve as the main mechanism for building momentum and synergy. They can be considered to form part of the “social capital” – trust relations and mutual respect across sectors -- that then translates into more substantive outcomes at various points in the institutional life-cycle. For analytical purposes, the report captures these processes along two directional logics. These include *deepening processes* targeted at community outreach and consultation and *broadening processes* targeted at partnership-building.

The second section discusses the Strategic Plans themselves with emphasis on understanding the large variation in the strategic priorities outlined in these plans.

Processes Related to Community Outreach and Consultation (Depth)

It became clear in our discussions with LIP leaders that planning and organizational efforts need to be understood broadly to include community outreach and partnership-building, as well as the more substantive policy or service provision objectives. In fact, these organic processes are integrally connected with substantive outcomes. In each of the six LIP case studies, processes related to community outreach were seen as integral to the substantive work of the LIP. Though there was variation in terms of how and to what extent these processes were undertaken, there was also marked commonality across these six communities in their felt need to engage in these deepening processes. Efforts here align with at least three main objectives as follows:

1. Building buy-in and legitimacy;
2. Building trust within the settlement community and across the sectors;
3. Building, aggregating, and sharing different forms of knowledge.

Challenges in Huron County in the early planning stages stem more from gaps in knowledge and awareness within the community than from a lack of political or leadership support. Members of the steering committee seem to share a common vision and understanding of the significance of the LIP, and links were built with outside expertise to help “make the case”. Such expertise came from experienced settlement sector representatives in London and from the University of Guelph in relation to changing demands of rural and community economic development. This assistance aimed to build awareness of immigration issues and opportunities among Council

members themselves. It is important to note here that Council was formed by way of invitation and that therefore initial meetings were intended to bring members to a common starting point for discussions. Efforts were therefore directed at knowledge building as well as gaining buy-in and legitimacy. It is interesting to note that building legitimacy in Huron meant connecting the work of the LIP to the County's 'Sustainability Plan.'

In Hamilton, the community development role was well emphasized. Prior to crafting the strategic plan, over 400 recent immigrants and refugees were consulted through a series of focus groups, and numerous other discussions were undertaken with local stakeholder groups and organizations. There was an extensive process of building awareness and trust that continued even after the strategic plan was completed. LIP leaders were involved in a process of gathering signatures on a community-wide 'declaration of intent' to solidify further institutional support and endorsement. The Mayor and all members of Council have signed the declaration as well as many of the lead businesses, organizations, and educational institutions in the community.

In Toronto West, as a strategic plan had already been compiled prior to receiving LIP funding, efforts were therefore directed at legitimizing this work amidst the new Council. The 100 strategies identified prior to LIP funding were put through a "critical thinking process" which involved a further set of interviews, focus groups, and discussions with the new Council. The goal was to generate a more doable set of priorities.

The Kingston LIP processes undertook an extensive year-long process of public consultation. An advisory committee led the community to define themes and goals around immigration. This public consultation process consisted of different phases, including open assemblies and approximately 13 focus groups. It ended with a large public event which took these ideas to create thematic mapping and a set of goals which then became part of the strategic plan. The Kingston LIP commitment to legitimizing its work within the community is reflected in its governance structures and processes. Council will undertake an annual planning cycle where priorities will be selected from the strategic plan and set for the year. These activities will then be reported back to the community in the form of a report card during a public assembly, at which time the community itself will help establish new priorities for the upcoming year. These will then be taken back to Council for adoption. Importantly, while new "strategies" and "actions" could be introduced depending on community consultations, resources, and players involved, the "goals" and "themes" arising from initial public consultations were not to be changed. In this way the Kingston LIP seeks to balance the need to provide direction while also allowing for an organic flow of ideas through community involvement. The Council understands public engagement to continue beyond the planning phase, and indeed, to become part of the way the LIP conducts its business.

A number of the LIP leaders spoke of the challenges associated with shifting away from a competitive culture to a culture of collaboration and trust. The reality for many communities is that settlement organizations have experienced a long history of competing for funds. Annual reports and patterns of dialogue between agencies have therefore been informed by this culture of competition. In Hamilton, the LIP leader noted

that “there needs to be a process of truth–building among settlement providers so that honest discussions can be had about the community’s collective need. And this also requires a common data set, accurate information sharing, and serious and transparent discussion.” Here LIPs can play an important role in building ‘truth and trust’.

Such relation-building processes are delicate and sometimes at odds with some of the LIPs mandated objectives. The tension plays out in concrete ways. For example, in two LIP communities, the stated CIC objective to address “duplication of services” was effectively crossed-out since it was considered by local members to be inconsistent with the goal of inspiring collaboration through trust and respect across sectors and organizations. On the other hand, communities such as Huron County and Thunder Bay were less concerned with such matters. Given the relatively simple settlement context in these communities (Huron County does not have any settlement service providers operating within its boundaries and the Thunder Bay Multicultural Association is the only settlement organization) leaders in both of these communities were less concerned about issues of duplication and more concerned to leverage what they saw as their communities’ strong social capital in support of immigration strategies. Once again, the significance of ‘place and context’ was evident in shaping LIP dynamics. Equally important, LIP leaders felt that these processes of community engagement could not be considered separate from learning and knowledge building. In practice, the two operate iteratively in the continual fine-tuning of LIP objectives and their translation into strategic plans.

There are a number of significant challenges associated with leadership efforts to outreach and consult with their respective communities. For instance, our discussions highlighted challenges associated with securing membership from smaller agencies and non-incorporated groups such as social clubs and faith-based organizations. In Huron County, stipends had been included and were considered to be essential in securing this very grass-roots participation.

In other cases, perceptions about the nature of the community conversations themselves seemed to deter participation or membership. In Toronto West, discussions were seen to not be “practical” enough to interest non-incorporated groups. The LIP leader in this community was hopeful that wider involvement would follow once discussions focused more on implementation issues.

Key Learnings:

- Variation in how and to what extent LIP’s engaged in processes of community outreach and consultation, amidst common “felt-need” to engage in these processes.

- Common outreach and consultation objectives focused on three objectives: building buy-in, building trust and legitimacy, building knowledge.
- Community engagement was considered essential for continual learning and refinement of strategic plans, continuing beyond the formal planning stage.
- Challenges to securing participation from non-incorporated groups related to resource capacities and the nature of discussions.

Processes Related to Partnership-Building (Breadth)

LIP leaders commonly cited their increased capacity to bring sectoral leaders from the community together as one of the most valuable contributions of the LIP process. In this process while the funding itself was important, so too was the increased legitimacy that transpired from having received CIC funding.

Leaders from each of the LIP case studies were happy to share accounts of the unexpected gains derived from these new collaborations. The social capital and the more substantive service-delivery gains emerging from these collaborations are not always easily captured nor recognized, but they nevertheless serve as one of the most commonly cited positive spin-offs from collaborative initiatives. For example, Thunder Bay is launching an educational/communication piece that is “only possible because of the partnerships which have been created.” And in Peel, the Region is contributing funding in order to enable a full-time communications position. These are examples of opportunities and funds which have been leveraged by LIP processes.

Much of the social capital which grows is “soft” and intangible. Attempts to capture the full significance of these processes need to consider various factors over a long period of time. For example, as has been noted above, many of the settlement organizations in some of these communities have long histories of mistrust. The new opportunities for discussion supplied by the LIPs have given organizations a ‘neutral space’ to tackle the “trust” barriers before moving onto substantive dialogue. LIP funding has helped provide the platform for these much needed community discussions. A working group in Toronto West, for example was able to speak openly about its reasons for not providing referrals to other agencies. These discussions uncovered a number of barriers (ie. waiting lists, answering machines, funding concerns) that together served to create a feeling of mistrust. The process of partnership building in this context needed therefore, to first unpack these issues and ‘to talk through the differences’ as the necessary foundation for genuine collaboration. The point here relates to the difficulty of properly capturing the intangible, but nevertheless important contributions resulting from the LIPs’ convening and planning. Trust building takes time and relies on the exchange of tacit knowledge. In turn, such experiential insights and lessons can substantially enhance collaborative planning and policy development.

It is therefore important to devise indicators that capture some of the gains emerging from these relationships. A number of examples were cited by LIP leaders, including Council members incorporating a number of action items outlined in the Strategic Plan into their own organizational objectives. Such changes resulting from LIP dialogue and knowledge transfer offer ‘a visible return on social capital’ and serve as one good indicator of the positive impact of collaborations.

Key Learnings:

- Positive spin-offs from collaborations flow from good process and respectful cross-sectoral and inter-organizational dialogue.
- Social capital is important and its intangible benefits can lead to substantive reforms important to immigrant settlement and integration outcomes.
- It is not easy to attach value to the social capital generated through collaborative institutions such as the LIPs.

STRATEGIC PLANS

Across the case studies, and more generally across all the LIPs, there is large variation in the nature of the priorities outlined in the Strategic Plans. This can be clearly seen in the descriptions of the Strategic Priorities in Annex B, Section 2. Partnership Council Processes, Objectives/Strategic Priorities (page 48).

The following discussion attempts to outline reasons behind this variation. Of course, variation can be seen as an indication of the success of the LIP process as genuinely bottom-up planning should reflect unique community profiles, experiences, and chosen directions. Such variation might also reflect real differences in community mobilization, the proactive capacity of the leadership and the particular Council composition.

LIP leaders expressed their lack of clarity about the life span of the LIPs as well as some ambiguity about their own roles going forward. At the same time, it was acknowledged that such ambiguity was likely inherent to these types of innovative community-driven initiatives. However, leaders also indicated that they needed to make some basic assumptions for planning purposes. We have already reported on the large variation of these assumptions, but it is important to discuss these points further as the uncertainties about the LIPs’ future were mentioned frequently in relation to the challenges of strategic planning.

One concern heard was that a narrow or short-term perspective for the planning process might make it more difficult to recruit community leaders, and to build on the good will, creativity and effective capacity generated through partnerships. Certainly, many of the deeper gains to be made through LIP processes would be jeopardized by a perspective that is so narrow or short-term that it limits the focus to producing a report rather than a

living action plan. Yet, community leaders seeking to capitalize on the full potential of the LIP expressed concern that they are taking a risk by ‘selling’ a longer-term initiative without certainty from a funding and policy perspective.

A particular perspective on the permanence of the LIP initiative might also influence how relative weights were placed on outlining ambitious priorities versus practical ones. Ambitious priorities would be those needing more substantial resources or partnership capacity. There would be a greater tendency to include these in the strategic plan if LIP members understood their work as quite long-term in nature. Another variable here may be related to evaluation. One LIP leader expressed concern with having a long list of ambitious priorities, fearing that this could then serve as a demanding baseline for subsequent evaluation. A more practical or pragmatic approach would tend to emphasize less ambitious priorities, needing fewer resources or collaborations, and/or a more narrow range of priorities, perhaps aligned closely with existing CIC funded programs. For example, the leader of the Thunder Bay LIP was clear in saying that they were being very realistic about what they felt they could accomplish given their funding. “Realistic goals were set based on funding that we now have.”

Of course, these perspectives are being framed here as discrete and oppositional for analytical purposes. In reality, they book-end a spectrum of possibilities and strategic approaches. Most LIP leaders fall somewhere within this spectrum, with choices and decisions related to leadership views on the nature of their role, the longevity of the LIP, and the resources made available. Such leadership perspectives help explain the variation in the extent to which strategic plans include more practical or ambitious priorities.

Variation in strategic plan priorities can also be understood in relation to the different types of outcomes that a particular LIP may seek. Three such outcomes are prominent: those related to service delivery improvements, those related to broader partnership building within and across immigration and other policy sectors, and those related to capacity building to address settlement and integration challenges. Recalling the earlier discussion of place-based immigration priorities, it stands to reason that there would be some relationship between the LIP context and the types of outcomes favoured. A community focused on service coordination, for example, would place less effort in the area of building multi-sectoral partnerships and even less so in the area of creating new services. As we have discussed, these contextual realities shape council membership and, in turn, influence the substance of strategic plans and priorities. Council membership and the structure of working groups might have direct bearing on the kinds of outcomes outlined, and this is an area needing further research as LIPs move from strategic planning to implementation.

Key Lessons:

- There is variation in Strategic Plans along the following lines: degree to

which they are ambitious (longer term and extensive partnerships) or pragmatic (short term and tied more to existing practices); and nature of key outcome envisioned: service improvement; partnership-building; capacity-building.

- All Strategic Plans include each of these dimensions but the relative weighting varies based on the nature of the community and its particular immigration challenges and on leadership perceptions about their roles and the longevity and resources of the LIP

TRANSITION 3: STRATEGIC PLAN TO IMPLEMENTATION

Our discussions in the six case studies ended at a moment when the communities were just beginning to think about implementation. Concrete decisions had not yet been made about priorities. Councils were tasked with gathering data and researching the needs of their respective communities during the developmental and planning stages, but now grappled with how to translate this knowledge into action. As such, our discussions focused on the processes of decision-making and gaining a better appreciation of the tensions and challenges faced by LIP leaders as moved into this phase of activity.

In fact, LIP leaders expressed some confusion about the appropriate role of the LIP once the strategic plan was drafted and the process moved to implementation. There was clarity on the notion that LIP Councils should drive implementation, but very little consensus in terms of how this role might evolve, how far Council should go in terms of implementation planning, and whether the Council itself might need renewal to meet the changing objectives (from planning to action).

Should the Council simply outline a goal and leave it to the community to define specific directions? Or should the Council be more ‘hands on’ in detailing action items and then seeking an appropriate community champion to lead? Simply put, should Council members be moving beyond the “what” questions to those of “who” and “how?” And how much control should Council seek to have over final outcomes? Once again, discussion pointed to large variation across the LIPs in terms of Council roles, with some communities envisaging a more enabling role and others a more directive one.

For those LIP communities considering a more directive role, a host of secondary questions follow, having to do with how best to move in this direction. How might the Council actually facilitate implementation and direct the various players? Should it nudge those in the community who it feels are best positioned or equipped to lead on specific action items? Should such questions of roles and responsibilities in implementation go back out to the broader community where different groups might step forward? There are risks with such an approach – on the one hand, no one might take the lead, perhaps calling into question the relevance of the LIPs’ strategic priorities; on the other hand, several groups may come forward, raising tricky issues of coordination and ownership. In short, the transition to implementation is not straightforward and LIP leaders are addressing important questions such as whether the Council should develop a working

group or some sort of bridging mechanism between planning and action to mobilize behind priority initiatives.

There are a number of cross-pressures at play in the implementation stage. LIP leaders are juggling to meet the objectives set out by the funder, the contract holder, the Council and the community itself. While these objectives may broadly converge in the baseline goal of improving outcomes for all newcomers, there remain differences in priorities and approaches. For example, the CIC contract outlined certain expectations around LIP structure, process, and planning, but CIC also recognizes the value of community-driven, bottom-up approaches. Moreover, as the Partnership Councils evolved and worked through new relationships, they began to envision a more dynamic and flexible role responding as much to community aspirations as to funder mandates. Contribution agreements are seen to be fairly top-down while partnership building emerges from the bottom up. The implementation phase of the LIPs brings into focus the creative tension between these two equally legitimate orientations. The value of a social innovation arises from the way in which the different actors manage this tension to deliver improved services and supports to the key stakeholder, in this case immigrants themselves.

A further challenge arises around implementation decision-making and whether this should rest with the Council or with some sort of steering committee or management group. In reality, Council meets at best, eight times per year, bringing to the fore questions about what their role can realistically be in the face of an initiative which is propelled by an evolving process of partnership-building and continuous learning.

Indeed, another key learning relates to the ongoing nature of partnership-building and community engagement through the LIPs as they transition from formal planning to implementation. LIP leaders were unanimous in their expressions of the central role that these processes play in sustaining momentum. LIPs leaders underscored the importance of involving the community in helping to prioritize strategic plans, identify emerging data gaps, further refine knowledge of barriers and opportunities, and ensure broad support for implementation of specific projects. Among our case studies, the LIPs where implementation is the most advanced, such as in Peel, the transition from planning looks very much like a process of fine-tuning through relationship-building, knowledge-exchange, and community-outreach. Town halls, community forums, and task groups are often important mechanisms. The central message here is that the process supporting good strategic planning is also highly relevant to effective implementation. The two stages are in fact more iterative, organic, and linked than a policy and funding framework can capture. In these terms, LIP leaders expressed strong concern about the lack of assured funding support once they moved beyond drafting a strategic plan. Such formal or tidy divisions between planning and implementation appear to quite artificial and unproductive when viewed from the perspective of the community and those tasked with translating visions or plans into concrete program or service improvements.

Key Lessons:

- Notable variation in Council implementation roles and leadership styles from “enabling” to “directive.”
- Recognition that the existing Council may be limited in its implementation capacity and that new working groups or leadership teams may be needed to manage the transition from planning to action.
- The ongoing importance of partnership-building, knowledge exchange, and community outreach as LIP leaders and partners continue to refine plans and priorities through implementation. Implementation involves the LIPs ‘learning by doing’.
- Tensions arising from what is perceived at the local level as an artificial gap between planning and implementation, leading to uncertainty about roles, responsibilities, and capacities.
- Cross-pressures on LIP leaders as they manage the varying objectives and expectations of different stakeholders.

TRANSITION 4: IMPLEMENTATION ACTION TO EVALUATION/LEARNING

The Need for Comprehensive Outcomes

While most of the LIP Councils involved in this research study had not yet considered issues related to monitoring and evaluation, it was clear from discussions that these matters weighed heavily on the minds of LIP leaders. Our discussions on this policy phase revealed concern about how to properly assess progress and what kinds of evaluation frameworks were appropriate to collaborative, community-driven policy initiatives.

What type of evaluation framework would best capture the gains made by these LIP initiatives? A number of possibilities were suggested. Community outcome indicators might be valuable in tracking place-specific progress, but it was also noted that they do not always capture the value of the ongoing learnings generated through the LIPs about building partnerships and deepening knowledge of immigrant challenges. At the same time, there was recognition that while service outcome indicators may be relevant, they also fall short of capturing the full complexity of the LIP processes. While not denying the importance of such ‘hard’ measures, many LIPs leaders expressed a desire to develop more holistic frameworks that could capture the intangible benefits and also acknowledge the longer term and complex nature of policy making through community-driven collaborations.

Process-related outcomes – arising from partnership synergies and social capital - were deemed to be especially significant by many of the LIP leaders in this study. In some

communities, LIP funding has meant that immigration has received positive media coverage and is now a relevant discussion in the community. Moreover, such outcomes arising from relational synergies emerge at different stages in the institutional life-cycle. For example, during the strategic planning stages, partners may work together to launch public education brochures, convene public assemblies and open houses about their joint work, or the Mayor or other members of local government, taking note of the energy and commitment generated through the LIP, may choose to advance an immigration platform; Indeed, these are all examples of outcomes beneficial to all newcomers emerging during planning stages well before implementation is formally underway. In all of these ways, the LIP process has helped mobilize leadership commitment and focus on immigration issues across sectors and institutions hitherto not engaged with such matters.

How can these types of “soft” or qualitative outcomes be adequately incorporated into evaluative frameworks? Their value rests in the supportive community context they nurture and create for more focused and multi-faceted supports for immigrants. “Hard” evidence of their benefits will only materialize over the longer term and often in quite indirect ways as mainstream institutions and organizations learn to adapt their attitudes and practices to become more welcoming of diversity. Here, a number of examples were cited of Council members translating particular action items as outlined in the strategic plan into their own organizational objectives. In fact, such inter-organizational learning offers a quite concrete or tangible demonstration of the value of collaborative relationships; evaluation frameworks applied to the LIPs should be attuned to these dynamics and acknowledge the outcomes.

In sum, with collaborative governance convening, planning, and implementation often overlap and feed into one another. Synergies lead to outcomes being realized at different stages. Outcomes in planning strengthen possibilities for effective implementation of often unanticipated or unintended goals.

How then can an evaluation framework best capture these relational dynamics that play out over time and produce indirect benefits that nonetheless constitute valuable outcomes for immigrants, host communities, and policy makers? Of course, our discussions did not set out to answer this large question. Rather, they illustrated its complexity and the need for all collaborative partners to think about outcomes in a more comprehensive and nuanced manner.

Finally, our discussions also pointed to the need for evaluation to consider again the importance of place – both as integration context and in terms of community scale. An effective evaluation framework cannot be ‘one size fits all’. Instead, templates should be sensitive to the particular dynamics of immigrant settlement and integration in each of our three types of LIP communities. If contextual realities lead to different types of Council structures and planning processes, then it goes without saying that outcomes and evaluation may also differ. If for example, the plan’s action items are predominantly about service coordination rather than capacity building, then evaluating its implementation will need to focus on these elements. Scale is also of relevance to evaluating outcomes. A key distinction is between the neighbourhood and the

municipality/county. At the neighbourhood level in Toronto, for example, “success” may mean that the newcomer will leave for another community with the mobility due in large part to the quality of the services and supports provided in the original neighbourhood. Some Toronto neighbourhoods act as landing places rather than settling places for newcomers, so measuring success needs to take into account this movement.

Key Learnings:

- Need for evaluation frameworks to consider “comprehensive outcomes.”
- Comprehensive outcomes include softer gains stemming from relational synergies as well as outcomes realized at different stages across the institutional life-cycle.
- Evaluation is also dependent on place-context and scale.

PART 3: MOVING FORWARD AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In 2011, thirty four LIPs are ‘up and running’ in all regions of Ontario. Recently, nine more have been approved, and so the LIPs now encompass Ontario’s big cities and their suburban belts, smaller cities, and rural communities. As our analysis makes clear, they have already made an impact on local settlement and integration issues across the province. Their start-up activities and early successes have not gone unnoticed. Academic observers (Seidle, 2010; Siemetickya, 2010) as well an expert OECD panel have commented favourably on this social innovation. Beyond CIC, government attention and interest is also encouraging. In its recommendations to Cabinet, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration stated:

The Committee believes LIPs have great potential. They could bring together diverse parties who might not otherwise collaborate on immigrant settlement initiatives. The LIPs provide a vehicle to move collaboration beyond their original purpose, as envisioned by one witness: “If you broaden the Local Immigration Partnership Council across the province, for example in Ontario, they can look at these other aspects of settlement: mental health and all the other aspects, not just job search and language”. Accordingly, the Committee encourages CIC to continue supporting the development of this approach in Ontario and to explore the potential of pilot projects in other interested provinces (Standing Committee, 2010).

In its response to the committee, the government was explicit in its support:

The Government agrees with this recommendation and remains committed to supporting LIPs and its 34 initiatives throughout Ontario. In addition, the principles of the LIPs are in line with government priorities in the *Speech from the*

Throne, namely that GOC will take steps to support communities in their efforts to tackle local challenges by involving various players to partner on new approaches to address regional challenges that bring together communities across Canada. LIPs are the best example of existing projects that foster partnerships ... The lessons learned from LIPs in Ontario ... will help to shape future engagement in this area and forge new innovative partnerships with municipalities, businesses, the health sector, schools and libraries. Some LIPs' efforts have also involved examining needs of immigrants and refugees in order to render mainstream services more responsive (Government of Canada, 2010).

Clearly, the LIPs have momentum as a promising governance experiment and policy innovation well-suited to the current dynamics of immigrant settlement and integration. With CIC, they are putting into practice key principles of the new public governance such as relational leadership, shared accountability, and blended knowledge. They may well represent a creative pathway to 'renewing Canadian multiculturalism from below' (see Annex A).

This report has analyzed the LIPs work through a place-based policy lens, and through a dynamic tracking of activities at key transition points in their start-up work. With this dual focus on place and transitions, we have underscored the importance of local leadership, community engagement, and deft policy support from governments. More broadly, we situated the LIPs in leading-edge academic research into new forms of public governance that stress the value of multi-sectoral and inter-governmental collaboration. A key lesson moving forward for both governments and community-based actors is to strike the optimal balance between top-down policy steering and bottom-up creativity in planning and implementation. As this balance is struck, it will also be important to consider different evaluation frameworks that capture the complexity and longer-term nature of change processes and outcomes generated through the LIPs.

In this spirit, we close with several key recommendations that flow from our study of the LIPs and that we believe will strengthen and help institutionalize this worthwhile social innovation.

- *Creation of an inter-LIP knowledge transfer/policy learning platform or mechanism.* Across the province, individual LIPs are generating a wealth of knowledge – both formal and tacit – about how best to design and deliver community-based collaborative policy. These insights and practices need to be aggregated and shared widely to ensure that different local networks reach their full potential based on the best available evidence and understandings of what works.
- *Capacity-building support both for community-based partners in leading local planning and implementation, and for civil servants in facilitating bottom-up policy development processes.* Striking the balance between top-down steering and bottom-up priorities is not easy, and experience elsewhere – for example, in the United Kingdom with centrally-mandated local strategic partnerships –

suggests the value of structured learning opportunities and supports in building the appropriate skill sets.

- *Creation of a multi-partite Funders Table that would provide a one-stop access point for LIPs project implementation.* A key challenge for the long term viability of the LIPs is securing funding and policy partnerships across levels of government and among private organizations and granting agencies. A table or mechanism that would streamline the process and create appropriate pathways for LIP leaders would be valuable.
- *Consultation and dialogue among communities and governments (and other service funders) about appropriate assessment tools and evaluation frameworks to guide the work of the LIPs.* Existing evaluation frameworks need to be adapted or revised to capture the range of outcomes generated through community-based collaborations. New research on “developmental evaluation” may be instructive here (Quinn Patten, 2010).
- *Consultation and dialogue among communities and governments about the long term future of the LIPs – is there a solid public policy rationale for supporting such a local immigration planning/mobilizing entity on a more permanent basis?* Given the early successes of the LIPs there is a need for clarity about longer term policy plans. Uncertainty about the institutional future has made it challenging for LIP leaders to build the broad-based momentum required to implement plans that require new community and governmental partnerships.

REFERENCES

- Banting, K. "Is There a Progressive's Dilemma in Canada? Immigration, Multiculturalism and the Welfare State". Presidential Address delivered to Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Montreal, June 2, 2010.
- Biles, J., M. Burstein and J. Frideres, eds. *Immigration and Integration in Canada in the twenty-first century*. Kingston: Metropolis, 2008.
- Booher D. and J. Innes. "Network Power in Collaborative Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21 (3): 221-236.
- Bradford, N. "Canadian Social Policy in the 2000s: Bringing Place In." *Plan Canada* (Special Edition, Welcoming Communities: Planning for Diverse Populations), 2009.
- Bradford, N. and C. Andrew. "The Federal Immigration Agenda: Continuity and Change" in B. Doern and C. Stoney, eds., *How Ottawa Spends 2011*. Kingston: McGill-Queens.
- Bradford, N. "Public Policy in Canada: Bringing Place In?" in S. Chisholm, ed., *Investing in Better Places: International Perspectives*. London: The Smith Institute.
- CIC. Citizenship and Immigration Canada. "Call for Proposals: Local Immigration Partnership Councils". Ottawa: 2010.
- External Advisory Committee to Prime Minister on Cities and Committees (EACCC). *From Restless Communities to Resilient Places*. Ottawa: 2006
- Gertler, M. "Tacit Knowledge and the economic geography of context, or The undefinable tacitness of being (there)." *Journal of Economic Geography*, 3 (1): 75-99, 2003.
- Government of Canada. Response to Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration. "Best Practices in Settlement Services", 2010.
- Gross Stein, J. "Canada by Mondrian: Networked Federalism in an Era of Globalization." Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada, 2007.
- Healey, P. *Making Better Places: The Planning Project in the 21st Century*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- OECD. *Building Competitive Regions: Strategies and Governance*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 2010.

OECD. *OECD Territorial Reviews: Toronto, Canada*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2010.

Osborne, S. *The New Public Governance*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Public Policy Forum. “Collaborative Governance and Changing Federal Roles.” A PPF and PRI Joint Roundtable Outcome Report. Ottawa: 2008.

Quinn Patton, M. *Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use*. Guilford Press, 2010.

Richmond, T. and R. Omvidar. “Immigrant Settlement and Social Inclusion in Canada”. Laidlaw Foundation, 2003.

Rimok, P. and R. Rouzier. “Integration Policies in Quebec: A Need to Expand the Structures”? in J. Biles et al., eds., *Immigration and Integration in Canada in the Twenty-first Century*. Kingston: Metropolis, 2008.

Sandercock, L. “Sustaining Canada’s Multicultural Cities: Learning from the Local”. Canadian Federation for Humanities and Social Sciences, 2004.

Seidle, L. “The Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement: Assessment and Options for Renewal”. Mowat Centre for Policy Innovation, 2010.

Siemiatycki, M. and T. Triadafilopoulos. “International Perspectives on Immigrant Service Provision”. Mowat Centre for Policy Innovation, 2010.

Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration. “Best Practices in Settlement Services.” House of Commons, 2010.

Statistic Canada. *Community Profiles*, 2006.

Stren, R. “Diversity: A Challenge to Urban Governance.” Paper presented at American Political Science Association Annual Meetings, Toronto September 2009.

Torjman, S. *Shared Space: The Communities Agenda*. Ottawa: Renouf, 2007.



Ontario's Local Immigration Partnership Councils: Renewing Multiculturalism from Below?

Neil Bradford, Department of Political Science
Huron University of College
November 2010



Presentation Themes

- *Diversity Ideas in Transition:
Challenge and Change in Multiculturalism*
- *Diversity Ideas Going Local:
Federal Devolution in Immigration Policy*
- *Diversity Ideas in Practice:
Reporting from the LIP front lines*



Note: the fourth in a series of related MER talks this fall ...

This presentation builds-off the three previous talks this fall on various aspects of 'managing Canadian diversity'

1. **L. Tossuti: ideas/theories of multiculturalism**
2. **D. Tunis: policy/governance of immigrant settlement**
3. **H. Hussein: practice/partnerships in communities**

Try to bring these different levels/foci of analysis together ...



Part 1

Diversity Ideas in Transition: Challenge and Change in Canadian Multiculturalism



Canada's Diversity Model: The Multicultural Pillar

- **1970s-1980s Canada institutionalized a "Diversity Model" with multiculturalism one key policy pillar (Jenson and Papillon, 2001)**
- **Trudeau-Mulroney multicultural nation-building expressed in policy, programs, legislation, constitution (Quebec opt-out)**
- **In Practice? Openness to immigration with newcomer integration through combination of timely settlement services reinforced by industrial economy and Keynesian welfare state**
- **View multiculturalism as *conceptual bridge* between immigration policy and settlement/integration programming (note: Department of CIC *and* Multiculturalism today)**
- **A "national policy success": immigrant mobility, public support, international recognition (Banting et al. 2010)**



Challenge and Change: 1990s and 2000s

- **Changing composition of newcomers = complex, specialized needs**
- **Industrial restructuring/economic recession hollow out manufacturing sector (entry level employment less available)**
- **Keynesian welfare state rationalized making longer term integration more problematic (services less available)**
- **Unemployment/underemployment/poverty for recent immigrants**
- **Concentration of race and poverty and "Poverty by Postal Code" in large cities; smaller places go without benefits of immigration**
- **Fraying bonds of community as "shared spaces and two-way streets" not as vital as once assumed**
- **Front line settlement sector stretched thin and mainstream community organizations insufficiently engaged**



Challenge and Change ...

Hard questions arise about the multicultural pillar of Canadian Diversity Model ...

1. **address complex, evolving conditions "on the ground" faced by different newcomers (too top-down)?**
2. **bridge short term settlement with long term societal integration (too time-limited)?**
3. **reinforce support for cultural diversity with economic opportunity (too siloed)?**
4. **balance recognition of difference with cohesion of society (too fragmenting)?**

CIC's Deborah Tunis, October 19 2010 UWO talk:

"Multiculturalism a successful policy but it's an evolution and we can't be trapped in the 1970s"



PART 2

***Diversity Ideas Going Local:
Federal Devolution in
Immigration Policy***



A Diversity Model in Transition

Federal governments in 1990s and 2000s respond with two shifts in the national multicultural framework:

- **selection/settlement policy devolution to the provinces (Manitoba, British Columbia), municipalities, and community-based organizations (Ontario)**
- **greater emphasis in programs and strategies on anti-racism, promotion of cross-cultural understanding, and supporting involvement of ethnic, religious, cultural communities in public decision making processes**

Scholarly and settlement communities assess the challenges to the Diversity Model and federal shifts

Broad support for the second (anti-racism, cross-cultural, civic engagement) but the first (devolution) controversial



Debates and Controversies

Scholarly literature identifies four federal motivations/drivers

1. **Fiscal:** federal deficit and program review lead to off-loading (Richmond, Laforest)
2. **Ideological/Partisan:** decentralize social policy in global era and 'new deal' for cities (Shields and Evans, Leo)
3. **New Multicultural Policy Knowledge:** 'three stages' of settling, integrating, belonging (Mwarigha, Omvidar)
4. **New Multicultural Conceptual Framework:** inter-cultural communities and localized bridging social capital (Parekh, Landry)



Multiculturalism and Devolution: Three Frameworks for Analysis

1. New Localism: Bottom-up Innovation

Optimistic Devolvers (focus on factors 3 and 4 on previous slide)

- beyond top down, centralized bureaucracy, local engagement for new ideas and community-based leadership (Stren and Polese)
- create local settlement service and civic networks for participatory planning and policy (Sandercock)
- B. Parekh "*Decentralization of power has a particularly important role to play in ensuring justice in multicultural societies. It is easier for local and regional bodies to accommodate differences than it is for the central government, because the adjustment required is more readily identified, limited in scale, not too costly and generally free from the glare of publicity.*" (*Rethinking Multiculturalism*, 2006: 212)



Three Frameworks ...

2. Neo-liberalism: Top-down Regulation

Pessimistic Devolvers (focus on factors 1 and 2 on previous slide)

- off- loading state responsibilities to local actors through rigid contractualism that compromises settlement sector and integration processes
- need to "scale-up" policy to address systemic problems: service underfunding, restrictive eligibility, sector capacity (Keil, Brenner)
- Tom Kent "Immigration to Canada is in chaos. The federal government's response to the problems has been to shuffle much of the responsibility to provincial governments and to employers for ostensibly temporary work. In the resulting confusion, the national purpose for immigration is lost. Some easements, such as better settlement services and language upgrading, are widely urged but little is done. At best, they are only band-aids. Fundamental changes are needed." (*Immigration: For Young Citizens*, 2010: 1)



Kymlicka: Shifting the Debate

Third framework takes its cue from Will Kymlicka: "multicultural states" require "intercultural citizens" to flourish (citizens who support multicultural policies that recognize and accommodate difference)

Kymlicka's concern: a growing gap between the multicultural state and intercultural citizens: "progress at state level not been matched in lived experience of inter-group relations"

Three ideas:

1. Citizens must *learn and practice* their intercultural skills through ongoing dialogue and interaction
2. Local hybrid spaces for joint problem solving between "celebrating food and festivals" and "reconciling deep differences"
3. Feedback loops from local interculturalism to multicultural state

Kymlicka effectively reframes the Canadian multicultural policy debate beyond polarized 'new localism v. neo-liberalism' to formation of *local hybrid institutions*



Third Framework: New Institutional Hybrids

- Kymlicka is a philosopher -- doesn't delve into design and strategy questions
- From the public administration/organizational design literature we can propose three central features of such new institutional hybrids
 1. Interest Representation: *Partnership* (OECD, 2001) 'networks of area-based partnerships'
 2. Institutional Design: *Metagovernance* (Jessop, 2004; Peters, 2010) 'not just government or governance'
 3. Policy Strategy: *Mainstreaming* (Torjman, 2007) 'not just devolution or subsidiarity'



New Institutional Hybrids

- **Metagovernance?**

“Steering Networks at a Distance”: local autonomy within national parameters

Tasks: mandate representation; set goals; build capacity; supply incentives; shared accountability

- **Mainstreaming?**

“Learning from the local”: local innovations into ‘core’ activities (Smith et al., 2007)

Types:

1. **Systemic change** (policy design eg. settlement linked to housing or health)
2. **Programmatic** (service delivery eg. one stop shopping or settlement service eligibility)
3. **Organizational** (planning priorities eg. municipal agencies or corporate mentorships)



PART 3

*Diversity Ideas in Practice:
Reporting from the LIP front
lines*



LIPs as institutional hybrid

A variety of cross-fertilizations:

1. **Federal Metagovernance *and* Local Action-Planning**
2. **Municipal *and* Community 'co-production'**
3. **Newcomer Representation *and* Mainstream Organizations**
4. **Community of Place *and* Communities of Interest/Identity**
5. **Economic Development *and* Social Inclusion**
6. **Multicultural state *and* intercultural citizens**
7. **Community Action *and* Community Research (WCI relationship: SSHRC and CIC)**
8. **Tacit knowledge *and* Public Discourse**



Other relevant hybrids?

Many examples from EU, but Canadian federal government not without its own history:

1. Neighbourhood Renewal (ANC, NIP 1970s)
2. Rural Development (CFDCs 1980s)
3. Urban Poverty (UDAs, VCs, UAS 1990s)
4. Homelessness (SCPI/CHP 2000s)

CIC can learn from these examples

Bradford (forthcoming) "The Federal Communities Agenda: Metagovernance for Place-based Policy"



A New role for Federal Government?

- COIA emerges in 2005 (NDCC, Harcourt Report)

"It is time for a profound transformation in the federal government's role from being prescriptive, controlling and sectoral to becoming enabling, deft and integrated – and, where relevant, place-based"

"The federal government should serve as a leader in ideas and as a convenor and facilitator, bringing people, governments and institutions together to help design solutions to be chosen and applied locally".

"It can offer national resources to convene those closer to communities, facilitate their dialogue and cooperation, and enable solutions through regulatory change and funding"

- (Harcourt Report, 2006: 21, 22, 29)



LIPs: The Roll-Out

- 2008 CIC call for proposals, 2010 34 LIPs across Ontario

CIC Purposes and Parameters:

"LIPs will provide a collaborative framework for, and facilitate the development and implementation of, sustainable local and regional solutions for successful integration of immigrants to Ontario."

CIC CFP identifies four specific objectives and outcomes:

1. **Improve access to, and coordination of, effective services**
2. **Improve access to the labour market**
3. **Strengthen local and regional awareness and capacity to integrate**
4. **Establish or enhance partnerships and participation of multiple stakeholders in planning, and coordinating delivery of integration services of both CIC and MCI**



LIPs: The Roll-Out

CIC funding:

1. Establish partnership council that must include wide stakeholders including municipal/regional government, community organizations, settlement agencies employers; council will develop strategic settlement/integration plan including performance measures and evaluation
2. Support partnership council to coordinate implementation of plan (but not specific projects unless in CIC mandate)

Three-step process:

1. Establish partnership council/terms of reference
2. Conduct research and establish local settlement strategy to be implemented over 3 years
3. Develop annual action plan and report progress



Great expectations ...

- Standing Committee March 2010:
"The Committee believes LIPs have great potential. They could bring together diverse parties who might not otherwise collaborate on immigrant settlement. The LIPs provide a vehicle to move collaboration beyond their original purpose".
- Government response September 2010:
"The principles of the LIPs are in line with government priorities in the Speech from the Throne, namely that the GOC will take steps to support communities in their efforts to tackle local challenges.. LIPS are the best example of existing projects that foster partnerships ... LIPs' efforts have also involved examining needs of immigrants and refugees in order to render mainstream services more responsive".
- LIPs as the key legacy from first COIA (*context of 2006 settlement funding increase but limited program uptake or evidence of better outcomes*)



LIPs study (March 2011)

Our research approach -- 4 person team through WCI with CIC funding support

1. **LIP document analysis (CIC CFPs, council formation, strategic plans, workplans)**
2. **May 2010 meeting of LIP representatives and policy makers from across province for dialogue on initial progress**
3. **Fall 2010 series of four semi-structured iterative interviews with key informant from 6 LIPs across provincial regions: Toronto, GTA, Central/Eastern/Northern Ontario, and rural**
4. **Interview topics: council and partnership formation; strategic planning; workplan implementation; evaluation and learning**
5. **Our expectation: "Unique local configurations of common elements"**



Report from the Field: Council and Partnership formation

- **Variation in scale and leadership: Toronto: neighbourhood/settlement sector lead; GTA and beyond: municipal or regional scale/government and mainstream organization lead (eg. United Way, EDC)**
- **Prior history of collaboration important factor in LIP council formation (trust and capacity and leadership)**
- **General structure features 3 bodies: Steering Committee, Governing Council, Sectoral Working Groups**
- **Broad range of stakeholders engaged everywhere and new partnerships eg. school boards, health, and police 'at the table'**
- **Rural communities mobilizing capacity-building partnerships (eg. Huron LIP with London SPOs and Guelph university researchers)**



Report from the Field: Strategic Planning

- **Variation in overall focus: Toronto: better settlement via coordination of many existing agencies; GTA and beyond: more attraction via filling gaps (second tier cities) or creating services (rural/north)**
- **Common operational priorities: employment, language, settlement, housing, health, justice, participation**
- **Public engagement: community fora, focus groups, culturally-appropriate community animators, surveys ("tacit knowledge")**
- **Plans as 'laundry lists' (eg. 100 items): need to identify early 'hits' (variation across LIPs but not big money initiatives)**
- **'Mainstreaming': eg. access to services; links to health and housing; shift corporate priorities in public and private organizations (one LIP has committee on 'Systemic Change')**
- **Vision of LIPs: not about "eliminating service duplication"; instead about community-driven "social innovation"**



Report from the Field: Implementation

- **LIPs cannot survive as "all research and talk, no action"**
- **Implementation stage challenges: selecting the projects; securing funding; mobilizing the 'doers'**
- **Some strategies: new Council Terms of Reference; recruit project champions; community 'declaration of intent' sign-ups; create 'funders table'**
- **Initiate 3 year "Planning-Implementation-Evaluation-Adaptation Cycle" across settlement-integration continuum**
- **LIP is not the service deliverer nor the funder but the catalyst, convenor, and coordinator (the "social incubator" model 'spinning out and spinning off' start-ups)**
- **Moving forward? funding challenges key – for strategic plan, for ongoing LIP role, for systemic change (health, housing, employment funding streams with their own criteria)**



Emerging Themes: Social Learning and Knowledge Transfer

- **Most LIP coordinators initially viewed LIPs as temporary bodies, but two years later see as permanent value-adds**
- **Two years of local social capital formation for community capacity**
- **Beyond “clever local experiments” to “provincial community of practice”**
- **Aggregating experience/practices; Sharing knowledge and successes**
- **Applying the EU’s Open Method of Coordination (common template, different pathways, compare results)**



Emerging Themes: CIC Learns to Metagovern?

- **LIPs experiment a major policy learning opportunity for government (CIC officials and the challenges of “letting go” and being both “partner and funder”)**

Challenges arising:

1. **Funding: Availability, and balancing two legitimate goals: community-driven innovation and federal accountability**
1. **Steering: Ensuring consistent messages to LIPs on parameters (eg. what’s planning v. implementation?); establish an inter-governmental “stakeholders table”**
2. **Coordinating: Longer term options for LIP role? (eg. permanent planning arm, OMC best practice network and tools, pilot project vehicle?)**



Conclusion: Key Takeaways on Theory, Practice, Policy

1. **Theory: Renewing Multiculturalism from Below through 'LIPs at work' (New Institutional Hybrid better than New Localism v. Neo-liberalism)**
1. **Local Practice: LIPs at key transition point, moving from Council partnership success to implementation activity (the mainstreaming agenda that demonstrates the value-add)**
2. **Policy Innovation? Governments learning how to work differently, steer at a distance not command and control (the metagoverning agenda that maintains buy-in to transform experiment into innovation)**

Highlights of Analysis of Organizational Structures and Processes

1. Partnership Council Structures

Initial Concern behind LIP Council & Choice of Chair/Co-Chair

Hamilton

Initial Partners: The City of Hamilton

Strategy: Settlement/integration initiative

Co-Chairs: President of Hamilton Chamber of Commerce/CEO of Hamilton Airport, and, Leader in the Arab community/Professor/active in settlement sector -- currently appointed by Consortium Partners (City of Hamilton and 6 representative community organizations)

Kingston

Initial Partners: Kingston Community Health Centre, KEYS Community Employment Centre and the Kingston Economic Development Corporation

Strategy: Settlement/integration and (more recently) local economic development initiative

Chair: Representative from Queens University -- currently appointed by Steering Committee

Thunder Bay

Initial Partners: Thunder Bay Multicultural Association

Strategy: Local economic development initiative (framed as a settlement/integration initiative)

Co-Chairs: Thunder Bay Multicultural Association (Executive Director) and Workforce Planning Board (senior representative) – elected by existing pre-LIP immigration partnership

Huron County

Initial Partners: The County of Huron

Strategy: Local economic development initiative

Chair: County Councilor – there are two County Councilors that sit on the Council and through consensus they appoint one to be Chair.

Peel

Initial Partners: United Way of Peel Region and the Region of Peel

Strategy: Settlement/integration initiative

Co-Chairs: United Way of Peel Region (senior representative) and the Region of Peel (senior representative) appointed pre-LIP Steering Committee working on similar issues

West Toronto

Initial Partners: West Downtown Toronto Settlement Service Planning Project (finished in 2009)

Strategy: Settlement/integration initiative

Chair: Hired a consultant to ‘act’ as Chair for the 3 Neighbourhood Partnership Councils (each representing 7 neighbourhoods): Kensington-Chinatown-Annex Council, Parkdale-Trinity Council, and Bloor-Junction Council

Common Issues Arising During Council Formation

- Tough decisions regarding who to include in limited spaces
- Ensuring the participation of all desired sectors
- Feeling the need to conduct anti-racism and other types of information presentations/sessions
- Defining agreed upon mandate for Council

2. Partnership Council Processes

Number of LIP Council Members & Practices for Adding New Members

	#of Council Members	Interest	Invitation	Mix
Hamilton	16-18		X	
Kingston	12-16	X*		
Thunder Bay	n/a			X
Huron County	2/3staff & 1/3volunteer			X
Peel	n/a		X**	
West Toronto	n/a		X	

* Only KIP member organizations are eligible to be represented at the KIP Council, to become a member, the organization must sign a letter of membership, outlining the organization’s support for the KIP.

** A Selections Committee will decide who will sit on Council.

Objectives/Strategic Priorities of LIP Council

Hamilton

- 1) Building collective and collaborative leadership in pursuit of Hamilton’s immigration vision
- 2) Strengthening the delivery of immigrant and refugee settlement services
- 3) Creating a welcoming community and thereby the conditions that encourages immigrants to both settle and stay in Hamilton
- 4) Creating and disseminating foundational knowledge of immigration and immigrants in Hamilton

Kingston

- 1) Understand, articulate and promote the role of immigrants in improving social and economic outcomes for Kingston.
- 2) Engage the Kingston community in the attraction, welcoming, inclusion, and integration of immigrants.
- 3) Strengthen community cooperation and collaboration to better support and improve settlement outcomes for immigrant newcomers.
- 4) Serve as a platform for communication, planning, and evaluation among community organizations, public institutions, and businesses, in pursuit of the Council's mandate.
- 5) Coordinate the implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and revision of the KIP Strategic Action Plan.

Thunder Bay

- 1) Identify and attract immigrants by
 - a) Identifying the target source countries
 - b) Identifying the skills needed
 - c) Developing and implementing a marketing strategy to promote the community to potential immigrants
 - d) Reducing barriers to entry
- 2) Foster a welcoming, supportive, and inclusive community through education, promotion, and participation
- 3) Ensure that coordination services are available to fulfill newcomers' needs

Huron County

- 1) To develop a long term settlement and labour market strategy.
- 2) To collaborate to enhance/build upon existing language instruction and labour market integration services.
- 3) To create awareness and promote inclusion.

Peel

- 1) To facilitate the development of a coordinated settlement services model that builds on existing services.
- 2) To work with local stakeholders, including municipalities and governments in the process of developing this new model.
- 3) To identify best practices and incorporate them into the service delivery system.

West Toronto

- 1) To improve the social and economic integration outcomes of vulnerable newcomer populations through the creation and implementation of three neighbourhood settlement strategies and workplans;
- 2) To involve newcomers, settlement service organizations, employers and other neighbourhood stakeholders in the processes to create three Councils & three neighbourhood settlement strategies; and
- 3) To create and implement detailed workplans and new pilot initiatives in the areas of service coordination and mentoring in all three neighbourhoods in a process that is linked and complementary.

“Vision”

Hamilton

“Hamilton is an inclusive community where the talents and experience that immigrants and refugees bring are valued because they are integral to making Hamilton the best place to raise a child.”

Kingston

“Our mandate is to provide leadership to the Kingston community in its efforts to attract, welcome, include and integrate immigrants; to build a continually improving community response to the needs of new Canadians; and to generate a welcoming and inclusive approach to newcomers in the broader community.”

Thunder Bay

“Thunder Bay and the region will be a culturally diverse and welcoming community, a destination of choice for immigrants who will contribute to, and benefit from, both social and economic development.”

Huron County

“By establishing the Partnership Council, to plan and coordinate the delivery of integration services, Huron County is ensuring its future.”

Peel

“The successful inclusion of all newcomers into all aspects of the community that embraces everyone’s contribution and ensures well-being for all.”

West Toronto

“Our vision is for the development of a neighbourhood in which all newcomers regardless of their immigration status are thriving, successful and fully engaged in their local community and can effectively navigate the service delivery system, including access to housing, education, employment, health services, and full social and civic inclusion.”

Practices for Ensuring the Continued Engagement of Partners

- Keep Council at a manageable size so all voices and issues are heard and addressed
- Using working groups/subcommittees to connect partners to their areas of expertise
- Providing per diems for members associated with community-based groups (volunteers)
- Requesting signed letters of intent or declarations of intent for membership

LIP Council Consultation Practices

	Public Consultations				Private Consultations			
	Focus Groups	Interviews	Surveys	Town Hall/ Assembly	Working Group	Consultants	Local 'Experts'	Outside 'Experts'
Hamilton	X		X	X			X	X
Kingston	X	X		X	X		X	
Thunder Bay				X	X		X	
Huron County			X*	X	X		X	X
Peel				X	X		X	
West Toronto	X	X		X	X	X(extensive)	X	X

*proposed

Self-Assessment and Feedback Practices

- No clear guidelines on how to assess – many imply they will deal with it when they get to the implementation stage
- Ambiguity – What are they trying to monitor? What is ‘success’? How to capture funding/money value for community/social value?
- Endorsement of local governing body seen as a positive indicator
- Some see increase in immigrants as indicator of success (northern/county LIPs)
- Some see increase in collaborative service provision as indicator of success (GTA)
- Idea that constant ‘informal’ evaluation is occurring

3. Leadership

Public Persona of the LIP Council: The ‘Main Message’

Hamilton: Planning/leadership – “The Partnership Council will provide strategic leadership to the development of the Collaborative Immigration Strategy” and “More detailed strategic actions are to be created by community partners including the municipal government, community institutions and organizations, both profit and not-for-profit, as well as community based groups”

Kingston: Planning/leadership – “Provide leadership to the Kingston community in its efforts to attract, welcome, include and integrate immigrants; to build a continually improving community response to the needs of new Canadians, and generate a welcoming and inclusive approach to newcomers in the broader community”.

Thunder Bay: Coordinating services – Provide the coordination of services for fostering a welcoming community which provides the necessary services to attract and retain immigrants.

Huron County: Coordinating services – “The Huron Settlement Partnership Council [will] coordinate the enhancement of community partnerships to increase the participation of multiple stakeholders in the planning and coordination of the delivery of integration services (settlement, language training, labour market integration)”

Peel: Coordinating services – “Peel Newcomer Strategy Group (PNSG) is a new organization designed to develop a coordinated and integrated settlement services model to ensure the successful settlement and integration of immigrants into all aspects of community life in the Region of Peel.”

West Toronto: Coordinating services/specializing services – “We are committed to a seamless ‘Matrix of Services’ for newcomers in downtown west Toronto that supports individual service entry choices, responds to newcomers’ service needs throughout their lifecycle, and is holistic, innovative, and highly accessible.”

4. Immigrant Engagement

Practices of Immigrant Engagement

	Informal Spaces		Formal Spaces
	Consultation (Public Forum)	Working Group/ Subcommittee	Council
Hamilton	X (many)		
Kingston	X (many)	X	
Thunder Bay	X (little)		
Huron County	X (little)		
Peel	X (pre-LIP)		
West Toronto	X	X	X

5. Other Elements of Synthesis

Identified Funding Priorities

- Sentiments that without initial LIP funding many initiatives, partnerships, etc. would not have occurred
- Hiring staff: organization, scheduling, research, and maintaining momentum , relations with CIC
- Per diems for community-based groups (volunteers): to ensure continued participation from non-organizational members of LIP Council or working groups/subcommittees

- Undertaking research: conducting county/municipal/neighbourhood demographic and agency/organization assessments, conducting and analyzing surveys, focus groups, and interviews, as well as report writing
- Creation and upkeep of Web-site/portal: important aspect of communication both within the LIP as well as with the public and immigrant communities
- Respectability: governmental funding lends credibility to LIP Council and their activities
- To hold inter-LIP conferences/meetings: opportunity for communal discussion

Points of Tension Surrounding the LIP Councils

- Mistrust among partners: continued competition for increasingly limited funds
- Fear of the unknown: continued funding, participation of partners from certain sectors and county/municipal/neighbourhood representatives (changing agendas or the result of elections)
- Perception of LIP Council telling partners what to do
- Sentiments of have to ‘fit in’ their strategies to limited LIP guidelines and/or acceptable CIC fundable initiatives
- Smaller agencies/organizations do not feel adequately represented by ‘lead umbrella’ service provider organizations

Experiences of Implementation

- Resulted in changes to original TOR and Council structure
- Questions about the actual role of Council in managing, monitoring, and advocacy of initiatives
- Confusion as to ‘how’, ‘who’, and ‘when’ involved with the implementation of specific strategies
- Fear of lack of funding to carryout planned activities/strategies
- Reduced momentum from partners (fatigue)
- Unforeseen changes to membership (less senior representatives from some organizations and newly elected governmental actors)

Coordination (within LIP)

- A few ‘leaders’ often control direction and inclusion/adoption of priorities/strategies (often due to small numbers)
- Staff often assume role of main organizer, motivator, task divider, etc.
- Limited use of consultants (West Toronto being the exception)

Coordination (outside LIP)

- Locally: create linkages with other community-based and county/city/neighbourhood initiatives with similar goals
- Inter-LIP conferences/meetings: positive environment conducive for knowledge transfer and the distribution of best practices

- LIP and CIC: varied strength of relationship between LIPs and respective local CIC representative due to issues arising from lack of mutual confidence and perceived engagement and level of importance
- Welcoming Communities: appreciation for research capabilities but some concern regarding their role in the implementation stage and ability to set the priority agenda
- Other: linking LIP strategies and actions with other partnerships and initiatives (e.g. Settlement Services North, anti-racism campaigns, or municipal master plans)

Public Education Practices

- Town hall/public assemblies where through speakers and discussions knowledge is transferred
- Web-site/portal
- Reports/newletters, meetings, and presentations for various departments, service providers, community-based organizations, etc.

Other Interesting Practices

Kingston – mentorship program

Huron County – identified the need for their own settlement provider organization (they don't have one and rely on London's for guidance)

Peel – on-line forum for discussions