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ABSTRACT

Local Immigration Partnerships: A Case Study of Regional Governance of Durham Region, Ontario

Blair Cullen

Introduced as part of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement, Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs) mark a fundamental shift in local settlement policy. To address the gap in knowledge about the implications of this policy change, this thesis research features a case study of Durham Region’s LIP. Objectives were designed to examine the impact of Durham’s LIP by interviewing 52 key-informants within six sectors involved in settlement and integration. Findings indicate an effective application of the LIP policy with participants pointing to the LIP’s vital role in bringing Welcome Centres to Durham, increasing the attention and profile of immigration issues and improving governance relations amongst different sectors in settlement and integration. A product of local circumstances, the LIP has engaged in a quasi-advocacy role educating mainstream service providers and institutions on how to respond to a diversifying population. Results contribute to the relatively under-studied but growing knowledge of the LIP policy while demonstrating that the localization of immigration policy under the appropriate terms can be successful.
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CHAPTER 1
The Future of Localized Immigration Policy: Local Innovative Policy or Limited Initiative Policy

1.1 Durham Region’s Immigrant Settlement Story

This thesis, about the next step in localized immigration policy, particularly as it relates to governance and regionalization, starts with the story of Durham Region. Located 50km east of Toronto, Durham Region has traditionally not been a popular immigrant settlement destination. Some informed observers may call it a stretch to classify Durham as an active settlement destination (Di Biase & Bauder 2005). A mix of urban and rural municipalities, Durham has a reputation as a bedroom community. Sitting between Toronto to the west and the cottage country communities and smaller urban centres of Peterborough County and the City of Kawartha Lakes to the east and north, it is often a transition zone not a settlement destination. As an outer region of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), Durham’s foreign-born population has hovered around a fifth for the past decade (Earle 2008). Often included in the GTA conversation about immigration, Durham does not have the history of Peel Region’s immigration (Stasiulis et al. 2011), has not experienced the magnitude of the recent influx of newcomers to York Region (York LIP 2012) nor does it share anything resembling the size of Toronto’s foreign-born population (Good 2009). Although an important part of continuing population growth, the number of newcomers in Durham compares more favourably to that of a mid-size city than as part of the most popular settlement area in Canada (Andrew & Abdourhamane 2011).

That said, Durham seemed like an unlikely candidate for considerable diversity change. In 2008, the Regional Municipality of Durham was reluctant to enter the
immigration or diversity policy area (Cullen 2009). For instance, the Town of Ajax, the municipality with the largest immigrant population, had yet to engage in developing any diversity policies or programs (Cullen 2009). There were no sectoral groups or associations designed to address diversity. Durham Region’s most notable piece of settlement infrastructure was an outdated contact list for ethno-cultural organizations (Cullen 2009). Governance between organizations involved in settlement and integration was fractured and fragmented (Cullen & Clow 2011). A consortium of settlement and language service providers as well as a few like-minded organizations had been trying for almost a decade to acquire a welcome centre (Durham Region Consortium of Partners Serving Immigrants 2007).

Fast forward to 2013, the Regional Municipality of Durham is an active leader in the immigration and diversity policy fields. The Town of Ajax has introduced and is in the process of implementing the most comprehensive diversity plan Durham has ever seen (Cullen & Clow 2011). Three sectoral groups designed to address diversity exist. Durham Region has a quarterly diversity newsletter and a multi-faceted digital immigration portal. Governance amongst sectors involved in settlement and integration has improved by leaps and bounds. Durham is home to two welcome centres.

Change of this scale rarely happens so rapidly. Progress on diversity work is often measured in decades not years. As far as settlement and diversity research is concerned, change of this nature is typically attributable to a drastic increase in the newcomer population (Good 2009) or an active ethno-cultural sector (Lim et al. 2003; Kataoka & Magnusson 2007). Experiencing a growing but steady immigrant population and with an under-developed minimally active ethno-cultural sector, Durham shares neither of these
characteristics (Cullen & Clow 2011). In this case, the driver if not the source of change seems to be Durham’s Local Immigration Partnership (LIP), also known as the Durham Region Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council (LDIPC). It would be shortsighted to say LDIPC is solely responsible for the change, nevertheless, none of this change materialized pre-LDIPC; certainly, there is a case to be made about its contribution.

1.2 Local Immigration Partnerships

According to Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC),

LIPs are the mechanism through which CIC supports the development of community-based partnerships and planning around the needs of newcomers. LIPs are steered by broad-based coordinating councils comprised of key community members, often representing important local organizations. The partnership councils are tasked with overall stewardship and management control over initiatives such as needs assessments and asset mapping of their own community. The partnership council’s main goal is to oversee the development of a local settlement strategy and targeted action plan to produce a more welcoming and inclusive community. The overall objective is to engage groups that will coordinate and enhance the current settlement and integration service delivery network, while avoiding duplication. Strategic partnerships between many stakeholders are encouraged to improve the dialogue and information sharing between sectors, identify gaps and align services.

(CIC 2011, 6)

LIPs represent the next step in localization of immigration policy (Tolley 2011). Localized immigration policy is nothing new. For over a decade, immigrant receiving western liberal democracies have been gradually devolving authority of immigration policy. This trend has played out differently across nation-states. In the United States devolution has been driven by security reasons (Leitner & Preston 2011); in Australia, successful integration of newcomers into the economy (Boese 2010). Canada’s rationale mirrors that of Australia. Likewise, Canada has followed a similar process decentralizing selection policy primarily through the Provincial Nominee Program (PNP) and settlement
services, albeit in a much more limited regard (Baglay 2012; Vineberg 2011). Until recently, the province of Ontario, Canada’s largest recipient of newcomers, remained the dawdler of this trend (Biles et al. 2011). With the advent of the five-year $920 million Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA) in 2005, Ontario quickly jumped to the forefront of this trend (Siemaitycki & Triadafilopoulos 2010). Although not as comprehensive in some areas as agreements with other provinces (Siemaitycki & Triadafilopoulos 2010), COIA increased Ontario’s control over selection policy, settlement policy and settlement services, undoubtedly facilitating and furthering the localization process. It was lauded for marking a new era in immigration policy relations between provincial and federal governments (Stasiulis et al. 2011; Seidle 2010).

One of the more publicized aspects has been the role given to Toronto (Andrew & Abdourhamme 2011). Put simply, COIA has given Toronto a seat at the table, the first agreement to formally recognize municipalities. As part of this arrangement, Toronto received increased autonomy and input mechanisms (COIA 2005). One of COIA’s less publicized aspects has been the introduction of LIPs. Assumingly designed to address the flaws of CIC’s previous local settlement policy, LIPs have rebuilt and in some places, established local settlement policy. Guided by a welcoming communities philosophy, LIPs have bolstered settlement policy through upper-level government funding and municipal involvement. LIPs represent municipalities’ first formal entry in local settlement policy (Andrew & Abdourhamme 2011). After continuous devolution on selection policy, LIPs symbolize devolution on settlement policy (Stasiulis et al. 2011). Because of LIPs, unlike Australia, decentralization in Canada is transpiring not only at the provincial level but also at the local level.
Considering the uniqueness of Toronto’s immigration situation, the challenge for the province of Ontario lies in balancing the needs of Toronto with the rest of Ontario. Historically, this has been difficult, with the province focusing disproportionately on Toronto (Biles et al. 2011). Yet, 35 LIPs are spread across Ontario, presenting the opportunity to reduce the disparity. Despite the innovative nature of LIPs, surprisingly relatively little is known about them. For the most part, what has been determined is they hold great potential (Bradford & Andrew 2010; 2011).

1.3 Research Goal and Objectives

Moving beyond describing potential to analyzing impact is the overall aim of this research. More specifically, understanding how localized immigration policy is playing out in under-studied areas with low to medium size immigrant populations. Localization is often framed negatively, in the right policy area under the appropriate terms, is it possible to be a positive force? The following research objectives have been designed to examine this question:

1) Describe the development and structure of LDIPC and identify the nature of LDIPC’s relationship with the sectors involved in immigrant settlement and its role in helping facilitate a welcoming community.

2) Examine the regional nature of LDIPC including the role of the Regional Municipality of Durham and regional infrastructure in developing a regional approach to settlement.

3) Comparing pre-LDIPC and post-LDIPC eras, assess the implications of LDIPC, particularly its unique components
1.4 Recasting and Reconstituting Local Immigration Policy

The three research objectives will be explored within the confines of immigration policy as it relates to the fields of localization, governance and regionalization. Sources will be drawn from a number of disciplines, most notably, geography, ethnic studies, political science, economics, migration studies and Canadian studies. Because localized immigration policy is not a recent development, much has been written on the topic. The bulk of this research focuses at the sub-national level, where the majority of change has occurred (Watt et al. 2008; Alboim 2009; Lewis 2010). Starting broadly at the international level, the research will explore this body of work documenting the origins, notable developments and challenges noted so far with localized immigration policy. The research will move one-step further, examining the next step in localization, embodied by LIPs. Partially because of their comparably shorter lifespan, relatively little is known about LIPs (Bradford & Andrew 2010). Thus far, research amounts to looking at potential and promise as well as preliminary findings on specific subjects (Burstein et al. 2012). By concentrating on impact, the research contributes to the next stage of localized immigration policy research.

By studying impact in Durham Region, one of many places with under-studied demographic characteristics, the research will broaden the sample of places studied, thereby expanding understanding of immigrant settlement. In the Canadian immigration literature, there is a plethora of research on Toronto (Truelove 2000; Lim et al. 2005; King & Newbold 2007). Sure, given Toronto’s ubiquity as a settlement destination this is understandable. At the same time, it is pervasive. Toronto’s unique circumstances distort or at minimum limit general understanding of immigrant settlement. With research spread
so unevenly and settlement being inherently a local process, the current composition of knowledge around settlement is not as applicable and transferable as it could be. With more newcomers choosing more settlement destinations (Murdie 2008; Segral 2012) and locally developed policies such as LIPs extending beyond non-traditional settlement locations (Burr 2011), there is an opportunity to turn the tide. The research seeks to capitalize on this opportunity.

With local autonomy granted to 35 LIPs across Ontario, there is likely to be innovative ways LIPs go about addressing the settlement process. By several measures, LIPs are mandated with developing new methods to build settlement capacity, beyond the conventional direct settlement service provision model (Bradford & Andrew 2011). Understanding this is critical to grasping the essence of LIPs. The research will utilize a governance framework to achieve this task. Traditionally, governance often refers to the act of governing, more recently, since the emergence of neo-liberalism, it has been re-purposed as a reactionary strategy to neo-liberalism (Swyngedouw 2005; Fontan et al. 2005). In the immigration literature, governance has received little usage. Its main use thus far lies as a tool for examining multi-level governance through provincial case studies (Katoka & Magnusson 2007; Haddow 2011). Despite its utility, it has not trickled down to the local level. The research will expand the application of governance, in particular, new governance, as an approach to examine the settlement strategies, planning and fresh methods LIPs will employ.

The research will also apply a local lens to the vibrant regionalization debate. Again, beginning at an international level and moving down to a national level, the research will chart the varied regionalization debates ongoing in many western liberal
democracies. In Canada, regionalization took on a new level of intensity following the results of the 2001 census, which illustrated the immense concentration of newcomers within Canada’s three major core cities (McDonald 2004; Derwing & Krahn 2008). Following a more equitable dispersion of newcomers, the debate, far from over, has simmered in recent years (Watt et al. 2008). Yet, LIPs have breathed new life into the debate at a local level. A product of CIC’s LIP groupings, many LIPs mirror those of the regional jurisdictions they have been implemented in, effectively regionalizing settlement policy at a local level. The research will delve into the implications of this policy development, particularly whether the LIP model is capable of tackling regionalization.

1.5 A Place-Based Approach for Localized Policy

To capture the local nature of the LIP’s impact, a qualitative case study will be utilized. Much of the Canadian immigration literature is comprised of case studies (Preston et al. 2009; Lewis 2010) and for good reason. Case studies permit a research approach that facilitates the development of a multi-faceted nuanced portrait of a particular phenomenon, accounting for contextual factors. By studying one unit intensively, case studies can often be generalizable amongst a set of larger units (Gerring 2004). In the case of LIPs, this is particularly useful, as findings can be transferred and compared to others, building a comprehensive general understanding of LIP policy.

Durham Region was chosen as the case study location (Figure 1.1). As one of five regional jurisdictions within the GTA, the landing area for the majority of newcomers to Canada, Durham reflects an interesting case study area but not for the reasons one would expect. Having the lowest levels of immigration amongst GTA regions, puts Durham in a somewhat awkward position, being a member of what is an immigration hotspot but
sharing more similarities with places outside this area. This not only problematizes the concept of speaking of the GTA as one entity as it relates to immigration but also sheds further light on the need for a local approach to immigration settlement. Pre-LIP, Durham had several immigration related challenges (Cullen 2009; Cullen & Clow 2011). Being a member of the GTA did little to help Durham address these challenges. In fact, it may have been more of a disservice as Durham was overshadowed by the GTA conversation on immigration and not unique enough to be noticed for any particular reason. Given this context, exploring the merit of a locally specific regional approach to immigration is a worthwhile endeavour.

The case study used a combination of interviews and primary document analysis to develop its data set. Trying to examine the impact of LDIPC on the organizations it was designed to assist, interview participants were recruited on the basis of their association with organizations involved in the settlement and integration process. In total, 52 key-informant interviews were completed with six sectors and three consultants. Data was analyzed on an organizational and sectoral basis to trace both the individual and collective impact of LDIPC.
1.6 Road Map of Thesis

Including the Introduction Chapter 1, the thesis contains nine chapters. Chapter 2 situates the research outlining its place within three fields, localized immigration policy, governance and regionalization. Chapter 3 explains the research design describing the research approach, choice of methods, profile of case study area and breakdown of data analysis. Chapter 4 marks the beginning of the findings chapters, documenting the purpose and objectives of LDIPC, according to its documents. Chapter 5 delves deeper into LDIPC operations, relying not only on LDIPC documents but also on interview transcripts, to examine LDIPC’s structure, particularly its community-executive balance, critical to its success. Chapter 6 moves from internal to external relations, detailing
LDIPC’s relationship with sectors involved in settlement and integration, highlighting
LDIPC terms of participation. Chapter 7 looks at both sides of the regionalization card,
regional municipal involvement and regionalization as a policy. Chapter 8 examines the
collective impact of LDIPC, emphasizing not only the change it has produced but also the
issues it has help address. Chapter 9, the last chapter, compares the conceptual
foundations with research findings, analyzing similarities, differences and the
contributions of the research while bringing attention to its limitations and opportunities
for future research.
CHAPTER 2
Reconceptualizing and Recontextualizing Local Immigration Policy

Utilizing sources from numerous disciplines and of a varied nature, this chapter sets the contextual and conceptual foundation for the following chapters. It begins with a breakdown of the path of localization of immigration policy, starting broadly at an international level working gradually towards a local level with an explicit focus on Ontario, Canada. In the process, documenting the origins, notable developments and challenges connected with localized immigration policy.

It then moves to map how localization changes the nature of immigration literature’s association with two areas, governance and regionalization. In the case of governance, reexamining how it is employed to understand and examine immigration policy. In terms of regionalization, how it adds a new layer to an ongoing and long-standing debate. Together, immigration policy as it relates to localization, governance and regionalization of immigration comprise the fields forming the framework in which my research objectives will be examined. The chapter will conclude by highlighting how these fields not only fit but also guide the research.

2.1 Localization of Immigration Policy

The localization of immigration policy, although a recent trend, is not a recent development. What is new, is its extension to a municipal or community level via Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs). LIPs seem poised to change not only the dynamics of immigration policy between national and local levels but also reconfigure the make-up of local settlement policy.

Over the past decade, one of the most notable trends in immigration policy for immigrant receiving western liberal democracies is the localization of immigration policy
Driven in large part by neo-liberalism and the subsequent restructuring it entailed, immigration policy has experienced a significant decentralization including downloading of responsibilities and services from upper level governments to lower level governments at the state and local level (Peck & Tickell 2002). Localization is far from specific to immigration policy, as several other policy fields as part of a neo-liberal agenda have endured similar changes (Pinch 1997; Jessop 2002; Bradford 2007).

Although localization is a general trend, it has expressed itself distinctively in different nation-states. In the United States, localization has meant the devolution of control policies to the state level, intended to regulate migrants’ access to public services or employment (Leitner and Preston 2012). Whereas in Australia, localization has centered on the downloading of settlement services to the provincial level, designed to assist newcomers in the process of integration into the host society (Boese 2010; Clarke and Skuterud 2012). Canada has followed a similar pattern to Australia with one important exception; Canada’s decentralization is not only transpiring at the provincial level, it has recently been formally expanded to the local level (Tolley 2011).

### 2.2 Canadian Immigration Policy: A Multi-Scalar Patchwork Quilt of Policies and Programs

Constitutionally, in Canada, immigration is a concurrent power, meaning it falls under both federal and provincial jurisdiction. The multi-scalar nature of this set-up plays a central part in multiple areas of immigration policy including administration, selection policy and settlement policy and has become more significant as the federal government has devolved an increasing number of its responsibilities. Administratively, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) and Heritage Canada, together, look after the bulk of responsibilities concerning immigrant selection, settlement and integration (Andrew &
Abdourhamane Hima 2011). Yet, they are not the only federal departments involved, as Human Resources and Social Development Canada, Health Canada, Status of Women Canada, Public Safety Canada, Industry Canada, Transport, Infrastructure and Communities Canada are all relevant to immigration policy (Andrew & Abdourhamane Hima 2011).

Provincially, the development of administrative departments to handle immigration is as formidable as the federal government, as all provinces and territories have given an immigration mandate to at least one of their departments (Vineberg 2011). Several provinces have vast and sophisticated immigration operations, which stretch across multiple departments (Biles et al. 2011). Vineberg (2011) calls this recent development a “superstructure” of provincial and territorial involvement in immigration that is reflective of a new era. Although some scholars will say provinces have always had some type of role in immigration (Vineberg 2010), the difference now is that the nature of the involvement is no longer ad hoc or temporary, it is permanent and this new reality is central to not only managing Canadian immigration policy but also to understanding it.

As shown in Table 2.1, beginning in the mid-1990’s, prompted by the 1991 Canada-Quebec Accord and pressure from the Prairie Provinces concerned about their fair share of immigrants, the federal government began to cede control of immigrant selection policy (Baglay 2012). While maintaining control of the three primary classes of entry (family reunification, economic, convention refugees), in 1995, the federal government added the ‘provincial/territorial’ nominee category. This category has evolved into the Provincial Nominee Program (PNP), which allows provinces and
territories to identify and nominate (with the help of employers), immigrants who can meet their specific labour market needs (Watt et al. 2008). Originally intended to complement the federal government’s selection policy and capped with limits to ensure this, the number of immigrants entering through the PNP’s has grown 350% over the past eight years (Alboim 2009). If this trend continues, the PNP is on the verge of becoming the primary source of economic immigrants to Canada (Alboim 2009). Manitoba was the first province to sign a PNP agreement in 1996, followed by Saskatchewan and British Columbia in 1998, New Brunswick and Newfoundland in 1999, Prince Edward Island and Yukon Territories in 2001, Alberta and Nova Scotia in 2002, Ontario in 2005, and finally Northwest Territories in 2009. Nunavut is the only jurisdiction without an agreement (Vineberg 2011). Despite being the largest recipient of immigrants, Ontario’s PNP is the least developed (Leitner & Preston 2012; Vineberg 2012).

Table 2.1: Timeline: Devolution of Canadian Immigration Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Canada-Quebec Immigration Accord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Settlement Renewal Initiative; Manitoba signs first PNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Manitoba and British Columbia sign first settlement service agreements includes PNP for both provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-2002</td>
<td>Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Yukon Territories, Alberta, and Nova Scotia get PNPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Ontario signs COIA, includes PNP, settlement services, municipalities included in settlement agreement for first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Alberta signs settlement service agreement also including municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Northwest Territories gets PNP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The federal government followed a similar pattern of devolution with settlement policy and programs through its 1996 ‘Settlement Renewal’ Initiative. In the midst of slashing its deficit, the federal government hoped to persuade as many provinces as possible to take on administration and delivery of settlement services by giving them new funds (Vineberg 2011). Additional funding convinced both Manitoba and British
Columbia to accept the federal government’s proposal and both provinces signed settlement realignment agreements in 1998. Over the next decade, all provinces and territories, again, with the exception of Nunavut signed settlement agreements with the federal government. It is worth noting that Ontario accepted the federal governments’ offer of increased funding when it began devolution but would not, thanks to a disinterested Conservative government, take on administration duties until the advent of COIA in 2005 (OCASI 2009). Recently, there has been a slight aberration in this trend. In April 2012, the federal government unexpectedly re-centralized control of British Columbia’s and Manitoba’s settlement services (Welcoming Communities Initiative 2012). Whether this marks the beginning of a trend remains to be seen.1

2.3 Ontario and Immigration: Laggard to Leader?

Among the provinces, Manitoba lobbied hard for and ultimately acted as the catalyst in ensuring the devolution of responsibilities both selection and settlement wise. Consequently, given the number of immigrants it receives, Manitoba receives a disproportionate amount of attention in the literature. Although some scholars have reservations (Lewis 2010), all (Leo 2007; Carter et al. 2008; Lewis 2010; Seidle 2010) generally acknowledge the success of Manitoba’s immigration agreement in meeting its mandate and increasing the number of immigrants to Manitoba.

What is surprising given its position as the gateway province for Canada is the lack of research on Ontario. There are a few articles that focus specifically on Ontario (Wang & Truelove 2003; Reitz 2003; Di Biase & Bauder 2005; Stasiulis et al. 2011;  

---

1 It may mark the start of a new trend considering many provinces are currently in the stages of negotiating new agreements with the federal government but the continued national implementation of the LIPs means localization as a trend line is far from over.
Biles et al. 2011) but only a few of these contain any discussion on Ontario’s role as a province, jurisdictionally speaking (Reitz 2003; Biles et al. 2011).

This limited output can be attributed to several reasons. First, there is a plethora of research on immigration in Ontario; however, the bulk of it is based in Toronto, thus neglecting any specific analysis on the province’s role. Research on Toronto includes settlement services (Lim et al. 2005; Lo et al. 2000; Sadiq 2004), the city-suburban dichotomy (Wallace & Frisken 2000; Truelove 2000), urban citizenship (Siemiatycki & Isin 1997; Keil 2002), and Toronto’s role as a gateway city for immigrants to Canada (McDonald 2004; King & Newbold 2007). Second, it is widely recognized in the literature that Ontario’s government has always been reluctant to be formally involved in the settlement and integration process of newcomers (OCASI 2009; Vineberg 2011; Biles et al. 2011; Stasiulis et al. 2011). Initially, Ontario’s position stemmed from the reality that, historically, it had been the largest recipient of immigrants and therefore left the responsibility to the large ethnic networks and community organizations that developed out of these circumstances (Biles et al. 2011; Stasiulis et al. 2011). For the same reason, unlike Quebec or the Prairie provinces, for Ontario, immigration as always been a federal prerogative (Vineberg 2011) and given its prosperity and number of immigrants, Ontario has never had a substantial reason to lobby the federal government for a new arrangement, because it has been by far the largest beneficiary of Canada’s immigration system. Even when the period of devolution began in the mid-1990’s, the Ontario government welcomed and accepted additional federal funding that became available but refused to take on the administration of settlement services (OCASI 2009). Because of this, Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI) and the Canadian
Immigrant Settlement Sector Alliance, both interest groups for immigrant serving agencies have advocated for the federal government to maintain its dominant role in immigrant services in Ontario (OCASI 2009; Burstein 2010). As illustrated in Table 2.2, this juxtaposition of trends and external forces has historically kept the Ontario government from a significant role in the sphere of settlement services.

Table 2.2: Timeline: Ontario’s Immigration Policy in a Period of Devolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Settlement Renewal Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Accepts additional funding for settlement services but refuses to take on administration responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>Experiences inter-governmental limbo and a deficit in immigration funds thanks to inter-governmental disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Signs $920 million COIA, includes PNP, settlement services, municipalities included in settlement agreement for first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Introduction of LIP policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>COIA expires, COIA 2 under negotiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the mid-2000’s, this omnipresent situation changed, as the federal government became concerned that Ontario was one of the few provinces without a federal-provincial agreement. Ontario also became disenchanted as it was losing-out on millions of dollars in settlement funds compared to other provinces. Both sides entered negotiations on an agreement, the outcome being, the 2005 $920 million COIA. COIA marked not only a landmark piece of legislation (Andrew & Abdourhamane Hima 2011) but according to Siemaitycki & Triadafilopoulos (2010, 1), “a significant step forward in intergovernmental arrangements and agreements in Canada”. In short, COIA created “an effective partnership between Canada and Ontario for the recruitment, selection, and admission of immigrants and temporary residents, as well as the settlement and integration of immigrants in Ontario” (COIA 2005, 3). It was a considerable devolution
agreement for Ontario but not as substantial as other provincial agreements (Siemiatycki & Triadafilopoulos 2010).

Still, COIA represented a noted aberration for Ontario and within the literature receives universal recognition for beginning a new era in immigration and settlement policy (Stasiuslis et al. 2011; Biles et al. 2011; Seidle 2010; Siemiatycki & Triadafilopoulos 2011). Highlights of the agreement include a PNP program, restored and increased settlement and integration services funding, expanded programming, online Immigration Portals and the formal involvement of municipalities through a partnership mechanism (COIA 2005). Intentionally or not, COIA addresses many of the long-standing issues scholars have raised associated with the settlement and integration process in Ontario including intergovernmental uncertainty (Mwarigha 2002; McIssac 2003; Omidvar 2003), lack of funding for settlement services (Richmond & Shields 2004; Sadiq 2004), the disparate relationship between the stakeholders involved in the settlement process (McIssac 2003; Frisken & Wallace 2003) and finally the de facto role of municipalities (AMO 2008; Carter et al. 2008; FCM 2009), all the product of Ontario’s previous settlement policy. While some research demonstrates that COIA has addressed certain issues such as intergovernmental uncertainty (Seidle 2010; Siemiatycki & Triadafilopoulos 2010) and settlement funding (OCASI 2009; Burstein 2010), answers to the issues around the impact of COIA remain unclear and under-studied. Since COIA, the Ontario government has been increasingly vocal about expanding devolution, calling on numerous occasions for a “made in Ontario” immigration policy (Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration 2010). Whether this change is a product of COIA and experiencing devolution first hand for the first time is unclear.
2.4 The Final Localization Frontier? Local Immigration Partnerships

Somewhat surprisingly, the most distinguishing and perhaps most innovative feature of COIA, municipal involvement as part of a tri-level partnership (COIA 2005), remains considerably under-examined. COIA is the first and one of only two (the other being Alberta’s Agreement for Canada-Alberta Cooperation on Immigration) to include municipal governments (Andrew & Abdourhamane 2011). Within COIA, multiple mechanisms have been integrated to ensure municipal involvement. In the second tier of the COIA management structure, municipal partnerships is one of the three divisions, the others being integration initiatives and economic initiatives (COIA 2005). Of the committees, the Municipal Immigration Committee is co-chaired by Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration (MCI), CIC and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and contains two working groups, attraction/retention and settlement/integration (COIA 2005). Municipal participation also is permitted in other COIA working groups. Lastly, in part due to Toronto’s influential role in ensuring the inclusion of municipalities (Andrew & Abdourhamme 2011) and thanks to its unique role as the recipient of 50% of Canada’s immigrants over the past five years, as part of the municipal partnerships, Toronto received a tripartite memorandum of understanding (MOU), which grants Toronto its own steering committee for joint initiatives and allows for Toronto representation on other COIA working groups (COIA 2005).

A product of municipal involvement in COIA has been a re-development of Ontario’s settlement and integration policy, primarily through a new program initiative, LIPs. Previously, CIC’s settlement policy consisted of funding general programs such as Language Instruction Training for Newcomers (LINC), Immigrant Settlement and
Adaptation Program (ISAP) and the HOST program for particular newcomers (permanent residents and convention refugees) in certain places (decided based on demographic statistics) for select periods of time (generally three years) (Biles 2008; Wayland 2006). Across Ontario, each place had a different mix of services depending upon their needs but all were subject to the same intergovernmental structure and constitutional restrictions. Furthermore, with great variability, different sectors, institutions and organizations delivered different services depending upon the place (Leitner & Preston 2012). Critics panned this approach as enabling the ghettoization of immigrant and settlement integration policy, as it keeps immigrants within the confines of immigrant serving agencies and prevents horizontal cooperation with mainstream organizations (Biles et al. 2011). It is important to note that with the implementation of the LIPs, this policy is not disappearing. Instead it is being built upon and broadened, in an attempt to address its flaws.

The adoption of LIPs is reflective of a new way of thinking about settlement and integration policy, one that focuses on welcoming communities. Although often used in vague contexts (Esses et al. 2010), the term welcoming community became popular in the 1990’s and is commonly understood “as a location that has the capacity to meet the needs and promote the inclusion of newcomers and ensure the machinery is in place to produce and support these capacities” (Esses et al. 2010, 9). The welcoming communities philosophy acknowledges that settlement and integration is a two way process, thus, the onus is not solely on the newcomer or newcomers but rather a partnership among all parties involved. At an institutional or service provider level, this means the settlement and integration process of newcomers is no longer solely the domain of immigrant
serving agencies, ethno-cultural organizations and faith based groups but also of mainstream organizations, school boards and municipalities.

Within CIC policy, the welcoming communities’ philosophy is embodied in the Community Connections stream of CIC’s modernization settlement program (Burr 2011). The premise of Community Connections is to build substantive and meaningful connections between newcomers and host societies. In addition to being a centerpiece of COIA, the LIPS are also the flagship initiative of Community Connections (Burr 2011).

In policy terms, the LIPS are defined as the following:

LIPS are the mechanism through which CIC supports the development of community-based partnerships and planning around the needs of newcomers. LIPS are steered by broad-based coordinating councils comprised of key community members, often representing important local organizations. The partnership councils are tasked with overall stewardship and management control over initiatives such as needs assessments and asset mapping of their own community. The partnership council’s main goal is to oversee the development of a local settlement strategy and targeted action plan to produce a more welcoming and inclusive community. The overall objective is to engage groups that will coordinate and enhance the current settlement and integration service delivery network, while avoiding duplication. Strategic partnerships between many stakeholders are encouraged to improve the dialogue and information sharing between sectors, identify gaps and align services.

(CIC 2011, 6)

Proposal calls for LIPS were made in early 2008 (Burr 2011). This may explain why the bulk of the literature on LIPS centers on the design and planning stages and strategic plans (Kobayashi et al. 2012) rather than the impact of the actual policy (Bradford & Andrew 2011; Stasiulis et al. 2011; Wiginton 2012). Common adjectives to describe LIPS such as “living experiment” and “social innovative policy in the making” (Bradford & Andrew 2011, 2), reflect their relative newness.

Preliminary findings indicate LIPS have great potential. In a report prepared for CIC, analyzing the policy context of LIPS, Bradford and Andrew (2010) call LIPS a
promising policy well designed to address the challenges and needs of 21st century immigration policy. In a subsequent report, studying the start-up phase of LIPs, they praise LIPs as a promising initiative, noting that even in their initial stages; they have put immigration on the agenda in places where typically it has not been (Bradford & Andrew 2010). In their review of COIA for the Mowat Institute, both Seidle (2010) as well as Siemiatycki and Triadafilopoulos (2010) echo this praise, singling out LIPs as a particular success of COIA. Policymakers affirm this, calling LIP programs “quite successful” (Wiginton 2012, 23), while researchers from the WCI research network are equally enthused pointing to the excitement about LIP outcomes at every level of government (Pero 2011). Success has led to official recognition. In 2010, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration called LIPs a best practice (Standing Committee 2010). In response, the federal government avowed this, confirming their full support (Government of Canada, 2010).

Despite an assortment of structures and differing priorities (Welcoming Communities Initiative 2012), to a certain extent, geographic location does not seem to dictate success. Positive findings emanate from a sample of places as varied as Peel, Hamilton, Ottawa and Thunder Bay. Research demonstrates the inclusion and role of municipalities to be a more telling indicator of success. Whether as a contract holder or a contributing member, LIPs where municipalities play a substantial role in a leadership or a supporting capacity have made more progress (Burstein et al. 2012). Yet, simply occupying a position will not suffice; municipalities must be engaged and willing in order for LIPs to be successful (Burstein et al. 2012). Success has reached a point where
suggestions have been made that LIPs be assigned greater control over financial allocations. This is a controversial proposal, one that may not be well received.

Still, it speaks to the sea of positivity surrounding LIPs, where merely a ripple of negativity is difficult to find. For a select few, this is reason for skepticism. According to Rebecca Pero (2011, 24), “LIP activities are being advanced without proper assessment and have not been discussed in the context of service cutbacks”. Pero goes further, “the costs to community stakeholders … have yet to be considered” (25). Moreover, as some scholars concede, (Bradford & Andrew 2010; Stasiulis et al. 2011) missing from this body of literature is an assessment of the impact and outcomes of the LIPs as well as an examination of the structures and processes.

At the same time, much of the literature under-emphasizes the origins of LIPs, more specifically, the Toronto-centric nature of their birth. As the federal government began its devolution of settlement and integration service responsibilities, the Ontario government’s uncooperative nature in accepting the federal government’s terms created what Mwarigha (2002) calls an “intergovernmental limbo” in settlement policy. This put Toronto in an extremely difficult situation as it had few policy levers and no policy autonomy to address the needs of its immigrant population, which is by far, Canada’s largest. Numerous reports during this period have documented Toronto’s circumstances (Mwarigha 2002; McIssac 2003; Good 2004) with organizations like the Maytree Foundation (2002) and Caledon Institute of Social Policy (2003) echoing the City of Toronto’s calls for a more stable and certain settlement policy with greater autonomy for Toronto (Mwarigha 2002).
In response to this policy vacuum, the Toronto City Summit Alliance (TCSA), a key part of the urban autonomy movement at the time, established the Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council (TRIEC) (Good 2004). TRIEC’s purpose is to help facilitate immigrants entry to the labour market and build policy capacity in the field of immigrant integration into the economy through a multi-stakeholder approach which includes representatives from the City of Toronto, Regions of Halton, York and Peel, provincial government, federal government, immigrant-service agencies, large corporate employers, occupational regulatory bodies, chambers of commerce or boards of trade, district labour councils and post-secondary institutions (TRIEC 2002). It carries out this mandate through a number of programs and committees dedicated to each of its objectives. According to the literature (Stasiulis et al. 2011; Andrew 2011; Good 2006), TRIEC’s success has been remarkable. From a solid record on facilitating immigrant employment (TRIEC N.D.) to creating numerous benefits for its stakeholders (Stasiulis et al. 2011), its success has led second tier cities such as Niagara, Waterloo and Ottawa to adopt similar models, although little research exists on their effectiveness.

TRIEC, as part of the TCSA, was developed in part to help put pressure on senior levels of government to give Toronto increased autonomy over immigration matters. This pressure seems to have paid off as Toronto was considered the impetus for the recognition of the role of municipalities within COIA and for the subsequent new powers it derived (Andrew & Abdourhamane Hima 2011). In light of Toronto’s influence on COIA, its ability to shape discourse on settlement policy due its special position (Andrew & Abdourhamane Hima 2011; Stasiulis et al. 2011), and the success of TRIEC, is it of
little surprise that COIA’s most profound and innovative policy involving municipalities, LIPs, is a variation of TRIEC.

Within the Canadian immigration policy field, TRIEC is the inaugural experiment in multi-sectoral governance (Stasiulis et al. 2011). Much of its success stems from the unique characteristics of Toronto (Stasiulis et al. 2011). Compared to other cities and regions, especially in Ontario, with a foreign-born population of 46%, Toronto has, by far, the largest immigrant population (Good 2009). This is not a recent development. The City of Toronto has a number of policies and programs geared towards facilitating settlement for newcomers (Siemiatycki 2008), its settlement service sector and ethnocultural sector are highly developed (Frisken and Wallace 1997; Kataoka and Magnusson 2007; Lim et al. 2003), and most of all, Toronto’s exposure to and experience with diversity remains unmatched. Overall, Toronto does not have a perfect settlement framework but compared to other places, its settlement toolbox is formidable.

Because of this, originally, CIC structured Toronto’s LIPs uniquely, allocating 17 at a neighbourhood level. In theory, this sounds appropriate, but in practice, it has been a different story. For example, the Toronto West LIP has experienced challenges being unable to develop an executive council beyond the settlement service world and has chosen to employ a more short-term approach as it relates to goals and objectives, unlike most LIPs who have taken a longer-term approach, for fear of losing funding (Bradford & Andrew 2011). Although little research supports this, problems of this nature might have been widespread as in December 2011, CIC axed the neighbourhood model, replacing it with a regional settlement model, consolidating 17 neighbourhood based LIPs into four regional partnerships (Bejan & Black 2012). Operating at a regional level would
seem like a logical improvement given TRIEC’s success but early indications suggest otherwise. Bejan & Black (2012) show in their study of the Toronto East LIP, that model restructuring has resulted in reduced staff, contracted networks (key part of the LIP model) and diminished capacity.

Most immigration literature (Good 2005; Andrew 2011; Biles et al. 2011) acknowledges Toronto’s exceptional nature as it relates to immigration and the need for policy-makers to treat it uniquely. Given how uniquely CIC treated Toronto and the promising origins of the LIP policy for Toronto, it seemed poised to produce positive outcomes, yet, the opposite has happened. Toronto’s exceptional nature has proved more problematic than prime. Toronto is an outlier, with LIPs in most other places experiencing more favourable results.

Given Toronto’s immigrant footprint, the challenge for the Government of Ontario has long been balancing the needs of Toronto with the rest of the province. Until recently, the province has focused disproportionately on the City of Toronto (Biles et al. 2011) posing the question: do LIPs mark the first step towards a re-balancing act especially considering results thus far?

Before making this judgment, what must be considered and what is a point of contention within the literature, is the appropriate boundary to draw around Toronto to achieve this balance, whether it is the City of Toronto or the Greater Toronto Area.

For some (Andrew & Abdourhamane Hima 2011, 62), “the GTA is the focal point of immigration.” While others identify the stark differences in several areas between the City of Toronto and other members of the GTA (Peel) and the rest of the province (Stasiulis et al. 2011). The GTA is the largest recipient of newcomers in Canada, making
it distinct; nevertheless, within the GTA, there is great variability in immigration policies, programs and levels, with the largest differences occurring between the City of Toronto and its suburbs (Halton, Peel, York and Durham). In fact, even the Region of Peel, which contains municipalities with near 50% levels of immigration, in its official Immigration Position Statement, acknowledges that “it does not have the long history of settlement agencies and supports that are based in Toronto” (Stasiulis et al. 2011, 95). The Region of York echoes this, pointing to the funding discrepancies between itself and the City of Toronto (York LIP 2012). Within COIA, it is the City of Toronto that has additional powers not any other GTA municipality, illustrating Toronto’s prevalence and power. Therefore, the City of Toronto seems like the more appropriate boundary.

This geographic variability, identified by CIC through its various approaches to LIPs, highlights the importance of acknowledging and understanding the role of place in policy development and immigrant settlement.

2.5 COIA: A Governance Instigator?

Governance is a multi-faceted, multi-disciplinary concept used in a variety of contexts. Governance has been researched widely in such fields as political theory, political science, sociology, human geography and health studies. Traditionally defined as the act or process of governing, governance has taken on a broader meaning over the past two decades thanks to new structures and relationships between the state, the private sector and civil society. For the most part, these new arrangements are a product of the impact of globalization, neo-liberalism and the subsequent state downloading of responsibilities and services (Warren et al. 1992; Jessop 2002; Swyngedouw 2005; Fontan et al. 2005). Neo-liberalism has caused a reduction in the role of government,
typically classified as part of the state, and thus necessitated the implementation of governance as a strategy between all sectors to cope with the withdrawal of the state (Bailey 2003; Brenner 2004).

In human geography, changing circumstances have prodded urban governance scholars to develop a new form of governance to understand the dynamics of these arrangements. Previously, urban governance scholars used ‘old governance’ to describe and understand a world in which the state governed in a hierarchical fashion from a fixed centre of authority (Walters 2004; Brenner 2004). This approach has become outdated, as the state has conceded more of its responsibilities to other sectors, in the process, assuming a new role, in which it is not insignificant but rather one of many actors (Jessop 2002).

In order to understand the workings of this reality, urban governance scholars have adopted a ‘new governance’ approach. This approach concedes that the traditional goals of government can no longer be achieved solely through the state acting alone but instead focus more on the processes of interaction, networking, and steering in a networked configuration with and through a host of private, para-state, third sector and voluntary groups (Rhodes 1996; Walters 2004). Within this context, governance is understood commonly as the involvement of a wide range of institutions and actors in the production of policy outcomes, including non-governmental organizations, private companies, pressure groups, social movements and state institutions traditionally regarded as formally part of the government (Johnston et al. 2004). In new governance literature, scholars such as Harvey (1989), Jessop (2002), Pierre (1999), Brenner (2004) and Kearns and Paddison (2000) have begun to look at governance at the local level in a
number of fields such as social services and employment services with a particular emphasis on the role of local government.

Currently, new governance shares a relatively limited relationship with immigration literature generally and with Canadian immigration literature in particular (Leo & August 2007; Lewis 2010; Stasiulis et al. 2010). As noted in Section 2.1, historically, the concept of governance has always been applicable to the settlement and integration process, however, only with the onset of devolution have scholars begun to use it in their research; for the most part, analysis has focused strictly on multi-level governance, primarily between the federal and provincial governments. For example, Leo and August (2007) in their examination of the Canada-Manitoba Agreement praise multi-level governance, as it has given the Manitoba government autonomy to both increase immigration and target immigration to what it, rather than the federal government, deems the highest needs areas. Carter, Morrish and Amoyaw (2008) had similar findings in their assessment of Manitoba’s PNP program, reaffirming Leo and August’s (2007) positive results on the partnership approach, including extensive community consultation, of Manitoba’s immigration program. On the other hand, Lewis (2010) was much more skeptical of the PNP program, accusing the federal government of not providing enough funding while allowing the burden of settlement costs to fall on local communities.

In the Ontario context, Stasiulis, Hughes and Amery (2011), express similar skepticism about the federal government’s role, asserting its devolution remains piecemeal and only partially complete, creating a disconnect between immigrant selection policy (mostly the domain of the federal government) and immigrant settlement policy (domain of local government and communities). Case studies of other provinces,
Nova Scotia (Haddow 2011) and British Columbia (Katoka & Magnusson 2007) present similar concerns. Therefore, the bulk of governance related research in Canadian immigration literature consists of multi-level governance analysis through provincial case studies.

Yet, despite the widespread acknowledgement that immigration settlement experience occurs locally and that other governance literature has had a local focus, scholars from both urban governance and immigration backgrounds have paid minimal attention to local governance (Edgington et al. 2001; Leitner & Preston 2012). There has been no explicit attempt to integrate governance or even urban governance concepts with studies of immigration. Certain articles containing multi-level governance research do mention local governments and communities (Leo & August 2007; Stasiulis et al. 2011), unfortunately, this is only in the context of their relations with upper-level governments not a dissection or a case study of local governance dynamics or practices.

Nevertheless, with the change in settlement policy, this relationship seems ripe for change. The new governance school of thought, although a relatively recent development, could have played a useful part in aiding in understanding of the settlement and integration process for CIC’s pre-COIA settlement policy. Long before the advent of new governance, the settlement and integration infrastructure has been a complicated web of networks involving the federal government, provincial government, settlement service agencies, faith groups and ethno-cultural organizations (Papillon 2002; Wayland 2006). What complicates this further is the individualized nature of the settlement and integration process (George 2002; George & Chaze 2009). A newcomer’s class of entry, employment prospects and settlement destination will determine what services they are
able to access, how they access them and eventually, their process of integration into the larger host society.

Research on the settlement process has established that, regardless of source country, newcomers settle with and utilize their ethnic networks in the preliminary stages of settlement (George & Chaze 2009; George & Tsang 2000; Ghosh 2007). Ethnic networks, while helpful, are limited in their capacity and reach (Li 2004). This becomes problematic at the latter stages of settlement, because of different needs that require different resources and services (George 2002), thus, making connecting with more formal or mainstream organizations essential for integration. Therefore, the settlement process is multi-sectoral involving multiple organizations who have different and in many cases complimentary roles. Yet, despite having specific mandates and despite the collaborative nature of the settlement process, little is known about the nature of interaction between the sectors and organizations involved. Governance related questions such as are there partnerships between ethno-cultural organizations and settlement service agencies, do ethno-cultural organizations refer immigrants to larger organizations, what types of interactions occur between settlement service and employment agencies and do organizations from the informal sector tend to collaborate only with organizations from their own sector, all have few answers. In some cases, research does exist on the financial relationship between mainstream settlement agencies and ethno-specific agencies (Papillon 2002; Sadiq 2004) and the formal dependency of ethno-specific agencies on mainstream settlement agencies but there is very little on how they may work together in the settlement process. Adopting a new governance approach to examine these questions
may yield significant insights into the pre-COIA service provider infrastructure responsible for settlement and integration.

Unfortunately, the lack of governance related research on the pre-COIA settlement policy means there is no base or foundation of knowledge. This oversight is important as Ontario shifts towards a settlement policy, premised on a ‘welcoming communities’ philosophy, which will entail increased interaction in many forms between sectors and organizations with little experience working together and for some, little experience working within the confines of immigration policy. As LIPs are partnership-based initiatives, they present opportunities to formalize existing relationships between different settlement stakeholders, for CIC funded organizations to include an array of organizations and sectors in the settlement process, to broaden the reach of settlement providers beyond their sector, and to include informal organizations from the ethnocultural sector, a crucial piece of the settlement process, in policy-making. Clearly, questions exist as to whether these possibilities will happen (Stasiulis et al. 2011) especially considering researchers have spent little time exploring whether these types of developments in other multi-sectoral partnership based initiatives such as TRIEC have occurred (Good 2009).

In sum, governance, both as a concept and as a practice, as it relates to Canadian immigration literature has been commonly associated with the removal of funds or withdrawal of a level of government (Stasiulis et al. 2011; Creese 2006). Governance typically has been constructed in the context of government to governance, meaning reduction of government funds. In some cases, such as the 1990’s, this view has been justified as funding for settlement services significantly decreased. However, just as
government has applications in multiple fields, it also has multiple applications in immigration. Therefore, governance needs to be separated from purely a strategy to cope with dwindling resources and broadened to include a way of examining the settlement and integration process. As CIC continues to localize settlement policy and adopt a welcoming communities philosophy, governance, particularly local governance will become central to understanding the effectiveness of settlement policy and the settlement and integration process (Burr 2011; House of Commons 2010). Assuming there is an appropriate amount of resources, the shift to governance and localization in settlement may not be entirely unhelpful based on the multi-sectoral and localized nature of the settlement and integration process.

2.6 A Re-Orientation of the Regionalization Debate

Perhaps the most pronounced debate of the last decade amongst Canadian immigration scholars has been regionalization. In the post-World War II era, the global population has urbanized at a rapid rate. According to the United Nations, as of 2012, half of the global population resides in an urban centre. Urbanization is as prevalent in the developed west as it is in the developing world. In the west, immigration is overwhelmingly an urban phenomenon (Boese 2012; Murdie & Skop 2012) and in immigrant receiving countries such as the United States and Australia, a contributing factor to urbanization. The concentration of newcomers in urban areas has sparked a regionalization debate within several countries.

Although this debate expresses itself differently within each nation-state, essentially, regionalization boils down to an uneven distribution of newcomers between urban areas (both core cities and suburbs) and small towns and rural areas (Johnston et al.
In an increasingly competitive global economy, immigrants are perceived as human capital and their disproportionate settlement in urban areas is seen as inequitable, particularly as rural areas continue to suffer from depopulation and lackluster economic development, partially, because of a lack of immigrants. In some ways, the regionalization of immigration debate is emblematic of the larger regionalization debate. Yet, urban concentration of newcomers has also provoked concerns about social mobility and ethnic enclaves (Collacott 2002). Consequently, an inequitable dispersal of newcomers is demonstrated to be unhealthy for both urban and rural areas. As a result, there has been a desire amongst governments and policy-makers to restore a more equitable distribution to newcomer settlement. Countries like Australia have taken more significant steps to address this imbalance but in countries like Canada, the regionalization debate has been more vibrant.

Prompted by the 2001 census, which marked the highest concentration of immigrants in Canada’s three largest cities, Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, this discussion has generated research from across Canada (Rose 2001; McDonald 2004; Derwing & Krahn 2008). Following the release of the 2001 census, even CIC commissioned a national conference on regionalization (CIC 2001) and briefly considered implementing a formal regionalization policy (Derwing & Krahn 2008), to ensure a more equitable dispersion of immigrants. Both academically and policy-wise, this debate has manifested itself on two scales, provincial and urban-rural. However, recent developments have dampened this debate on the provincial front. Provincially, the introduction of the PNP’s and the demise of Canada’s economic heartland have started to produce a more equitable distribution of immigrants (Watt et al. 2008; Segral 2012).
Notably within provinces, the urban-rural dichotomy has not dissipated as local initiatives have proved relatively unsuccessful and have done little to correct the regional imbalance to any significant degree, therefore propelling scholars to continue research in hopes of further understanding and possibly correcting this issue (Hyndman et al. 2006; King & Newbold 2007). Yet, as research continues to explore regionalization on an urban-rural continuum, it neglects to account for a notable development, the suburbanization of immigration.

More than ever, immigrants are choosing the suburbs as the destination of their choice (Murdie 2008). In Ontario, for example, immigrants are increasingly by-passing the City of Toronto, for its outer suburbs (Andrew & Abdourhamane Hima 2011). In Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta, similar patterns have been observed. Increased suburban immigration has led to calls for more research (Gertler 2001; King & Newbold 2007.) To some extent, these calls have been answered in recent years, as scholars have begun examining an assortment of issues such as homelessness (Preston et al. 2009), housing (Deluca & Newbold 2007; Ray 1994), reception to immigrants (Rose 2001) and ethno-cultural differences (Lo and Wang 1997; Teixeira 2007). Most of this research consists of case studies of specific places or municipalities examining a particular issue. Thus far, little attention has been paid to how increasing immigrant suburbanization is changing suburbs relationships with their core cities and rural fringes especially through the lens of immigration policy. Historically, demographically, suburbs have more closely resembled their rural outskirts than their core cities and therefore shared starker policy differences with their core cities (Hoerder & Walker 2012). Yet, as the suburban intake of immigrants has increased, suburbs are becoming dissimilar from
their rural municipalities and sharing more in common with their core city counterparts. If these trends continue, in the realm of settlement policy, suburban communities will demand more immigrant services, more resources to deal with a more diverse population and perhaps even adopt more inclusive local policies. Moving in this direction will begin to align suburban communities closer to their core cities and further from their rural fringes.

Currently, at a national and provincial level, the regionalization debate is occurring between first tier cities and rural areas but in actual policy practice, this debate is happening at the local level within regional jurisdictions containing both suburban and rural municipalities. In Ontario, this phenomenon is likely to express itself uniquely with the adoption of LIPs. Across Ontario, LIPs have been implemented on a neighbourhood scale to a regional scale (Bradford & Andrew 2010). In most cases, regional LIPs mirror the pre-existing boundaries of the regional governments that have implemented them (Burr 2011). As a result, they contain both suburban and rural municipalities with distinct demographic profiles and thus differing priorities in terms of immigration. Hence, through the LIPs, CIC has essentially regionalized settlement policy for certain areas. As municipalities were previously uninvolved in immigration policy (AMO 2008; FCM 2009) in any formal policy capacity, a regionalized settlement policy marks their first step into the immigration policy field (COIA 2005). Ultimately, nowhere in the literature, has regionalization of immigration been explored in the context of one regionally bound local jurisdiction. These debates raise concerns about whether the regionalization debate occurring within the microcosm of one policy in one jurisdiction share similarities with the national debate? And, what insights, if any, can be pulled from
this debate that may shed light on the national debate or at the very least, move it forward?

In addition, although the federal government has expressed its preference for a more equitable distribution of immigrants, it has been criticized for not supporting the communities it hopes will take on more immigrants (Walton-Roberts 2005), prompting the question: will the adoption of LIPs and the localization of settlement policy help address this concern? In light of these trends, it seems as if the terms of the regionalization debate need to be updated to account for both new spatial and demographic developments and recent policy changes.

2.7 Conceptual Framework

Weaved within the fields of localized immigration policy, governance and regionalization is COIA and its offspring, LIPs, the most localized form of immigration policy. Against the conceptual and contextual backdrop outlined in this chapter, this research will examine LIPs and how they intersect with each of these fields in Durham Region, Ontario. Durham sits at the centre of the web of these fields and, thus, serves as a telling indicator of the type of change, positive or negative, LIPs are capable of. Durham’s municipalities, particularly at a regional level, had little involvement in settlement while historically, in terms of upper-level government funding for immigration services has been chronically under-funded, therefore, providing an opportunity to understand the impact of the LIP’s trademarks, municipal involvement and upper-level government funding. By adopting a welcoming communities approach to local immigration policy, LIPs have changed the terms of governance and how scholars understand governance within the context of the settlement process, how will these
changes play out in Durham, where previous approaches have resulted in poor governance and a sector specific (or “siloed”) settlement system (Objective 1). At the core of this siloed approach was the absence of a regional approach to immigration. By introducing municipalities into the mix, for Durham’s purposes, LIPs have essentially regionalized local immigration policy, a first for Durham and Ontario. This change will build and expand the often-vibrant regionalization debate (Objective 2). As a blank slate, in many of the areas LIPs seek to address, a study of Durham makes a significant contribution to understanding the LIP policy and its most notable features (Objective 3). In doing so, this research will contribute to how applicable and transferable LIP components will be to future local immigration policy.
CHAPTER 3
The Blueprint: Research Design

This chapter will explain the research approach designed to examine LIPs through the localization of immigration policy as it relates to governance and regionalization. In the process, outlining the rationale for choices made in regards to type of study, area of study, data collection, and data analysis. The chapter begins documenting the merits of a case study approach, briefly covering relevant literature and pointing to the appropriateness of a case study for this type of research. Next, the chapter describes the case study area, Durham Region, including a demographic profile and summary of local research. Following the profile is a breakdown of data collection methods, in depth interviews coupled with supplemental primary document collection and analysis. To conclude, the chapter will detail how data was managed and analyzed, identifying thematically how objectives were met, thus, setting the stage for subsequent findings chapters.

3.1 Inter-Linkages between Framework, Objectives and Research Design

The settlement process is definitely local. The common theme amongst the research fields outlined in Chapter 2, localized immigration policy, governance, and regionalization is the focus on the local. In many ways, the purpose of the research is to document the impact of macro policy changes on local circumstances, in particular, on specific places. As illustrated in Table 3.1, the research design has been developed in accordance with the conceptual framework to ensure the research approach meets this goal. The first conceptual category centers on the changing nature of governance. This category seeks to understand how the upper-level government agreement known as COIA has changed the local governance dynamics of settlement policy and ultimately the
settlement process. The second conceptual category concerns the regionalization of immigration. Through COIA, LIPs have essentially regionalized settlement policy in many places; thereby formalizing regionalization at a local level, something that has become more of a reality as more newcomers have chosen the suburbs. This approach seeks to find meaning in this formalization. The third conceptual category examines the implications of localized immigration policy. The objective here is to document the changes through LIPs upper-level governments have made to local settlement policy with an explicit focus on the unique components of this policy. In order to capture the complexities of local circumstances and the impact of relatively new local policies, a qualitative case study will be the approach of choice.
## Table 3.1: Inter-Linkages between Framework, Objectives, and Research Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK</th>
<th>RESEARCH OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>SPECIFIC RESEARCH QUESTIONS</th>
<th>METHODS, DATA AND SCALE OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Changing nature of governance | (Objective 1) Describe the development and structure of LDIPC and identify the nature of LDIPC’s relationship with the sectors involved in immigrant settlement and its role in helping facilitate a welcoming community. | • What is the impact of specific (CIC funded) and non-specific organizations working together?  
• Are sectors previously left out of the settlement process being included?  
• Has LDIPC had a disproportionate effect on some sectors versus others?  
• What does a ‘welcoming communities’ approach look like within a LDIPC framework? | • Review of literature and analysis of transcripts from key-informant interviews  
• Micro-scale: Local/Sectoral  
• Critically review all primary documents in relation to LDIPC including newsletters, reports, committee minutes and community plan |
| Regionalization of immigration | (Objective 2) Examine the regional nature of LDIPC including the role of the Regional Municipality of Durham and regional infrastructure in developing a regional approach to settlement. | • How has the regional nature of LDIPC played out?  
• Is immigration expressing itself across only suburban municipalities or the entire regional municipality?  
• Should LDIPC have been designated at the regional level? If not, what boundary?  
• Is there a link between Regional municipal involvement and broad-based sectoral participation? | • Review of literature and analysis of transcripts from key-informant interviews  
• Meso-scale: Regional |
| Implications of localization of immigration policy | (Objective 3) Comparing pre-LDIPC and post-LDIPC eras, assess the implications of LDIPC, particularly its unique components | • What is the impact of municipal involvement?  
• Has upper-level government funding made a difference?  
• Has COIA addressed many of the long-standing issues the literature identified about pre-COIA local settlement policy?  
• How does LDIPC compare to LIPs across Ontario in terms of the distinctive elements of LIP policy, notably, scale and configuration? | • Review of literature and media; critical review of government policies and documents; analysis of transcripts from key-informant interviews  
• Macro-scale: Regional, Provincial and Federal |
3.2 Case Study: A Place-Based Approach for a Local Process

According to Gerring (2004, 341), a case study “is best defined as an in-depth study of a single unit (a relatively bounded phenomenon) where the scholar’s aim is to elucidate features of a larger class of similar phenomena.” This does not mean case studies are limited to one particular unit, either temporally or spatially, case studies commonly comprise multiple units studying the same subject (Baxter 2010). The primary rationale for case studies is to develop a thorough, multi-faceted nuanced portrait of a particular phenomenon, accounting for contextual factors.

It is important to distinguish; a case study is not a research method but rather an approach to research design (Baxter 2010; Stake 1995). In order to be part of an effective research design, a case study must be paired with another method such as interviews or surveys. A case is essentially a window into the specific issue a researcher wishes to explore. Within a case study framework, there are multiple ways, intrinsic and instrumental, to examine certain issues related to a research topic. An intrinsic case study approach focuses on creating a ‘thick description,’ by developing what makes a particular case significant within its own realm (Stake 1995). This entails delving into the unique circumstances of a particular case, irrespective of its larger relevance to research or theory. Conversely, instrumental case study design centres on looking at how certain external issues are represented within a specific case (Stake 1995). With this approach, researchers typically have a preconceived idea of what they are searching for.

In reality, there is no preferential case study approach, choosing depends on the nature of research objectives. However, the intrinsic-instrumental dichotomy underpins one of the central questions around the use of case studies, whether the specific data
acquired in a case study project can be used to generalize about the particular topic being researched. Conventional wisdom suggests case studies may be well suited to smaller scale projects like pilot studies but were not intended for fully developed research projects. This sentiment has been echoed by others who believe a case study is too subjective, giving the researcher too much flexibility to set the terms of the research to their liking rather than to objective criteria (Flyvberg 2006). Moreover, certain types of research like ethnographic studies are not by their make-up, generalizable, making it difficult to draw broadly applicable conclusions (Giddens 1984). Although to some extent, this may be true the literature has recently begun to agree that in most examples of research, generalizing is permissible in one form or another from a single case (Flyvberg 2006; Ruddin 2006; Platt 1992). In the eyes of some, case studies are chosen explicitly to study one unit intensively in order to be able to generalize amongst a set of larger units (Gerring 2004).

Much of the Canadian immigration literature is composed of case studies (Lewis 2010; Preston et al. 2009; Sherrell et al. 2005). For issue-based research or policy based-research, at the local or provincial level, case studies remain the tool of choice for immigration research. Part of the reason for this is the locally based nature of the settlement and integration process of newcomers. Put simply, immigrants settle in communities.

Thanks to the fragmented nature of Canada’s intergovernmental settlement policy framework, communities across Canada, both within and between provinces have different services and different service levels available to newcomers. In addition, because of the contractual nature of CIC’s services, in which CIC outsources the delivery
of services to different NGO’s and institutions such as school boards, different organizations provide the same federal services in different communities (Richmond & Shields 2004). For example, in Kingston, Kingston Community Health Centres provides both the ISAP and HOST program, while the KEYS Community Employment Centres provides the Job Search Workshops (JSW). In contrast, in Halton Region, the Halton Multicultural Association (HMA) provides the HOST program, ISAP and Job Search Workshops (JSW). Similarly, with LIPS, depending on location, different governments or organizations have been the principle organizer. In Toronto, settlement service agencies have often taken the lead in different neighbourhood LIPs while in second tier cities such as London; it is usually the municipality (Bradford & Andrew 2011). Other locally-based factors like experience with diversity, concentration of certain ethnic groups and strong ethnic networks influence the settlement of newcomers.

Capturing complexities and explaining local nuances is central to understanding the intimate nature of the settlement and integration process, thereby making a case study, particularly useful. At the same time, the emergence of the LIP policy marks the first time Ontario and for that matter Canada have a comparable general settlement policy across multiple locations. This development coupled with the relative recent nature of LIPs makes ensuring case studies of LIPs are applicable to other places a worthwhile endeavour. Sticking with the notion that case studies can be generalizable (Gerring 2004), the research has been designed to achieve this goal (Objective 3 in Table 3.1). By studying one LIP, the aim was to be able to draw best practices and lessons in one place and ensure they are equally applicable and exportable to other LIPs. In doing so, the
research seeks to contribute to the continuing discussion on whether case studies have
general relevance beyond their specific cases.

3.3 Durham Region: A Unique but Under-Studied Case Study Area

Figure 3.1: Map of Greater Toronto Area

Source: http://www.urbancentre.utoronto.ca/gtuo/gta_cma_map.html

Located 50km east of Toronto, the research took place in Durham Region, Ontario, Canada (Figure 3.1). According to the latest census (Statistics Canada 2011), Durham has a population of 608,124, 22% of which is immigrants. Although Durham’s immigrant population has grown by 30% since 1996 (Earle 2008), the majority of immigrants living in Durham arrived prior to 1996 (CDCD & United Way Ajax-
Pickering-Uxbridge 2008). Despite the relatively small increase in the immigrant population, it has been concentrated in three places; Pickering, Ajax and Whitby (Table 3.2). Since 1996, immigrants have accounted for 18% of the overall population growth, with the rest coming from internal migrants from elsewhere in Ontario, and other parts of Canada. As a peripheral region of the GTA, Durham is a prime location for secondary migration in the GTA, especially for immigrants whose initial destination is the City of Toronto. Nevertheless, there are signs this is starting to change with more newcomers choosing Durham as their primary destination (CDCD 2010). Since 1996, Durham has grown 22% and its population is expected to reach nearly one million by 2031. This growth rate is five percent higher than the ten-year provincial rate from 1996-2006 (Earle 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>15,815</td>
<td>18,550</td>
<td>27,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington</td>
<td>7,755</td>
<td>8,130</td>
<td>9,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>21,875</td>
<td>21,565</td>
<td>21,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>25,110</td>
<td>26,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>14,475</td>
<td>16,455</td>
<td>22,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durham Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>94,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>113,395</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Canada (1996; 2001; 2006)

In terms of regional development, Durham has always been less urbanized than other suburban regions within the GTA (i.e., Halton, Peel and York), although it is currently transitioning away from its predominately rural and urban fringe landscape towards an increasingly commercialized and commuter region. Administratively, Durham has two
tiers of government: (i) the regional level, which provides planning, servicing, and financing for the region: and (ii) the eight municipalities of Ajax (pop. 109,400), Brock (pop. 11,341), Clarington (pop. 84,548), Oshawa (pop. 149,607), Pickering (pop. 88,721), Scugog (pop. 21,569), Uxbridge (pop. 20,623) and Whitby (pop. 122,022), which function on a local scale handling services such as local planning, tax collection and parks and recreation (Figure 3.2).

**Figure 3.2: Map of Durham Region**

![Map of Durham Region](http://www.screamworks.ca/halloween-events.php)

Durham is of particular interest because it is one of five regional jurisdictions within the GTA, the focal point of immigration in Canada (Andrew & Abdourhamane 2011). Although part of the GTA jurisdictionally, it has the lowest levels of immigration amongst GTA regions, making the size of its immigrant population comparable to second tier cities like Windsor and Hamilton. This puts Durham in an interesting position, as it is often included in the GTA conversation about immigration (Lim et al. 2005; Frances &
Wallace 1997). Yet its program and policy responses are much similar to regions or municipalities outside the GTA, further problematizing discussing the GTA as a single entity, as raised in Chapter 2. A case in point is Durham’s lack of participation in TRIEC, the only missing GTA region. In fact, within some research on the GTA, certain scholars have neglected to include Durham because of its comparably low levels of immigration (Di Biase & Bauder 2005). Other research has included Durham but noted its fundamental differences in comparison to the rest of the GTA (Lim et al. 2005). Further hampering Durham in the literature is its dual CMA identity (Figure 3.2). As part of the Greater Toronto Census Metropolitan Area and Oshawa Census Metropolitan Area, it is abnormally difficult studying Durham as a single entity, especially in statistical analyses relying on census data. With an increased focus on second and third cities in the immigration literature, Durham has received slightly more attention (Tossutti and Esses 2011; Walton-Roberts 2007; Frisken and Wallace 2003), nonetheless, it remains on the margins of the academic literature.

Local research boils down to a few community studies and one undergraduate thesis. The research arm of Durham Region’s social planning council, the CDCD has produced multiple statistical reports on immigration in Durham (Earle 2008; CDCD & United Way of Ajax-Pickering-Uxbridge 2008). Recently CDCD conducted a report on the integration of services within Durham, “Towards an Integrated Immigrant Service Delivery System: Research and Considerations for Moving Forward,” interviewing CIC funded and other service providers, laying out options for moving towards a more integrated immigrant service system (CDCD 2010). Although not specifically on
immigration, the CDCD has documented the fragmentation of services in the social services sector in Durham (CDCD 2009).

In the summer of 2010, a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) funded project conducted by the Welcoming Communities Initiative (WCI) completed an inventory of immigration services in Durham (Cullen & Clow 2011). This report noted the regional problems in this area including lack of cooperation and collaboration between service agencies. In doing so, it built on the concerns about regional governance as it related to immigration highlighted by Cullen (2009). Although around half of this research was carried out during the lifespan of LDIPC, most of it, with one exception (CDCD 2010), albeit with very brief reference, does not examine or assess LDIPC in any fashion.

Figure 3.3: Map of Greater Toronto Area and Toronto Census Metropolitan Area

Source:
3.4 Data Collection: Qualitative in Scope, Broad-Based in Nature

For years, qualitative research has been like the youngest sibling in social science methods. Fighting for attention and legitimacy mainly through advocacy, qualitative research has reached a period of maturity, finally being accepted as an established research approach (Crang 2005; Crang 2002). Generally defined, qualitative research is “any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification” (Strauss and Corbin 1990, 17). In short, the researcher does not try to manipulate a certain issue or phenomenon but instead seeks to explore how a phenomenon unfolds naturally (Golafshani 2003). Although this inherently makes a phenomenon messy or less manageable, it is a sign of good qualitative research when a study is able to build understanding of a particular phenomenon in this state (Winchester and Rofe 2010; Eisner 1991).

According to Patton (2001), qualitative research entails the researcher be immersed in the research to account for real-world change and be present before and after changes occur. By relying on the existing body of research and examining LDIPC from its inception, the research was able to document the changes in Durham’s settlement landscape between the pre-LIP era and post-LIP era. Of the three theoretical perspectives that inform qualitative research, the one applied in this research is interpretative (Lather 1992).

In an interpretative qualitative study, a researcher’s primary concern is how participants construct meaning of a phenomenon and how they perceive a phenomenon (Merriam 2002). The research utilized this perspective in two ways. First, the research described how Durham constructed its LIP officially (Objective 1, see Chapter 4).
Second, the research detailed how the sectors involved in the settlement and integration process interpret and perceive the local construction of LIPs as well as how they interact with LDIPC generally (Objective 1, see Chapter 6). Utilizing an interpretative qualitative framework yielded useful insights into the LIPs impact at a local level from a multiplicity of sources.

To establish a thorough representation of LDIPC, a mix of primary and secondary data collection methods were employed. Primary data collection consisted mainly of interviews. Objectives (Table 3.4) were designed to examine the impact of a re-formatted and re-booted local settlement policy on a sectoral and organizational basis. Interviews offered the most effective method for direct access to stakeholders, facilitating the opportunity to acquire the type of data needed to understand LDIPC’s impact on an individual organizational and collective basis. This way, as shown in the interview guides, participants could document their relations with LDIPC as well as sharing their overall impressions. Different interview guides were distributed to participants. Although most participants received the previously mentioned guide (see Appendix A), a second guide was developed specifically for officials from LDIPC, as it seemed futile to ask them about relations with themselves. Instead, a decision was made to develop a separate guide focusing on some of LDIPC’s most notable initiatives and the challenges it has encountered in the developmental process (see Appendix B). Guides reflected a semi-structured interview style, employed to ensure an adequate amount of structure and organization with enough freedom to adapt and change questions as need be during interviews (Dunn 2005). Guides contained both open and closed questions, as there were specific (LDIPC’s newsletter) and general (perceptions of LDIPC) topics, the research
explored. Secondary data collection included an analysis of LDIPC primary documents and an examination of local municipal and library minutes as well as other organizational newsletters or documents possibly containing information about LDIPC.

By definition, ethics refers to the moral conduct of researchers and their responsibilities and obligations to those involved in the research (Hay 2010). To ensure research is conducted in an ethical manner, each post-secondary institution has an ethics board, in which all research has to be approved and meet the highest of ethical standards, the Tri-Council Ethical Guidelines. Research began after approval from the Trent Research Ethics Board in July 2011 (see Appendix C). The recruitment strategy relied on previous contacts, developed from undergraduate thesis research and as a research assistant on a Welcoming Communities Initiative research project out of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT). After connecting with contacts, inquiries were made in regards to which individuals within each organization interacted most with LDIPC. If the organization had little interaction with LDIPC, contacts were asked to suggest which person would be suitable for an interview. In cases with no contacts, outreach was made to senior level people or to departments or individuals most likely to have something diversity related in their mandate. Participant selection was based chiefly on interaction with LDIPC. Some consideration was given to position, because it was important to account for LDIPC experiences at different levels, but interaction with LDIPC was paramount. Results were a mix of front line workers, program managers, and chief administrative and executive officers. This is permissible as it speaks to the different approaches each sector, dependent on their place, have taken to LDIPC. In most cases, participants were reached via e-mail, in others via phone.
Following connection, all participants were informed of the purpose of the project and the reason for contact. If they agreed to an interview, they were sent the appropriate interview guide (see Appendices A & B) and a consent form (see Appendix D). Participants were granted free rein in choosing meeting times, dates and locations. Interviews took place mostly in participant’s offices or workplaces, in certain cases in private homes, if there were no other venue options. Before interviews began, participants were informed of the purpose of the research, how the data will be used, provided a consent form and asked if they had questions. Participants were guaranteed anonymity in name and position. With informed consent, the interview started. Interviews ranged from 15 minutes to two and a half hours, with average length being just over one hour.

Challenges in recruitment pertained to awareness and familiarity with LDIPC. A number of potential participants had no knowledge of LDIPC and those who did had little idea of its purpose. The largest resistance stemmed from a select few individuals, who were not interviewed because they felt unable to answer questions objectively about LDIPC generally and LDIPC’s effect on their organization given their considerable involvement in LDIPC. It is important to note all potential participants were part of the sectors interviewed. Some participants were reluctant to partake citing insufficient involvement or outdated participation. Although participating in or contributing to LDIPC activities, participants felt they did not have enough to offer. Nevertheless, as pointed out in Chapter 6, many participants were re-assured after going through the interview guide with the researcher. Finally, the most common barrier to interviews was limited time. Some interviews never materialized because of time, individuals unable to
find time in their schedules. This applied to participants interviewed in a volunteer and employment capacity.

Interviews began in May 2012. The goal was to complete 50-60 interviews with key informants. Immigration services in Durham are provided by a combination of government agencies, groups, associations and organizations from the community. Durham’s immigration landscape can be divided into two categories. Specific organizations have a mandate to serve explicitly newcomers. The specific is composed of two types of organizations; formal organizations typically CIC funded including CDCD, Durham District School Board (DDSB), Durham Catholic District School Board (DCDSB), Durham Region Unemployed Help Centre (DRUHC) and Northern Lights Canada and informal organizations like ethno-cultural as well as faith-based organizations (Table 3.2). Non-specific organizations have a general service mandate that comprises newcomers but diversity is often only addressed voluntarily.
LDIPC’s mandate covers settlement. Traditionally, settlement is understood as being the domain of specific organizations. However, as noted in Chapter 2, with the change in thinking around settlement policy and the advent of the welcoming communities’ philosophy, settlement is beginning to be understood in broader terms (Esses et al. 2010). In many ways, LIPs embody this philosophy and reflect the change to a broad-based settlement policy. Therefore, multi-sectoral participation including specific and non-specific organizations was critical to establishing a reflective and representative sample of LDIPC. In total, 52 interviews were completed with 39 organizations. As illustrated in table 3.3, the largest number of participants came from the municipal sector followed closely by ethno-cultural sector and libraries while the sector with the highest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Specific or Non-Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Council of Durham</td>
<td>ISAP, NSP, HOST, SWIS</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Multicultural Resource and Counseling Centre of Durham</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham District School Board</td>
<td>LINC, ESL, SWIS</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Catholic District School Board</td>
<td>LINC, ESL, SWIS</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Region Unemployed Help Centre</td>
<td>JSW</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Lights Canada</td>
<td>JSW</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Cultural organizations</td>
<td>Provide an array of cultural and social festivities.</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-Based Organizations</td>
<td>Provide some settlement functions</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Municipality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Tier Municipalities</td>
<td>No formal services, some such as Ajax have diversity policies.</td>
<td>Non-Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Dedicated diversity staff and diversity policies.</td>
<td>Non-Specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
representation percentage was libraries, trailed by municipalities and employment services. A list of all participating organizations can be seen in Appendix E.

Table 3.4: Interviews by Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>Number of Organizations Interviewed</th>
<th>Number of Organizations in Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Boards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-Based</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Cultural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As LDIPC marked Durham’s first attempt at a regional approach to immigration, the interview sample tried to ensure regional representation from each sector (Objective 2). Unfortunately, this was met with mixed results. Only in the library and school board sector was regional representation achieved, it was nearly achieved in the municipal sector. In the ethno-cultural sector, only organizations from Ajax, Pickering and Oshawa were interviewed. Although this is less than half of Durham’s municipalities, to a certain degree, this is unavoidable. Based on historical settlement patterns, only specific places have given birth to ethno-cultural organizations. Unlike say settlement services in Durham, which are concentrated in southern municipalities, there is no linear geographical pattern to the ethno-cultural sector make-up. How LDIPC addresses this issue is examined in Chapters 6 and 8. Consequently, here, it is near impossible to produce a regionally representative sample. Depending on how regionally representative is defined, regional representation was or was not achieved in the settlement or employment service sector. The only settlement service agency interviewed was a
regional service provider while four of the five employment service agencies were also
regional service providers. Not every location of these organizations was interviewed but
participants were able to offer answers regional in scope. Regional representation was not
applied to faith-based organizations as the priority was multi-faith participation.

3.5 Data Analysis: Searching for the Impact of LDIPC

When complete, interviews were transcribed. Transcripts, notes taken during and
after interviews and primary documents formed the basis of the data set. Data was
analyzed with a focus on the three categories outlined in Table 3.1, governance,
regionalization and localization of immigration policy. Objectives were designed around
these categories and interview guides were structured around objectives. Before analysis
began, transcripts were examined to ensure they corresponded with the objectives. Data
were coded manually with the purpose of meeting the objectives and answering the
research questions laid out in Table 3.1. Transcripts were coded thematically based on
how they applied to each objective and what themes emerged, relevant to the research
questions outlined in Table 3.1. Attention was paid to the origins of the themes, whether
they were from an organization, a sector or multiple sectors. Questions designed to help
achieve certain objectives assisted in organizing data and identifying themes. Although
most analysis was qualitative in nature, there was a minor quantitative element, totaling
the nature of each organization’s relationship with LDIPC. To maintain authenticity of
the data, specific quotations are used throughout the findings chapters.

As objectives were tied to conceptual categories, themes related to each objective
by default and were slotted into these conceptual categories. Findings are presented over
the next four chapters, all under-pinned by at least one conceptual category, as shown in
Table 3.4. Chapter 4 describes the mandate and purpose of LDIPC as well as its notable initiatives according to LDIPC documents. Chapter 5 moves deeper into LDIPC operations, expanding its primary source foundation beyond LDIPC documents and focusing on the executive-community balance that sits at the nucleus of LDIPC’s structure. Chapter 6 looks at LDIPC’s external relations, more specifically, its relationship with each sector and its terms of engagement with organizations. Chapter 7 explores both sides of the regionalization coin, regional municipal involvement and regionalization as a policy. Lastly, Chapter 8 compares primary findings to the conceptual foundations laid out in Chapter 2, examining how they intertwine and interact, in the process, highlighting the contributions of the research and areas for future research.
CHAPTER 4
Durham Region Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council: The Official Story

This chapter describes the official purpose of LDIPC (Objective 1). Using primary documents including consultation papers, commissioned research papers, LDIPC meeting minutes, strategic plan documents, copies of The Citizen, presentation materials by LDIPC staff or council members, pamphlets from LDIPC events and CIC Call for Proposals, the goal is to set the context for the subsequent findings chapters, which will explore multiple facets of LDIPC (Objectives 2 & 3). As the tone of this chapter will be much more explanatory than critical, quotations from participants have been used sparingly unless they help explain a certain event or initiative. The chapter begins building on the LIP background established in the previous chapters by looking at the varied nature of LIPs across Ontario highlighting where Durham Region fits into this context. The next section outlines the origins of Durham’s LIP focusing on its various stages of development. The third section will delve into LDIPC’s most notable initiatives including uncovering its core philosophy aimed at building more diversity competent organizations in multiple sectors in Durham.

4.1 Durham’s Place on the LIP Spectrum

Currently, there are 35 LIPs across Ontario and although this definition can be applied generally, there is significant variation in the mandate, composition and scale of each LIP. The Ontario branch of CIC has rolled out different LIPs to different places at different times. The first call for proposals was issued February 6, 2008 with a proposal submission deadline of May 6, 2008. This call was open to all places with the exception of Toronto, however, there was a very strict criteria established for acceptance of
proposals (CIC 2008). Applicants, comprising municipalities, settlement service agencies and large social service organizations, were instructed to develop applications to build partnership councils within their communities that were to be planning and senior policy development bodies with an eye to coordinating service provision rather than service delivery. In subsequent calls for proposals, these restrictions were loosened to give the freedom to some LIPs to act as service providers if they so choose or if needed (CIC 2013). As a result, the responsibilities of each LIP are not necessarily the same, although there are common elements (CIC 2010).

In the original call for proposals, there was flexibility given to what type of entity could create a LIP. Either a municipal or regional government or an established community organization could submit proposals. Regardless of who was submitting the proposal, there had to be representation from either a community group or municipality in some capacity (CIC 2008). Alterations were also permitted by communities that had either existing employment or social service based partnership councils related to immigration to add to their existing council. For instance, a consortium of settlement service providers leads the Peel Region LIP with a municipal seat on the council whereas the Regional Municipality of York leads the York Region LIP with settlement service providers as a representative on the council (Burr 2011). These set-ups are a reflection of CIC’s localized approach to the composition of the LIPs.

A separate call was made specifically for Toronto LIPs on April 3, 2008, the primary difference being, Toronto LIPs were being accepted at a neighbourhood level as opposed to a municipal or regional level across the rest of Ontario (CIC 2008). Toronto had 17 LIPs in individual neighbourhoods that report to one regional LIP with a unique
structure. As identified in Chapter 2, as of December 2011, the neighbourhood model was scrapped, replaced by four regionally based LIPs across Toronto (Bejan & Black 2012). Still, Toronto is the only geographic entity with more than one LIP, as other places (has dictated by CIC’s eligibility criteria) were permitted one LIP per geographic entity.

Where does Durham Region fit in this maze of LIPs? The Regional Municipality of Durham applied in the first calls for proposals and was notified of its successful application as of June 2008 (LDIPC 2008). The Region of Durham partnered with the Community Development Council of Durham, Durham’s social planning council and largest settlement service provider and the Durham Workforce Authority (formerly the Durham Region Labour Training Board), the primary source and researcher of local labour market data. The Region of Durham is responsible for the vast majority of the deliverables in the CIC contract (LDIPC 2011). Unlike the City of London or City of Toronto, the Durham Region did not have a partnership council prior to the LIP policy. LDIPC marks the Region of Durham’s first foray into the policy area of immigration or diversity and the first time Durham Region has had a regional body responsible for immigration in any form. Durham Region is one of four regionally based LIPs in Ontario, the others being Peel, York, Niagara and Waterloo. The one unique element of LDIPC compared to the other Ontario LIPs is how it defines diversity. For other LIPs, diversity is defined specifically within the context of immigration. In Durham, LDIPC broadens this definition of diversity:

The LDIPC defines diversity in the broadest sense of the word recognizing that there are intersections of diversity and that a plan to integrate newcomers could and should, be leveraged to improve the integration and engagement levels of all members of a community including newcomers, the disabled, youth, seniors, women, the gay lesbian bisexual transgender community and all other marginalized populations.
According to participants, this was both an inclusive and strategic decision made at the onset of the development of Durham’s LIP application. Yet, as indicated by the Community Plan (LDIPC 2011), efforts to integrate the needs of the broader diversity community will occur over the longer term.

4.2 The Origins of the LIP in Durham Region

Although Durham Region did not have a partnership council in the pre-LIP area, the Region of Durham did signal interest in the area of diversity by mandating the establishment of a “Regional Diversity Committee” as a regional council resolution in December 2007 (Durham Region 2007). Besides a couple of statements about “representation of relevant regional departments as well as appropriate partners” (Durham Region 2007, 13) and the development of a diversity strategy to coordinate existing services and create new initiatives, few details are provided as to the mandate, shape and structure of this committee. In fact, many participants had little idea as to what would have transpired with the proposed Regional Diversity Committee had the opportunity for the LIPs not occurred. Shortly after learning of CIC’s call for proposals for LIPs, the Region of Durham decided it made less sense to develop its own approach and more sense to combine its preliminary ideas with the concept of the LIP proposed by CIC. As one of the Co-Chairs of the LDIPC, Dr. Hugh Drouin, stated in September 2008, “these two events increased the incentive to move forward in addressing diversity in Durham” (LDIPC 2008).

As part of the first phase of the CIC contract the Region of Durham received in June 2008, an advisory group was established to oversee the formation of broad inclusive
settlement strategies and the creation of the Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council (see Table 4.1 for list of members of the advisory committee). In developing this committee, the Region of Durham had to follow strict guidelines from CIC that mandated the partnership council consist of a wide range of stakeholders from various sectors in the community (CIC 2008). The Region of Durham followed these guidelines as closely as possible especially in terms of institutions, however, as some participants conceded, for Durham, the foremost priority at this stage was to ensure all major institutions and organizations were on board to help facilitate “buy-in” for future LDIPC initiatives, thus, the committee was not entirely representative of the community.

**Table 4.1: LDIPC Advisory Committee (2008)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual (s)</th>
<th>Organization/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councilor April Cullen (Co-Chair), Councilor Colleen Jordan</td>
<td>Regional Municipality of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Hugh Drouin (Co-Chair), Audrey Andrews, Kelly O’Brien</td>
<td>Social Services, Regional Municipality of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Lindenblom</td>
<td>Economic Development &amp; Tourism Department, Regional Municipality of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Koopmans</td>
<td>Planning Department, Regional Municipality of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Tyner-Cavangh</td>
<td>CAO’s Office, Regional Municipality of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Richards</td>
<td>Durham Region Police Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Shahid Alvi</td>
<td>University of Ontario Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Blanchard</td>
<td>Durham College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Fillion, Rick Lea, Heather McMillan</td>
<td>Durham Region Workforce Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Vaughan, Ben Earle</td>
<td>Community Development Council of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda Leach</td>
<td>Lakeridge Health Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Taylor Simpson (consultant)</td>
<td>ProAct Ideas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Under the guidance of the advisory committee, over the course of summer 2008, preliminary consultations consisting of sixteen key informant interviews and several focus groups were conducted to gain a more comprehensive understanding of diversity issues in Durham and what direction a partnership council might take (LDIPC 2008). The findings of these consultations were summarized in a community consultation paper, “Durham Region Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council: Proposed Themes and Action Strategies,” (LDIPC 2008) released widely to the public and numerous service providers seeking feedback on the initial findings. Included in the paper were not only feedback forums to comment on or add to the initial strategies but also an opportunity for any of the recipients of the paper to either host a focus group with a facilitator provided by the CDCD or the opportunity to participate in an in-depth interview (LDIPC 2008). To ensure all residents of Durham were able to access this feedback process, assistance was also provided for those who required feedback in a language other than English.

Consultations continued with an all-day community consultation held on Friday October 17, 2008 at the Heydenshore Pavilion in Whitby. The purpose of the event was to bolster ongoing consultations by bringing together what LDIPC describes as a “broad range of stakeholders, residents, and service providers,” (LDIPC 2008, 1) to “share knowledge as we develop a diversity and newcomer strategy for Durham Region” (Roger Anderson, i).² According to regional records, over 100 people attended the event (LDIPC 2008). The day was headlined by a keynote speech by Ontario’s Fairness Commissioner

---

² As of 2008, Roger Anderson was (and still is) the Chair of the Regional Municipality of Durham as chosen by Regional Council. This quote is sourced from a formal statement positioned at the beginning of a welcome package participants received the day of the presentation. Anderson’s statements are reflective of the Region’s support.
the Honourable Jean Augustine and consisted of an information update from the Region of Durham on LDIPC, multiple panel discussions and an opportunity for participants to offer feedback on an array of issues related to LDIPC moving forward.

Following the October consultation event, LDIPC conducted additional small group consultations with what it calls “hard to reach and special interest groups” (LDIPC 2008, 1). During the consultation period, CDCD released two research reports “Profile of Immigration and Ethnocultural Diversity in the Region of Durham” (CDCD & United Way of Ajax-Pickering-Uxbridge 2008) and “Understanding Immigrant Integration: A Discussion Paper” (Earle 2008) that helped inform the process. The consultation stage for this phase of LDIPC concluded November 21, 2008 with a final report, “Durham Region Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council and Proposed Action Strategies: Final Report” (LDIPC 2008) highlighting the recommendations made for the first phase of the two part planning process. In early 2009, the advisory committee evolved into the interim Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council (LDIPC). Despite the title change, there was no change in membership or personnel, although there was increased responsibility given to the interim LDIPC.

The next phase of LDIPC started on a separate CIC contract beginning February 1, 2009. This phase involved a focus on the work of the partnership council and the design and development of a detailed settlement work plan focused on how to implement the broad strategies in the Final Report of the first phase of LDIPC (LDIPC 2011). Building on the priority areas set out in the Final Report (LDIPC 2008), LDIPC began consultations specifically for its work plan developing an online survey and commissioning CDCD to conduct a research and literature review, the outcome of which
was two reports, “Diverse Voices: Understanding the Experience of Immigration in The Region of Durham” (Earle et al. 2011) and “Towards an Integrated Immigrant Service Delivery System in Durham Region: Research and Considerations for Moving Forward” (CDCD 2010).

As part of Ontario’s Municipal Immigration Information Online (MIIO) program, in early 2009, LDIPC was awarded $535,600 from both the Ontario and Federal governments, to develop a community-integrated portal acting as an online one-stop shop for any information on diversity and immigration in the Durham Region (durhamimmigration.ca). As part of the development of the portal, more than 60 service providers and community members were brought together to develop content for the portal. The portal was officially launched on March 11, 2010 with the development stages of the project informing aspects of LDIPC’s work plan.

In May of 2010, LDIPC released an expression of interest to expand their membership and move from an interim council to a permanent council. A call was put out looking for three representatives in the following sectors: business/industry, faith/ethnocultural sector and community members at large. Besides ensuring a representative from each sector as well as the involvement of community leaders and stakeholders, little criteria was provided as to how choices were made. Overall, eight new members were added, ten individuals maintained their positions and the council was re-shuffled to ensure each member represented a specific sector in the community (further details will be provided in the next chapter).

On March 24, 2010, at the Ajax Convention Centre, LDIPC hosted an interactive full day workshop to provide an update on its various initiatives and give community
stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback on the development of the work plan. Over 100 attendees got to comment on LDIPC’s draft work plan both verbally and on paper as LDIPC provided feedback forums along with paper copies of the draft.

At the conclusion of the workshop, it was announced the work plan was to be released in the fall of 2010. However, due to a few setbacks, the plan was not officially launched until March 4, 2011, when a public event was held at the Ajax Convention Centre to celebrate its launch. In sum, what is known officially as the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan was the product of nearly two years of consultations and research that included, according to LDIPC, “more than 500 individuals representing thousands of constituents” (LDIPC 2011, 5), and comprised a multiplicity of consultative methods.

4.3 The Role of LDIPC: Steward not Service Provider

For Durham Region, the development of LDIPC marks a number of firsts. It is the first time the Region of Durham has been formally involved in the diversity or immigration policy area. It is the first time an entity, regardless of leadership or composition, has been responsible for looking after any issues related to diversity or immigration at the regional level. It is the first time an advisory body has created a broad-based coalition of different sectoral representatives designed to make Durham a welcome community outside the settlement service or ethno-cultural sector. Well there are other diversity-based councils in Durham, Ajax Diversity and Community Engagement Committee and the Whitby Ethno-Cultural and Diversity Committee, LDIPC’s mandate and financial resources far exceed either body.
As outlined in the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan (LDIPC 2011), the purpose of the LDIPC is as follows:

The Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council’s primary purpose is to act as a community advisory body lending direction to the development and execution of a Diversity and Immigration Community Plan for Durham Region that will improve the settlement and integration experience of Durham residents. The LDIPC will aim to create alignment of newcomer and diversity initiatives and services. The development of a local plan will allow for the utilization of best practices, sharing of resources and avoiding service duplication. The framework of the LDIPC will ensure the best use of Durham Region’s community resources and services.

(LDIPC 2011, 21)

Within this purpose, the Community Plan outlines four objectives that guide LDIPC’s work.

1) To create a culture of inclusion
2) To improve labour market outcomes for newcomers residing in Durham
3) To attract and retain newcomers to Durham Region
4) To enhance Durham’s settlement capacity

(LDIPC 2011, 10)

Combined, these four objectives are the DNA of LDIPC. They direct and determine the nature and scope of all LDIPC activities. Any document outlining LDIPC activities, whether it be meeting minutes from the council or the quarterly Citizen newsletter are organized along these four objectives.

Following these objectives, the ultimate goal of LDIPC is to encourage governments, business, organizations, boards, agencies, and civic society to embed the needs of newcomers (all populations) into local planning processes. LDIPC wants organization’s strategic plans and planning processes to align with the Community Plan. The first step to making that happen was to develop a plan that identified and was reflective of community needs around immigration and diversity. The next step is to assist the community, in most cases on an organizational level, in varying capacities to
achieve the objectives and priority areas laid out in the Community Plan. LDIPC works with individual organizations to meet their internal diversity objectives; which in turn, moves the community closer to achieving the objectives in the Community Plan. LDIPC is responsible for certain deliverables under its CIC contract, nevertheless LDIPC is not exclusively responsible for the implementation of the Community Plan, it is the collective responsibility of the residents and organizations of Durham Region (LDIPC 2011).

Despite this, LDIPC has no authority to direct or mandate that organizations aspire to this goal or participate in this process. Organizations must willingly and voluntarily commit to working with LDIPC on their own terms. As to whether LDIPC approaches an organization or an organization approaches LDIPC; that varies and is dependent on each individual case. Therefore, the basis of most of LDIPC’s activities is by default collaborative. There are few initiatives that can be identified solely as LDIPC initiatives, with three exceptions, the “Durham Diversity and Immigration Community Report Card,” the quarterly *The Citizen* newsletter and quarterly “Funding Opportunities Update for Non-Profits.”

The idea for the “Durham Diversity and Immigration Community Report Card,” emerged from the consultations for the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan (LDIPC 2013). The report card is intertwined with the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan, serving as a measuring stick for the objectives of the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan. According to LDIPC (2013), the report card is designed as a tool capable of acting as a marker for success of diversity in Durham at large. The primary report from this initiative was released in May 2013. For the purposes of this research, the report card will receive little mention for the following reasons. One, the
report card was very much in the development stages from the start of this research including during the data collection stages. Two, despite designing an interview guide geared towards specific LDIPC initiatives (see Appendix A), only three participants made any mention of it. Lastly, the report card is designed to measure progress on diversity as it relates to the broader Durham community, not the role of LDIPC, as is the focus of this research.

According to its inaugural issue, released in June 2009, the purpose of the newsletter is “to communicate with the community on the activities of the Council, share information about the work going on in the community, showcase providers, residents, and governments that are working towards the development of a more inclusive and welcoming community in the region” (The Citizen 2009, 4). The Citizen reaches nearly 20,000 people and subscriptions are available in print or electronically. Participants reported both LDIPC soliciting articles for the newsletter and volunteering articles as it serves as a great promotional tool for organizations.

The purpose of the funding information update is to help organizations navigate the funding landscape by notifying them of funding opportunities from various funding bodies. The update contains an easy to read table comprising the name of the funder, description of and contact information for each funding opportunity as well as the deadline. The update was designed as part of LDIPC’s objective to increase Durham’s settlement capacity by supporting the activities of the non-profit sector in the Durham Region. In some cases such as the Devi Mandir, a Hindu Temple in Pickering, information gained from this notification has led to the reception of funding grants.
The LDIPC acts in a myriad number of ways to assist organizations and the Durham Region community in building their diversity competency. Later chapters, particularly Chapter 6, will get into specifics but generally LDIPC has acted as a convener and host for a number of diversity events and initiatives while helping build organization’s diversity competency through expert feedback, providing diversity resources, grant writing, grant endorsing, diversity training and information workshops as well as sitting on different organization’s board or committees in a consultative capacity.

As indicated in Chapter 2, LIPs are completely federally funded. As of 2011, the cost per LIP ranged from $59,500 to $553,600 for one year (CIC 2011). According to CIC (2011, 7), “the average cost during the intense initial development period has been $226,000.” LDIPC’s funding has varied on an annual basis from a maximum $599,832 for fiscal year 2011-2012 to a minimum of $354,511 for fiscal year 2012-2013 (Table 4.2).

**Table 4.2: LDIPC Annual Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>CIC Funding Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>$553,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>$553,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>$599,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>$354,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/disclosure/grants/menu-reports.asp

Until fiscal year 2012/2013, funding was fairly consistent. Although no specific reason was found for the sudden drop in funding, a few participants did mention CIC had made across the board ten percent budget cuts, which they doubted LDIPC would have escaped. Additional inquiries did not confirm or deny this. Although general funding sums are disclosed, LDIPC has not released any documentation detailing where or how
these funds are spent. Nevertheless, to provide some idea, CIC has compiled data from all LIPs to give a general picture of how LIP funds are allocated (Figure 4.1)

Figure 4.1

### Average LIP Expenditures (2011)

- **LIP Staff**: 57%
- **Administrative and Overhead**: 19%
- **Research and Consultants**: 10%
- **Knowledge Transfer and Community Outreach**: 8%
- **Travel**: 3%
- **Partnership Council Meetings**: 2%
- **Translation and Interpretation**: 1%

Source: CIC 2011

4.4 Summary

This chapter has sought to explain the development and purpose of the LIP policy initiative and LDIPC, using primary documents of LDIPC, in order to establish a perspective on what LDIPC is intended to do. Although there have been instances of describing LDIPC’s activities in practice, this has been done primarily in a non-critical light and only to develop an understanding of the wide range of activities LDIPC engages in. Doing so has enabled a foundation to be set for subsequent findings chapters where specific elements of LDIPC introduced in this chapter will be further analyzed and
discussed in Chapter 5 ("The Inner-Workings of LDIPC: Community Perceptions and Experience") and Chapter 6 ("A View from Below: LDIPC Sectoral Interaction").
CHAPTER 5
The Inner-Workings of the LDIPC: Community Perceptions and Experience

This chapter examines the LDIPC model. Drawing primarily on the results from the thematic analysis of interviews with all sectors and utilizing primary documents such as terms of reference, meeting minutes and strategic plan documents where appropriate, the purpose will be to seek insight into how the structure of LDIPC developed and how it interacts with the various sectors involved in settlement and integration at an executive and community level (Objective 1). Although part of the chapter will be devoted to describing specific elements of the LDIPC model, it will build on rather than replicate the framework of LDIPC established in Chapter 4. Beginning with a breakdown of LDIPC, the chapter documents the role and purpose of the executive driven council as it relates to LDIPC’s activities. The second section focuses on the community reception of the executive council mostly in regards to its composition sectorally. The third section discusses the evolution of LDIPC’s structure as it relates to community engagement and participation concentrating on LDIPC’s working groups. The fourth section continues the theme of community engagement exploring alternative channels and connections to the community outside of the working groups.

5.1 The Purpose and Structure of LDIPC

As LDIPC is not a service provider in the traditional sense of the word, focusing more on planning and policy as opposed to program development and delivery, its structure is unique within the settlement landscape. Because of its collaborative nature, LDIPC’s structure contains several components with different sometimes-overlapping
purposes responsible for the execution of the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan. One of these components is LDIPC’s executive council (Figure 5.1).

**Figure 5.1: LDIPC Structure**

Evolving out of the original advisory committee responsible for managing the development of LDIPC itself, the executive council’s primary function is to oversee the development and execution of the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan by
lending direction, support and expertise. Officially, members’ responsibilities are to
“provide executive leadership, the wisdom of experience, sector specific knowledge, and
overall direction” (LDIPC 2011, 21). The nature of the council’s work as described by a
participant from the Inter-Church Immigrant Support Group (IISG), “the council should
not be doing the work so much as facilitating what others are already doing in those
sectors and encouraging it.” According to a participant from Durham College, “a lot of
work happens outside of the meetings to push the agenda forward and to push funding
proposals forward, for sure… but certainly the staff people from the Region do a lot of
legwork to move the agenda forward.” Based on this type of mandate, LDIPC is
populated mainly with senior level people. LDIPC meets throughout the year with the
exception of July and August at least five times for two to three hours. The composition
of the present council is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Lindsay Coolidge</td>
<td>External Relations Associate</td>
<td>University of Ontario Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Mary Blanchard</td>
<td>Dean, School of Interdisciplinary Studies and Employment Services</td>
<td>Durham College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Caroline Nevin</td>
<td>Branch Manager, Uxbridge</td>
<td>Scotiabank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Member at Large</td>
<td>Ali Juma</td>
<td>Training Supervisor</td>
<td>Durham Children’s Aid Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer/Service Provider</td>
<td>Dianne Miller</td>
<td>CHRP Manager</td>
<td>Lakeridge Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Skills and Training</td>
<td>Heather McMillan</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Durham Workforce Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocultural/Francophone</td>
<td>Keith Hernandez</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>KAH Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Municipal Government</td>
<td>Terry Clayton</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Township of Brock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Board</td>
<td>Martyn Beckett</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Durham District School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Services</td>
<td>Ben Earle</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Community Development Council of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Pam DeWilde</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Inter-Church Immigrant Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Donna Bright</td>
<td>Chief Librarian and Executive Officer</td>
<td>Ajax Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>Bruce Townley</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Durham Regional Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Municipal Representative</td>
<td>Tracey Vaughan-Barrett</td>
<td>Director, Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>Town of Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Kasia Chojecki</td>
<td>Manager of Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Region of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>John Koopmans</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Region of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Deborah Skinner</td>
<td>Accessibility Coordinator</td>
<td>Region of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Janice Bogdan</td>
<td>Manager, Public Health Department</td>
<td>Region of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>Dr. Hugh Drouin (Co-Chair)</td>
<td>Commissioner of Social Services</td>
<td>Region of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Council</td>
<td>Lorne Coe (Co-Chair)</td>
<td>Regional Councillor</td>
<td>Town of Whitby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.durhamimmigration.ca/about/ldipc/Pages/Members.aspx
Criteria for LDIPC membership is based primarily on sectoral representation. In the spirit of the Welcoming Communities philosophy, the executive council “is representative of institutions, organizations and/or sectors” (LDIPC 2011, 24) within Durham region that reach a wide spectrum of populations to ensure contribution from and connection with most Durham residents. In terms of the specific composition, LDIPC must follow certain guidelines as part of its CIC contract. According to CIC,

The partnership council must include the participation of a wide range of community stakeholders including the municipal and/or regional government, community organizations, settlement agencies, language training providers, local associations, and employers. Other relevant partners could include sector councils, regional newcomer employment networks, and economic and economic development corporations.

(CIC 2008, 5)

Within this framework, up to 14 of the 17 members of LDIPC are required to represent institutional stakeholders and sectors in the community, leaving the positions of Community Member at Large, Ethno-Cultural/Francophone, Business and Member of the Faith/Cultural Community open to choosing by a recruitment selection sub-committee of LDIPC through way of a public call. Only once, following an announcement in the June/July 2010 edition of The Citizen, have these positions been filled. Member terms are two years with LDIPC reviewing membership as needed or an annual basis. According to the guidelines outlined in the Immigration and Diversity Community Plan, besides the minimum required for sectoral representation, there is no fixed numbers of seats, in the language of the plan, “seats will be added or replaced as deemed appropriate by the LDIPC” (LDIPC 24, 2011). Different circumstances may require different stakeholders and membership terms are designed to accommodate this.
Despite setting terms for a fluid membership, there has been little overturn in the organizational composition of the council. With the exceptions of the Ajax Public Library, the Public Health Department of the Region of Durham, and the Town of Whitby, all organizations from the original LDIPC have retained their seats. That said, there has been considerable personnel change as UOIT, Lakeridge Health, CDCD, Durham Workforce Authority, Durham Regional Police Services, Accessibility Committee of Durham Region and Economic Development department of Durham Region have all changed their LDIPC representative. External members also have been added. A participant from the IISG explains, “but they have just opened it to a few new members, I don’t know what they call them. A representative from recreation, culture, and sport is coming, federal representative coming, the woman from Service Canada, they (LDIPC) recognize that is helpful to have the funders at the table and hear the conversations and what the plans are.”

In terms of the composition of council, it is regionally representative of all eight municipalities in Durham as well as the Regional Municipality of Durham. Through the designated seats, every sector in one way or another is based in a certain municipality or serves a particular municipality. In addition to geographic diversity, LDIPC is comprised of over a dozen sectors within Durham region, representing a multiplicity of organizations and people. In the mould of the welcoming communities philosophy, for the most part, LDIPC has brought together specific organizations, CDCD as well as DDSB and non-specific, Durham College and Lakeridge Health, involved within the settlement and integration process of newcomers. Given Durham Region’s disparate history of governance relations within the settlement sector as well as the lack of
cooperation and collaboration between specific and non-specific organizations (Cullen & Clow 2011; Cullen 2009; Earle 2008), this is a notable achievement.

5.2 “It’s Your Plan” or Is It? The Community-Executive Balancing Act

Based on its mandate, the number of senior people, 17 of 21, and the number of seats currently occupied by institutions, 15 of 21, several key informants characterized LDIPC’s operations as top down. A participant from the DDSB sees LDIPC as “more from what I understand more at a management/executive level. That is what I perceive it as.” Many participants who made this classification did not do so in a negative way. Observations from a participant from the Whitby Public Library indicate “I got the sense from the launch, that it was a lot of who’s whose, there was a lot of heads of and chairs of, which is great and you need that for profile… you kind of need that for buy-in and to move things forward.” A participant from Durham College affirmed this, stating “every project to make it work has to have champions.” When asked if LDIPC happened primarily at an executive level, one of the participating consultants replied “Yup, exactly. That’s it. So basically, there is nothing wrong with that. You can still do it that way but try and engage the community.”

This last quote perfectly illustrates LDIPC’s ongoing balancing act, trying to run an executive based council with primarily institutional representation while maintaining and ensuring community input, participation and interest. At this point, this balancing act is a bit lob-sided as several participants expressed criticism over LDIPC’s level of community representation and access. In the view of a participating consultant, “My greatest frustration with the LDIPC was that it seemed very top down, extremely disturbing especially in a community as small as Durham region. Well it is, as far as
players. I don’t think there is enough representation for the front line workers; I think there is a lot of senior staff…” Another participant from Northern Lights acknowledged certain components such as the immigration portal were community driven but were hesitant to attach the same label to LDIPC itself:

I feel bad saying that, but beyond that (the portal) I’m not sure if its community driven. I think you’ve got key players that are pushing it forward, the Region, CDCD, school boards and so you’ve got the big institutions which traditionally Durham Region, the school boards and Durham College haven’t been very community oriented.

A participant from the Canadian Polish Congress echoed this sentiment, “Community means a lot more than just say school boards or city council, regional council, who is the community they’re dealing with?” Similarly, a participant from John Howard Society posed the question, “it’s great to have [an LDIPC council member] on there and the whole she bang but is [an LDIPC council member] at the level of grassroots?” A participant from the Town of Ajax wondered something else about LDIPC, “where are your sort of civic representatives?”

Other participants mentioned the lack of representation from different ethnic and religious groups. According to a participant from the Durham Tamil Association, “to me, community driven means all players who represent the communities should have access and involvement but that has not happened.” A participant from the Ajax-Pickering Congress of Black Women demonstrates this “Certainly I don’t see anything on there (LDIPC) driven by the Black community, for instance, absolutely nothing. Are there any organizations on there in Durham serving the Black community?” In the eyes of a participant from the Indo-Canadian Cultural Association, “They don’t have anybody in that organization at a community level, they have perhaps a professor of university or
college who perhaps may look like me but doesn’t have experience as I do as a community organizer.” Finally, a participant from the Baha’i faith suggested the following:

I’d like to see more representation from MCOD, the Afghani community, the Chinese community, now they’re not direct service providers and that is the criteria they use. But I would like to see more representation from the ethno-cultural and religious groups because this is the backbone of the community in terms of diversity work.

5.3 Back to the Future? The Original LDIPC Model

Originally, LDIPC had proposed a model designed to accommodate community representation and facilitate community participation. LDIPC acknowledged early on in its development that it would be difficult to ensure full representation on the council while ensuring a workable structure (LDIPC 2008). Suggested by CDCD and confirmed through consultations, working groups were to be developed to address this challenge. As stated in LDIPC’s proposal submitted in May 2008 to CIC, working groups were to constitute an important component of LDIPC’s work: “To be effective the people at the table need to be supported by strong legs. A second tier of involvement would be comprised of working/reference groups that would help get things done and carry out the strategies and plans of the council” (LDIPC 2008). Membership of working groups was to be “very broad and inclusive” (LDIPC 2008) and developing working groups to support each of the council’s objectives was a key part of LDIPC’s strategy (LDIPC 2008). A participant from CDCD explains how this was intended to work in practice:

So even the structure of the LDIPC with having the council that reports to Regional Council but having all of the advisory groups (same as working groups) that was something we really wanted to ensure that even if you don’t hold a designated seat at the council itself, the council itself is almost just like the funnel. All of the information that is gathered by the working groups, which are the people on the ground who have the hands on experience; they are going to
collect all that intelligence and information and feed it to the council. And the council then has the opportunity because there are a lot of people around the table who can pull the levers, if something comes up that concerns [an organization on LDIPC], [that organization’s representative] can say great, I can address that! Implement that policy change and he will do that the information goes the council. We knew there was two really important perspectives. One, the heads of the organizations don’t know what the true challenges are, so we know that, how do we ensure that people are respected, front line people and those with lived experience are respected, included, and listened to but it’s one thing to just do that and have that as a table because it never goes anywhere. So we also had to make sure that there was a mechanism to get it to the people who could actually listen, respond, and make systemic change.

In March 2011, with the release of the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan, this model was still very much part of LDIPC’s strategy. As outlined in the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan,

Components of the Community Plan will be executed by working groups. The working groups could potentially be limitless giving the largest number of community members a role in the success of the plan. This model was designed in response to community consultations and is slightly different than many models adopted across the province.

(LDIPC 2011, 28)

When interviews for this research were complete, participants were asked whether they had a seat on, were invited to, or have heard anything about any of these working groups, 96% of participants said no (Figure 5.2).
Answers among respondents varied drastically. Samples of responses include “no (Baha’i’),” “no not yet (Indo-Canadian Cultural Association),” “I have no idea (Consultant),” “absolutely not, have not heard anything (DDSB),” and

No I was reading that in the terms of reference, there was something that and I thought oh, what type of working sub-groups did they have? Then I started to think, have I known anything about that? No

(John Howard Society).

A participant from the Durham Workforce Authority, one of the lead partners was under the impression that original model had been scrapped; “no I think that’s gone.” A participant from the other lead organization, CDCD, stated that “they haven’t implemented those working groups on a full level yet. I don’t know why, I can’t answer why or why not.” Although said participant was unsure why, they did speculate; “it probably has a lot do with resourcing and priorities…” In all LDIPC literature and updates since the launch of the Community Plan including an annual report released to
Regional Council on March 8, 2012, there were no references to the status of any working groups.

Yet, according to a participant from LDIPC, there are operational working groups. These include portal working committees, the governance committee of the Welcome Centres and a youth immigrant advisory committee. A participant from CDCD confirmed this, excluding the portal working committees, but affirming the other two committees to be working groups of LDIPC. This participant describes how the youth immigrant advisory committee functioned as a working group:

So the youth immigrant advisory committee, yes. So that did report to LDIPC and actually they did formal presentations to the LDIPC. So they you would hope would recognize they were doing work they did formal reports, so absolutely they were connected to LDIPC and informing the work of LDIPC. And what you will see in terms of programmatic responses for example is now in the Welcome Centre, there is now sort of a percolating youth piece that is happening here. So agencies who are serving youth, like the youth centre, like Northern Lights, other agencies are now meeting and strategizing based on responses that were collected through the youth advisory committee and report it to the LDIPC and the LDIPC came back and said okay, how do we figure out our programmatic responses. So between myself and my welcome centre manager, we take that information and we look at what we can do, we contact partners. So that is really how it works, the information is captured, its fed up, we talk about how we make some strategies, what are some intervention points we can do, and then we go after those intervention points. So for example, going in the new call, looking for where the funding is, where it isn’t, what other funding avenues do we have to be able to strengthen the infrastructure of the youth serving agencies. So trying to leverage those resources, so, the youth centre, for example, never had a particular focus on immigrant youth, now they are in the Welcome Centre, they are running programs here, they are collaborating with other immigrant serving agencies and they are looking at okay we could do this. Or we could that. And they are trying new things and I think it’s really exciting and it came from that new process.

Again, 96% of participants did not have any knowledge of these working groups.

In regards to the youth immigrant advisory committee, public notices were given looking for members; however, these were to be individual volunteers unaffiliated with
organizations. Moreover, in these notices, little was mentioned about any association with LDIPC. As for the governance committee of the Welcome Centre working group, that membership was pre-determined as the five lead agencies for the Welcome Centres comprise the committee. With the exception of the Durham Region Unemployed Help Centre, all other members sit on LDIPC. Interestingly, all working groups are the product of upper-level government funding projects. At this point, whether working groups could or would be developed separate from an upper-level government funded project is unclear. With that in mind, given the Regional Municipality of Durham’s relationship with upper-level government funding (see Chapter 7) and seeing as no participants mentioned the possibility of any new working groups independent of upper-level government funding, it seems unlikely.

In addition to the process of data acquisition noted about the immigrant youth advisory committee, the same participant from CDCD, highlighted a similar process for the governance committee of the Welcome Centres. Therefore, regardless of classification, data from these groups is reaching the work of LDIPC in some form or another. However, the specific work of these groups as far as it relates to LDIPC is consultative. LDIPC or members of LDIPC receive data from these groups and bring it to the LDIPC table, connect or gather the appropriate organizations or people and act on it. Perhaps this is the brunt of LDIPC’s role or the intended reach of LDIPC into the community but it may also account for what seems to be disconnect between community consultation and community representation as far as the relationship between the community and LDIPC goes.
5.4 Community Driven? Access to and Participation in LDIPC

This may partly explain the mixed numbers behind participants’ responses to the question of whether LDIPC was community driven (Figure 5.3).

**Figure 5.3**

Would you describe the process behind the design and implementation of the LDIPC as "community driven"?

- 36% replied that it was not community driven
- 31% believed it was community driven
- 14% were unsure
- 19% were unable to answer due to lack of interaction

N = 42

Of those who were asked, 36% replied that it was not community driven while 31% believe it was community driven. 14% were unsure and 19% were unable to answer due to lack of interaction with LDIPC. Collectively, the majority of participants in employment, library and ethno-cultural sectors all saw LDIPC as not community driven. On the other hand, the majority of participants in the school board and consultant sector believed LDIPC to be community driven with the municipal and faith-based sectors split equally.

As outlined in Chapter 4 and as verified by participants, the consultations for the Community Plan have been thorough and exhaustive. In the words of a participant from Durham College, “I think the community consultations have been well-received, well-
attended, the number of people on the street who attended those consultations was good, it wasn’t just people from organizations who were there, it was newcomers, and they were given a space so their voices are heard.” Likewise, a participant from the Town of Whitby stated that, “for initial meetings, there were large numbers of people from diverse groups invited to those forums at the beginning. So in that case, there was a broad community input from the start.” Even those who questioned how community driven LDIPC was such as a participant from the Baha’i faith acknowledged the inclusive nature of these consultations,

Community meetings to get community involvement and share what it was all about was extremely good. I attended both meetings and was asked to be, about four of us were on a guest panel. There was a person from the school board, person from the Region, there was another ethno-cultural group, and I represented the Baha’i faith as a community person. So in a nutshell, I think all of the prep work and the way they involved the community in setting up the LDIPC was extremely good. Very professional, well organized and very inclusive.

For participants, disconnect started to develop upon completion of consultations. As a participant from the Town of Whitby stated, “Since that March 24 forum (2010) that was like a full day event, I haven’t really heard anything. Very minimal.” Another participant from the City of Oshawa had a similar experience,

You know we left there (March 24 consultation), I don’t recall getting anything as a follow-up, summary, or anything like that and we left there and I think I did have the impression there would be at least something coming back to us. I don’t recall anything coming back out to us. To be frank, since that time, I haven’t heard much about the group.

Participants from organizations who sat on the portal committees, committees that LDIPC called working or advisory groups, felt a distance from the ongoing operations of LDIPC. When asked to describe the impact of LDIPC on Durham Region, a participant from the John Howard Society expressed their level of personal awareness,
Do I go out to the community and feel like the LDIPC is the talk of the town? No. Because again if that was the case than I would be more knowledgeable than I am and I am not.

A participant from META Vocational did commend LDIPC for the support provided to their organization but acknowledged a lack of awareness about the executive council, “I don’t know much about the council, I have never gone to a meeting, I don’t know what they do there.”

Lastly, one of the participating consultants expressed the following,

The LDIPC committee should have something else, and I don’t know much about it. Do they meet? How often do they meet? I know there was a plan distributed a long time ago. As a committee member myself (portal), besides the portal and that consultation they had because consultation is a planning tool, they should have an initiative or program and help organize/execute to say they have done this as a committee.

As evidenced by portal meeting minutes, updates on LDIPC activities are provided; whether the connection is made between the portal and LDIPC is debatable as is the role participants feel they are playing in LDIPC.

If an organization does not sit on a portal committee, opportunities for staying up to date with LDIPC’s activities, following its progress and seeking opportunities for collaboration decrease. Besides an annual progress report sent to Regional Council and not posted elsewhere, there is no central place that updates the public on LDIPC’s activities or the status of its projects. Periodic updates of LDIPC activities related to special events or funding announcements are listed in The Citizen. Until late fall of 2012, minutes from LDIPC meetings were inaccessible publicly because of in the words of a participant from LDIPC “time restraints and a technical glitch dating back to November 2010 that has not been fixed or resolved.” Although LDIPC meetings date back to November 18, 2010, presently, only minutes starting from the September 2012 meeting
are posted. In the case of meeting minutes from LDIPC’s working groups, they are still not currently posted. Although it is unknown if meeting minutes were taken at the immigrant youth advisory committee or are taken at the governance committee of the Welcome Centre working group, as shown to the researcher, meeting minutes are recorded for the portal committee working groups. Why these are kept private especially considering other LIPs such as Simcoe County’s publicize and post their working group minutes is unknown.

In the views of most participants, the actual LDIPC meetings were private. When asked if LDIPC meetings were public, a participant from the IISG responded, “no, I don’t think so.” Asked if the meetings seemed private, a participant from Northern Lights stated “yeah and I don’t think we’ve received an invitation to attend any of the council meetings.” A participant from the Town of Ajax echoed this, saying “there weren’t any opportunities (to attend).” When inquired about the public nature with one of the lead organizations, Durham Workforce Authority, the following discussion occurred:

Researcher: From my understanding, those are private meetings, correct?

Participant: Would the general public be invited, no I don’t think so. I don’t think it would be offensive if the general public attended as observers in my mind. I don’t believe it’s on the Durham Region’s website or anything like that, like the other meetings the Region typically has. So no. But I’m not sure I’m real comfortable with the word private. Because I don’t think the public would be asked to be excluded.

Researcher: Okay. How would you describe it? Like say I wanted to attend the next meeting, would I be able to do that?

Participant: To sit and observe?...

Researcher: (Yeah).

Participant: … I think absolutely. I think a quick e-mail to the chair, I personally feel they would be thrilled to have someone there as observers. But I don’t
think they would go out of their way to make it a public process. Because they certainly approach them in a manner I would expect municipal governments to approach their meetings. The only thing I think they don’t do is post them on their website.

With this example in mind, it should be noted all participants except those with seats on LDIPC had not attended a LDIPC meeting. Furthermore, according to LDIPC minutes, only two members of non-LDIPC organizations had attended a meeting as visitors. For some participants from organizations like the DCDSB and the Whitby Public Library, attending was not crucial as they were content with their sectoral representative on LDIPC. In theory, LDIPC members are asked to pass along all correspondence and opportunities related to LDIPC to their professional networks and the various organizations in the sector they represent. The rationale being that, organizations without an LDIPC seat still are aware of and have access to anything related to LDIPC’s activities. In practice, besides the library (Ajax Public Library), academic (Durham College) and faith (IISG) sectoral representatives, no other participants reported hearing from or receiving any LDIPC correspondence from their sectoral representative.

In effect, it appears LDIPC was not designed to be a grassroots body run by community-based participation. However, the executive design of LDIPC represents a drastic change for Durham, where historically, diversity work and settlement has been the domain of non-profit grassroots based organizations. As a participant from the Baha’i faith highlights, “if you look at the history and all the work and accomplishments in terms of promoting diversity work and settlement, 70’s till this day, its been done by ethno-cultural organizations.” LDIPC is far from competing with these organizations; however, it has entered the same policy arena and, as outlined in its mandate, the key to its success means maintaining a community-executive balance. LDIPC requires community input
and participation to function most effectively. Because of its voluntary nature (which will be discussed in Chapter 6), perceived legitimacy in the eyes of the community is crucial. Presently, the balance, as evidenced throughout this chapter seems to be leaning towards the executive side yet as demonstrated by the following quote from a participant from CDCD, if success of LDIPC’s objectives is going to be attained, the balance must be more equitable.

Participant: I think the criticisms of them are legitimate but they do have to be balanced with some of the realities of the situation and the problem is, though to be fully fair to everyone who might levy criticism is there are very few people who have that inside track on any of this right? There are very few people who actually understand what’s going on with the LIPs.

Researcher: But don’t you think that is part of the problem?

Participant: That is part of the problem. To me, that is a problem. I agree and that is one of things I always talk to them about is you need the community to understand why what you are doing is valuable. Or else they are not going to support or buy-in. And that is something they haven’t done very well is build the community buy-in. That is something I don’t think they have done very well. Does it mitigate what they are trying to do overall? No. It just means they haven’t built the community capacity or buy-in they need to build to move forward properly.
CHAPTER 6
A View from Below: LDIPC Sectoral Interaction

The previous chapter examined LDIPC’s internal relations, this chapter will shift focus to LDIPC’s external relations, mapping LDIPC’s interaction with the sectors involved in settlement and integration (Objective 1). Part of LDIPC’s mandate is not to execute the objectives of the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan but rather to equip organizations, so they are able to meet the objectives of the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan. Depending on their sector and level of diversity competency, equipping takes on several forms. Because of this, it is worthwhile to understand on an individual basis how LDIPC has helped move organizations forward on the diversity file.

To do this, the first section of the chapter will chart, using seven indicators, the nature of interaction between LDIPC and each participating sector. Indicators were not chosen based on any LDIPC criteria. Instead, in order to develop a thorough and clear picture of LDIPC’s sectoral relationships (Objective 1), six indicators were chosen as they rank amongst the widest reaching, most visible and commonly identified LDIPC initiatives, hence, serving as easily identifiable comparison points, applicable to the widest range of sectors and organizations. The seventh indicator, results of a question about fairness of opportunity to participate, was included to see how participants viewed their opportunity with LDIPC given the nature of their interaction. Within each sector, if applicable, other forms of interaction were documented. As LDIPC is set-up on a sectoral basis, the findings of this section follow this structure. It should be noted that the consultants and settlement services sector are not included; consultants because they do not represent an organization and settlement services because the only organization
interviewed is CDCD, a lead partner in LDIPC and thus has participated in all selected LDIPC initiatives, hence, its interaction with LDIPC is unique compared to all other organizations. There should be no expectations that all sectors will have the same level and type of interaction. Although LDIPC seeks broad participation, it is also must act according to the priorities and needs outlined in the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan. Nowhere in the plan is there language about equality of interaction.

As far as LDIPC participation goes, LDIPC outreach is only part of the equation. Organizations have no obligation to participate and LDIPC has no authority to ensure participation. Outside the cornerstone LDIPC initiatives, it is expected that organizations interested in working with LDIPC contact them on their own initiative. The second section will analyze the nature of these terms of participation especially as it relates to the variability of interaction amongst different sectors and LDIPC’s communication methods.

As participation with LDIPC is voluntary, organizations must accrue a favourable cost to benefits ratio to ensure continued interest, as such, the final section will explore the benefits organizations have received from working with LDIPC. Although findings for this chapter will rely primarily on results from thematic analysis of interviews, primary documents from LDIPC like meeting minutes, terms of reference, copies of The Citizen and strategic plan documents have been incorporated where necessary.

6.1 LDIPC Sectoral Interaction: Employment Services

The employment services sector has had consistent interaction with LDIPC and strong participation in LDIPC initiatives (Figure 6.1).\(^3\) From the planning stages, employment services has been well represented as the Durham Workforce Authority is a

\(^3\) All figures in this chapter are based on the number of organizational responses not participants responses. As a result, the numbers will be smaller because there were fewer organizations than participants interviewed. Part of this is attributable to multiple participants from certain organizations, see Chapter 3.
lead partner in LDIPC and both it and Durham College were members of LDIPC’s advisory committee and interim council. Beginning in 2009, all participating organizations were invited to sit on the “Working in Durham” portal committee with the exception of the Durham Workforce Authority, which was asked to sit on the “Business in Durham” portal committee. As members of these committees, organizations worked together to develop content for their given section of the portal. LDIPC’s ability to bring together this sector to work towards a common goal is impressive given the previous lack of coordination and sometimes-minimal cooperation described by participants. In the words of a participant from John Howard Society, “literacy has a very clear idea of what service coordination means and we are still working on that in employment.” A participant from Northern Lights expressed similar concerns, “partially because of so many service providers that have been embedded in the community for so long to bring them together can be challenging. It can be complicated in Durham.”

Figure 6.1
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Participating organizations have been featured in *The Citizen* and on the portal. In the cases described, LDIPC was pro-active in contacting organizations asking if they would be profiled. For example, when META Vocational was asked whether LDIPC inquired about featuring their organization, a participant replied,

> Yes, they have offered many times. The funny thing is when you go to the meetings (portal meetings), they always re-enforce if you have something you want us to advertise on the portal or on *The Citizen*, let us know. So, we also have to take the initiative to help them with the information but they are pretty good, they seek it.

A participant from the John Howard Society replied similarly, “nope [an LDIPC staff member] sent us an e-mail and said would you like to, they are reaching out to different service providers, because if you look at every issue, it’s something different, right. Help Centre (another employment service organization), has their information profiled.”

Besides promotion, participating organizations were invited to LDIPC’s launch on March 4, 2011 and have attended multiple professional development sessions either hosted or co-hosted by LDIPC including portal demonstrations, Ontario Trillium Grant information/how to sessions and different presentations by cultural competency consultant Lionel Laroche.

Only META Vocational was not invited to and did not attend any consultations, this seems to be the product of a lack of awareness on LDIPC’s behalf, rather than intentional disregard, a participant from META Vocational explains,

> We were never left out. The first time I went to the Region for a meeting the Region didn’t even know about META, they had never heard about us and I was shocked because from what I understand they have been in Durham region for 13 years and they didn’t know who we were. And [an LDIPC staff member] can remember, the first time I met her, she said what does your organization do? And I told her and she said you have to get involved, we need to know more. And I was welcome and questions were asked and now they are quite aware of META.
Despite this, META Vocational and other participating organization all felt they had a fair opportunity to participate in and contribute to LDIPC initiatives. When asked this question, a participant from Durham Workforce Authority, responded, “yes, committees, consultations, info sharing,” while a participant from Northern Lights stated, “I think we get the invitations and we usually have someone attend pretty much all of those events, so yeah.”

Outside the six standard metrics used in Figure 6.1, the employment services sector has engaged in a number of forms of interaction. For instance, the Durham Workforce Authority collaborated with LDIPC and Durham Region Unemployed Help Centre to get funding for the Mentoring Partnership program designed to connect internationally trained professionals with established professionals in their field. According to a participant from Durham Workforce Authority, LDIPC played a significant role in acquiring funding for this program,

Most definitely, [LDIPC staff member] did for sure. As I seem to recall it was the three of them, [then executive director of Durham Workforce Authority], [executive director of Durham Region Unemployed Help Centre] and [LDIPC staff member] put the grant package together. I believe that was a joint collaboration between them. [LDIPC staff member] then also participated in the hiring of the staff that worked on the mentoring partnership.

In addition, in terms of funding, LDIPC has provided a letter of endorsement to META Vocational for a grant application, unfortunately, the application was unsuccessful. LDIPC staff and council members have attended different events of employment service organizations. In the case of John Howard Society, “they were there for our grand opening in Whitby, so they are very supportive.” For Durham College, “we had the opening of our Aboriginal student centre and a number of people from the council attended.”
Clearly, the employment services sector has had a high level of interaction with LDIPC. This amount of interaction may be responsible for the suggestion by a few participants that a staff member from LDIPC be invited to the table and perhaps given a seat at DREN, a coordinating body for the employment services sector for Durham Region. A participant from the Durham Workforce Authority provides the rationale,

And I think LDIPC whether it’s [an LDIPC staff member] or someone else can bring that bigger perspective into that (DREN) and into that community (employment services) because like you said, those people have been around for eons, the same players for 20 years. And some of those players will see immigrants, like [DRUHC employee], will see immigrants as a priority, and some of them are ok we need to deal with persons with disabilities. So now there is going to be a bit more of a carrot, actually, a carrot and a stick to bring in the LDIPC in a much more meaningful way. We just talked to her (LDIPC staff member) about it yesterday.

A participant from the John Howard Society affirmed this, “actually that came up at our last implementation meeting that [said LDIPC staff member] should be invited to the table.” Overall, a willingness to not only work with LDIPC but also invite LDIPC into their work reflects the sector’s general feelings towards LDIPC.

6.2 Sectoral Interaction: School Boards

Similar to the employment service sector, there has been strong outreach by LDIPC to school boards (Figure 6.2). School boards have also had representation via the Durham District School Board since the inception of LDIPC’s advisory committee and interim council. Both the Durham Public and Catholic Boards have been invited to or attended all designated outreach indicators. Differences amongst the school boards emerge when comparing participation and outreach between the two Durham boards and the Kawartha-Pine Ridge (KPR) School Board. Unlike the DDSB and DCDSB who have seats on the “Learning in Durham” portal committee and have other employees attend the
meetings of different portal committees, KPR does not have a seat nor has it attended any portal meetings. Moreover, KPR was not asked to participate in any of the consultations for the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan.

Regardless, varying levels of participation do not seem to have created any exclusionary feelings. When asked if they were given a fair opportunity to participate in and contribute to LDIPC activities, all school boards responded yes, with a participant from KPR describing LDIPC’s approach as “open and willing.” All school boards attended the public launch, been or have had one of their events featured in *The Citizen*, and attended a professional development session. Professional development sessions have varied amongst the sector with employees of DDSB participating in diversity training sessions by cultural competency consultant Lionel Laroche while the KPR attended a conference, “Exploring Social Innovation in Durham,” about different practices and models of social innovation.

**Figure 6.2**
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N = 3
Beyond the standard metrics, LDIPC staff attended an Equity and Diversity Gala hosted by KPR on May 10, 2011. LDIPC commissioned a language instructor from the DCDSB with federal and provincial funding to create a tool called “Durham Immigration Portal-based Curriculum: English Language Learning Resources,” designed to incorporate the portal’s resources into English language lessons and activities to be used by language instructors or volunteers to aid in orienting newcomers to Durham. Although they have not had a need yet, a participant from the DCDSB is aware it “can ask for letters of support” from LDIPC for funding applications.

6.3 Sectoral Interaction: Faith-Based Organizations

The faith sector was one of the final additions to LDIPC, gaining a seat, after the consultations, as the council was formalized just before its inaugural meeting November 18, 2010. Although this may partly explain why half of participating organizations contributed to the consultation phases, it does not seem to have affected outreach towards this sector (Figure 6.3). Each participating organization has had a seat on or contributed to the work of portal committees, nearly all have attended or been invited to LDIPC’s public launch, and have been profiled in *The Citizen*. In the case of *The Citizen*, most organizations have been asked to submit articles, a participant from the Devi Mandir elaborates, “we did with [LDIPC staff member], she is the one asking for articles about our upcoming events or what we are doing.” A participant from the Baha’i’ faith echoes this sentiment in relation to the immigration portal, “and [an LDIPC staff member] has approached me about some events and said, can I put this on the portal and I said yes.” Despite the nature of the sector’s work not always ideally aligning with professional development in the institutional sense, three quarters of the organizations have
participated in professional development sessions. All organizations believed they had a fair opportunity to participate in and contribute to LDIPC initiatives.

Figure 6.3
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Other forms of interaction include three places of worship of tours, November 24, 2010, September 20, 2011 and September 15, 2012 that included members of LDIPC, with both the Devi Mandir and IISG participating. A participant from Forest Brook Community Church describes the benefits,

> Although the LDIPC has done a couple things in the past year, to grow the council’s awareness and community leader’s awareness of the faith element. For example, they have organized 2 tours of faith communities, where they take council members and community leaders around to faith representatives to a Mosque to the Hindu Temple, Christian Church, the Synagogue, and they get presentations given to them about each of those different faiths, which really helps to create a good sense of awareness, it’s a really good thing to be doing.

LDIPC staff and members have attended and been invited to events held by both IISG and Devi Mandir. The Devi Mandir has discovered funding opportunities through LDIPC’s quarterly funding opportunities notification and LDIPC supplied a letter of
support for a Human Resources and Social Development Canada New Horizons for Seniors Program grant called “Growing Together,” that was successful.

Although LDIPC has had success in dealing with the faith sector on an individual organizational level, collectively, has proved more difficult. In early 2011, LDIPC convened a meeting of various faith groups in Durham in an attempt to examine ways to build communication and awareness amongst different faith groups (LDIPC 2011). Eventually, as described by a participant from IISG, this evolved into something more tangible, “so, yeah one thing LDIPC did was try and for, there was some federal CIC money available and we were trying to develop a grant for some type of multi-faith event.” In the words of a participant from IISG, LDIPC was extremely supportive, “so I would say for sure [said LDIPC staff member], put a lot into putting that together, she organized the meeting, she called the meeting, she did the horrible scheduling of when we can all meet, she gave us the room and was willing to do the research on the grants, so that was huge!” A participant from Forest Brook Church affirmed this, “[LDIPC staff member] from the Region, what they did say was we’ll give you an office, a meeting space, we’ll put our name behind it, you know Durham Region…The Region was supportive of trying to get it going.” Despite this, after multiple small and large meetings with different faith groups, the ad hoc group encountered difficulties moving forward, a participant from IISG explains,

Trying to force relationships to make us aware of each other, identify a priority this funding would meet or develop and it was a bit like trying to put a square peg in a round hole, because we really didn’t know each other and there was nothing bringing us together and it’s very hard even within Christian denominations to say this is the one thing we are going to do together.
At the time interviews were completed, this initiative was stalled, in the words of a participant from the Baha’i faith, “it’s been over a year,” since there was any movement. Multiple participants attributed this to inactivity on the faith sectors behalf. As a participant from the Baha’i faith put it, “it’s not very active because she (LDIPC staff member) tended to rely on community groups.” This expectation was seconded by a participant from Forest Brook Community Church, “what they’re (LDIPC) waiting for is for faith leaders to step up.” Both participants are not necessarily inaccurate in this judgment but this example speaks to the limitations of LDIPC’s model. Based on what participants have communicated, LDIPC has done everything in its capacity to get this initiative off the ground with the exception of doing it itself and this is where LDIPC’s boundaries begin, it requires, perhaps is even dependent upon, said community organizations, regardless of their sector, to take responsibility and move initiatives forward, without that, the initiative, whatever it may be, stagnates.

6.4 Sectoral Interaction: Municipalities

Since its inception, LDIPC has had strong municipal representation with a municipal representative on the advisory committee and interim council and although not technically designated as a municipal representative, a Regional Councillor because as a Regional sub-committee, LDIPC shares Co-Chairs with the Durham Region Health and Social Services Committee. This has ensured regional representation throughout LDIPC’s development as regional councilors from Oshawa, Ajax, Whitby and Brock have been LDIPC members at different stages of its development.

Yet, in practice, regional representation at the executive level has not translated into regional awareness of LDIPC and regional participation in LDIPC initiatives. For
instance, two indicators with the highest level of participation, portal membership and consultations, all municipalities except Scugog or Uxbridge, two of the three most rural municipalities, participated (Figure 6.4). The next highest indicator, public launch, indicates a similar story as Scugog and Uxbridge were not invited and did not attend. Moving down to the next highest indicators, promotion and professional development, participation and awareness shrink further. In addition to Scugog and Uxbridge, Clarington and Oshawa have not been featured on any of LDIPC’s promotional platforms. When asked if they were familiar with *The Citizen*, a participant from Scugog replied “no” while a participant from Oshawa responded “no not at all.” Conversely, LDIPC has solicited articles for *The Citizen* from Ajax and Pickering. According to a participant from Pickering, this is a common occurrence,

> They (LDIPC) will often send us e-mails just reminding us that you know they will welcome any contributions we make. That is really good too because we get so busy with what we are doing, you think of wait a minute, we have an opportunity to promote something, a good news story, so it’s nice they remind us too.

Ajax, Oshawa and Whitby have participated in professional development sessions, albeit different ones. A participant from Ajax mentioned employees of Ajax attending workshops on “how to speak the html language and how to make amendments to the actual portal.” Alternatively, a participant from Oshawa stated, “one of my staff did a workshop on grant writing that came from them and that is the only thing I can recall (workshop participant referring to is one by OTF, the LDIPC hosted on March 5, 2012).”
Despite the variation in interaction, the majority of participants agreed they had been given a fair opportunity to participate in and contribute to LDIPC initiatives. In the words of a participant from Ajax, “yeah, they’ve been very good in terms of providing ongoing updates and we are certainly kept in the loop.” A participant from Pickering stated, “yes, I don’t think we have ever been excluded.” Again, this sentiment was far from universal as when asked, a participant from Oshawa replied, “not really, not if I am not aware of it.”

Other forms of interaction were limited to Ajax and Whitby. Ajax consulted LDIPC during the planning stages of its own Diversity and Community Engagement Plan. A participant from LDIPC explains, “the Regional Plan is more high level and the local plan reflects local needs – therefore there is no duplication. The local and regional plans should complement each other – and align and they do.” Ajax and Whitby co-
hosted a customer service conference, which they invited an LDIPC staff member to
come and present on behalf of the immigration portal and LDIPC. Similarly, Whitby has
an LDIPC staff member as a representative on its Ethno-Cultural and Diversity Advisory
committee. Whitby requested a calendar documenting all the various diversity holidays
and LDIPC provided one. LDIPC staff helped complete and contribute expertise to a
grant application from Human Resources and Social Development Canada called “New
Horizons for Seniors: Immigrants and Newcomers Support Services” for $23,180
submitted by the Town of Whitby Senior Services, which was successful.

Municipalities need a baseline level of awareness to be able to make requests to
LDIPC, nevertheless, it should be noted that Whitby was the only municipality to contact
LDIPC with specific requests on its own terms. With this in mind, the only
correspondence from LDIPC that has reached all municipalities in Durham, according to
public records and participants accounts is a request for the municipal representative
position to be filled sent May 17, 2011 (please see Appendix C). Besides that, piecemeal
communication seems to have lead to varying levels of awareness and participation
amongst this sector. LDIPC has not contacted or met with either the Durham Region
Recreation Directors or the Durham Region CAO’s Group, both professional groups that
meet quarterly to discuss various issues.

6.5 Sectoral Interaction: Libraries

The library sector is the most recent sectoral seat addition to LDIPC, making it
the 18th representative seat (in LDIPC’s terms each sectoral seat is called a
representative) on LDIPC. The process of the libraries becoming a sectoral member is
unique, as it is the only sector to have requested a seat on LDIPC. The Library Executive
Directors Roundtable made a request in early 2011 asking LDIPC to expand membership to include libraries. After discussion about the importance of libraries as a point of contact and provider of services for newcomers, the libraries’ request was granted in summer of 2011 (LDIPC 2011).

Prior to this development, libraries interaction with LDIPC was limited. Indicators occurring before their request to be on LDIPC, consultations, invitations to portal committees and the public launch, demonstrate a participation or awareness rate of fifty percent or less (Figure 6.5). Still, comparatively delayed outreach attempts to the library sector by LDIPC do not seem to have harboured any ill feelings. In fact, when asked, libraries attributed the delayed outreach to themselves not LDIPC. As described by a participant from the Pickering Public Library,

And I just think it was because libraries are not networking, they are not networking for a purpose. They are not just networking to find out what’s happening that kind of thing and I guess it’s just telling people at a higher level what we are doing and pushing ourselves to be involved a bit more.

A participant from Scugog Public Library prescribed a similar reason, “but you know what, maybe it’s our fault too and maybe that’s something we talk about in the library community a lot, something that the libraries are not good at promoting themselves to the community in such a way that people understand what libraries do.” These claims were not only seconded by most libraries but are also bolstered by the fact that sixty-three percent of libraries believed they had a fair opportunity to participate in or contribute to LDIPC activities.

What may partly explain this response is the relatively recent increase in interaction with LDIPC. Since March 2011, participation has intensified beginning with LDIPC staff making a visit to the Durham Libraries Multicultural Alliance (DMLA).
This visit snowballed into a number of other collaborations, a participant from the Pickering Public Library explains,

And then [an LDIPC staff member came (to March DMLA meeting) and then she talked about what they (LDIPC) were doing and then wanted someone from the libraries on her community report card. And then I said yeah because I wanted to learn more. Then once I was on there she learned, wow you guys are doing a lot of things, someone should be on the board and I said yeah they should. And then a call went out to the CEOs and then [employee from Ajax Public Library] went on.

Different library members on LDIPC and LDIPC Community Report Card Advisory Group as well as LDIPC staff regularly attending DMLA meetings and making presentations to the Library Executive Directors Roundtable are all products of this meeting. Subsequently, other libraries have noticed increased outreach from LDIPC. For example, a participant from Scugog said, “I’d say it’s only been within the last year that we have been actively aware in terms of me having people talk to me, send The Citizen, and go to the Welcome Centre, so it’s just been within the last year we’ve been connected with them.” Furthermore, although some were featured previously, libraries, have recently gained increased exposure in The Citizen (LDIPC 2011; LDIPC 2012). Other forms of interaction include the Pickering Public Library requesting contacts of LDIPC from diverse communities and Ajax Public Library asking LDIPC to review and offer advice on diversity related policies.
In spite of this increase, there is still a gap in regional interaction. In terms of professional development, according to participants, only Pickering Public Library, Ajax Public Library and Oshawa Public Library attended either of the Lionel Laroche diversity training workshops while staff from Pickering did a Results Based Accountability training session. A parallel situation exists in terms of portal committees, where Oshawa Public Library, Ajax Public Library and Whitby Public Library have seats on portal committees. Although Scugog has seen a moderate increase in interaction, participants from other northern municipalities, Brock and Uxbridge reported having no interaction with LDIPC. Again, as with municipalities, only a few organizations, Pickering Public Library and Ajax Public Library have made specific requests to LDIPC on their own terms.

6.6 Sectoral Interaction: Ethno-Cultural Organizations

The ethno-cultural sector was one of the final additions to LDIPC, gaining a seat, after the consultations, as the council was formalized just before its inaugural meeting.
November 18, 2010. The ethno-cultural representative is rare in the sense that he does not belong to an organization within the sector he represents. This may explain why the ethno-cultural sector was the only sector that had not heard from or knew who their representative was. Clearly, based on the data, the ethno-cultural sector is an outlier (Figure 6.6). Only four organizations have shared interaction of any form with LDIPC, Indo-Canadian Cultural Association of Durham (ICCAD), Durham Tamil Academic and Cultural Society, Hispanic-Alliance of Ontario, and MCOD. In this group, only ICCAD, as a portal member, having attended most LDIPC events, having LDIPC attend their events and being featured in The Citizen has maintained consistent interaction with LDIPC.

Figure 6.6
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Outside this group, most organizations were unaware of LDIPC’s existence. As a participant from the Ajax-Pickering Congress of Black Women stated, “quite frankly, I didn’t even know it existed.” Another participant, from the Canadian-Polish Congress was in a similar position, “no, no one has gotten in contact as I said you (researcher) are
the first one who has actually brought this group into focus for us.” According to participants, through coincidence, COFRD and the Hispanic Alliance of Ontario had recently learned, months before their interview, of LDIPC. Organizations communicated that other organizations in their sector were unaware as well. A participant from the Canadian Jamaican Club of Oshawa elaborates, “no, I don’t hear about it (LDIPC). And I haven’t heard Club Carib talk about it either.” Speaking about organizations associated with Oshawa Folk Arts Council and whether they had heard anything about LDIPC, a participant from Club Loreley replied “nothing. No, this is the first time you know.” When asked this question, a participant from the Canadian-Polish Congress, provided the same answer.

A participant from the municipal sector observed the same reality:

The government funded organizations in that field, have a really good relationship with the council and I think there is a lot of ongoing exchange, so I think that is good. The very structured community group organizations that are diversity based like ICCAD, those kind of groups, I also see a very strong relationship. Maybe the less formally organized groups, I don’t really see a connection. So but then there are other groups like the Ajax-Pickering Italian Social Club and I don’t think their involved in any way and Hispanic Canadian Alliance of Durham I am not sure they’re involved, Congress of Black Women I don’t think they’re involved, you know there’s like, Durham Tamil Association, are they involved I am not sure, you know what I mean? So I think there is opportunities there.

Not surprisingly, only the ICCAD believed they had a fair opportunity to participate in and contribute to LDIPC initiatives.

Outside of participating organizations, LDIPC has connected with the Durham Chinese-Canadian Culture Centre (DCCC). The DCCC are members of different portal committees and LDIPC staff have facilitated a working relationship with Economic Development department of Durham Region which has resulted in them hosting a delegation from China to explore business opportunities in Durham (LDIPC 2011;
LDIPC 2012). This attention has not gone unnoticed, as a participant from the Durham Tamil Association believed LDIPC has placed an “overemphasis” on the DCCC. LDIPC has also developed an ethno-cultural listing directory posted on the immigration portal, listing ethno-cultural organizations in Durham contact information; yet, no participating organizations reported being contacted about this.

Given the ethno-cultural sector’s history of diversity work (Cullen 2009), relevance to and role in immigrant settlement (Cullen & Clow 2011), and its match with much of LDIPC’s mandate (LDIPC 2011), the question looms, why such minimal interaction? A participant from the Baha’i’ suspected that the lack of interaction with the ethno-cultural sector was a product of LDIPC’s explicit focus on “service providers.” This hypothesis would hold if it were not for LDIPC’s strong outreach towards the other voluntary sector on LDIPC, the faith sector. Another possible reason could be LDIPC’s concern, as a regional initiative whose primary actor is the Durham Region, about overstepping its jurisdictional boundaries. Most ethno-cultural organizations in Durham tend to operate mostly in their home municipality, rarely venturing outside of it (Cullen 2009). When asked about this suggestion, a participant from the municipality of Whitby said, “I don’t know if that’s the case, they haven’t expressed that.”

Although they had not expressed it, because ethno-cultural organization’s activity generally tends to stay in their municipality, they usually have closer relationships with their home municipality and since Durham Region has never had a relationship with ethno-cultural organizations prior to LDIPC because they have never fallen under regional jurisdiction, has the jurisdictional divide of the two-tier municipal system
impeded LDIPC from pro-actively contacting ethno-cultural organizations because they operate at a lower-tier municipal level? A participant from CDCD speculates,

The issue there has probably less to do with the diversity issue specifically and has more to do with the way regional government works with local municipalities. And that is one of those political things that is not going to be overcome just because a LIP wants it overcome. That is one of those territorial and jurisdictional issues that is always going to be a problem in these types of things and I don’t know how we overcome that. I am not sure.

If this were the case, this would shed some light on why LDIPC have, according to lower tier municipalities, who have worked with ethno-cultural organizations for decades, not made any inquiries about ethno-cultural organizations.

The latter raises an important question: is the lack of outreach a product of inexperience? Previously, in a Durham Region report from November 2007 (Durham Region 2007), the Regional Municipality demonstrated limited knowledge of the ethno-cultural sector after describing the bulk of immigrant and diversity related initiatives in Durham, it referred to activity in the ethno-cultural sector in the following way, “this report could not possibly capture all the activities celebrating and promoting multi-cultural and ethno cultural diversity by independent organizations and the faith based communities.” This explanation would be more plausible if LDIPC had not compiled an ethno-cultural listing and had not connected with a select few ethno-cultural organizations.

As a self-designated political body (LDIPC 2013), is LDIPC being politically cautious about not choosing an ethno-cultural organization for the ethno-cultural/francophone representative for fear of being seen as unfair? If LDIPC picks one ethno-cultural organization, it may be perceived as playing favourites. How does a body aiming to be inclusive justify one ethno-cultural organization over another? This
rationalization would stick if LDIPC had not chosen one faith based organization, the IISG, a Christian denominated organization, as its faith based representative.

Ultimately, whatever the reason, lack of outreach does not seem to have dampened interest in connecting with LDIPC amongst participating organizations. A participant from the Ajax-Pickering Congress of Black Women stated, “I would be really interested if they were aware of us and they tried to reach out to us. What they do could be valuable to us.” When asked if LDIPC was worth looking into, a participant from Club Loreley responded, “its worth looking into, yeah.” Although some organizations such as the Canadian Jamaican Club of Oshawa are a bit perturbed, “why all the funds they get, we are supposed to outreach?”, they still indicated interest in connecting, “I am going to make sure that we, now that you explain this to me, we find out how we can join them.”

6.7 Part 1 of the LDIPC Participation Equation: Voluntary

Evidently, there is great variability in the level of interaction between the participating sectors; from lack of awareness of LDIPC’s existence to complete, consistent contact at an in depth level. Variability to some degree is not necessarily a problem as different organizations are at varying levels of diversity competency. However, too much variability may lead to mixed understandings of the purpose of LDIPC and little awareness of the type of possible collaboration with LDIPC. Variability is amplified by LDIPC’s communication methods. Besides The Citizen, which does contain periodic updates about LDIPC activities but is not primarily a newsletter for LDIPC activities, communication is targeted at different organizations when something is deemed relevant or useful. According to a participant from LDIPC, as followed by the findings of the consultations, by design, there is not a general e-mail list serve that
provides updates on LDIPC activities. Hence, with the exception of the recently posted LDIPC minutes, there is no channel to follow LDIPC activities.

At the same time, LDIPC has no authority to exercise to ensure participation. For organizations, there is no obligation to participate in any LDIPC led or joint initiatives. Furthermore, the responsibility falls to organizations to take the initiative to connect with LDIPC for assistance or participation. There are some exceptions to this such as the portal or Citizen where most organizations have been asked to participate or are generally aware because of the broadly-based and wide-reaching nature of each initiative. Beyond this, organizations must connect on their own terms. Thus far, self-prompted uptake has not been high. When asked, only 28 percent of organizations reported making any outreach to LDIPC. This statistic differs from a claim made by a participant from LDIPC, who stated LDIPC has been “inundated” with requests for their involvement. Of course, as demonstrated by the first five sections of this chapter, certain organizations have reached out to LDIPC; however, these organizations represent a minority of participants. Perhaps this level of outreach is attributable to a lack of awareness of outreach options.

In many cases, organizations who have not reached out, considered doing so, when the option was proposed during the interview. Asked about whether Northern Lights had made any inquiries about resources or research from LDIPC, a participant responded, “nothing at all. In terms of research, I’ve never even thought to go to the LDIPC for research.” When asked if the City of Pickering had considered soliciting input for their recently completed cultural directory, a participant stated “nope. Probably could of. Probably a missed opportunity not to involve them.” After the researcher explained
many of LDIPC’s functions, a participant foresaw opportunities for reaching out to LDIPC:

But when certain things come up, like recently legislation has changed which affects us tremendously in terms of trans-gender access to washrooms and change rooms. We didn’t know where to turn to get the information, if I had thought a little more going back a few years, or gone on the portal, I think this group would have provided us with a speaker or resource to help us figure out how to create our new approach to this. Because we need to change a lot of procedures.

Questions that emerged out of this part of the findings included: is lack of awareness of how LDIPC can help organizations develop and implement their diversity policies a factor in limiting outreach to LDIPC? Because of targeted interaction, do employment services know that their diversity policies could be reviewed by LDIPC like the Ajax Public Library did? Do ethno-cultural organizations know they can request a funding reference letter from LDIPC like Devi Mandir did? Based on the level and type of interaction described by different organizations, there seems to be a real possibility they do not especially considering that LDIPC has not highlighted any of these examples in any of their publications or postings, besides talking to other organizations, how would organizations learn about these options? The collaborative nature of LDIPC’s work further impedes awareness as from an observer’s point of view it is difficult to identify what role LDIPC plays in its initiatives. In LDIPC material of any medium, little explanation is devoted to explaining its contribution. The absence of any centralized communication detailing and updating LDIPC activities complicates matters further.

In the earlier stages of LDIPC’s development, this situation may have been less problematic as LDIPC was in the process of establishing itself and participant involvement boiled down to a few key initiatives. During this time, many of LDIPC’s current communication techniques were developed. Yet, now with LDIPC having been
fully operational for almost two years, it has entered a new phase, one in which centers on meeting the objectives of the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan. An essential part of accomplishing this is equipping organizations to build their diversity competence. Consequently, it may be useful altering LDIPC communication methods; particularly, spotlighting LDIPC’s work as opposed to solely the community’s work and explicitly educating through a variety of mediums on the many ways LDIPC can help improve organization’s diversity competency. Doing so, may help facilitate increased participation, leading to a higher likelihood of achieving the objectives of the community plan.

6.8 Part 2 of the LDIPC Participation Equation: Benefits

Because of the voluntary nature of LDIPC participation, benefits are important. Due to LDIPC’s lack of authority, organizations are likely to make a costs-benefit analysis of their participation, the outcome dictating present and future participation. This makes understanding what benefits organizations accrue a worthwhile endeavour. As reported by participants, by far, the most cited benefit is networking. A participant from the John Howard Society describes their experience, “and I go back to that, the beginning of the portal, for me, I was new in the world of employment services and that was a very valuable experience for me to be working around the table and to have that opportunity to contribute and really get to know some of the other service providers.” For a different reason, a participant from the Oshawa Public Library felt the same way, “one of the best things that has happened is that they bring all these different people to the table and it gives us a chance to share and brainstorm because all of us we’re the rabble-rousers back
home, we’re on the front lines we can make things happen up to a point and that’s how things seem to get done here.”

A by-product of networking has been increased awareness of other organizations in immigrant settlement and within each sector. According to a participant from the Ajax Public Library, they learned more about other organizations, “I didn’t know the school board or police had a diversity officer.” This increased awareness has led to subsequent partnerships with DRPS. A participant from Ajax describes an increased awareness of diversity activities in other communities in Durham

Because I had no idea really beyond our confines in the Town of Ajax what other communities were doing in the way of diversity. So, we every time we meet do a check in to and everybody talks about what’s been going on, in only a few months it’s always astounding just how much work is being done. Sometimes in isolation, sometimes in partnerships but it’s always really really good to hear the stuff going on.

Awareness has played out in other forms, specifically, increased cultural diversity awareness. In many cases, this is the result of diversity training sessions hosted or coordinated by LDIPC. After attending a session by Lionel Laroche, a participant from the Pickering Public Library had this to say,

Yeah that was the thing we did attend. I took the HR manager and I took a whole team of staff because we are talking about being a more diverse workforce. So the first piece is talk about, he was wonderful. Staff were so excited about it and they were telling other staff about it because we didn’t realize the barriers people were facing. And I thought, there was just so many eye openers to me, that has just been great. And it was great for staff because they understood more about the tensions that might arise inadvertently, so it was a great session.

Attending a similar session, a participant from DDSB had a very positive experience,

I was at the most recent one in Ajax. Fantastic, absolutely amazing, very worthwhile. Of interactive workshops to have someone a professional with that expertise to come and speak to the frontline workers and have the frontline workers there sharing the information. So more front line is what we need but
Lionel Liorache, he was exceptional, there was a lot of ideas I got from him and thinking about things.

Promotion via LDIPC’s platforms was another benefit mentioned by participants.

A participant from Ajax highlighted the benefits of *The Citizen*,

Yeah, they have *The Citizen*. We’ve used on different occasions to highlight events here at the Town of Ajax. And that has been a promising practice for us just because the publication has gained momentum, we make it available now at our front counter when it comes out. Again, just getting the word out.

Similarly, a participant from the DDSB, outlined the merits of using the portal,

Yeah. So one of things we don’t have anymore is marketing. So, we have to come up with very innovative ways to market the ELT program. So one of the ways is making sure we are in direct contact with the portal and having like ahh, having the newcomer success stories up there. That has been a huge gain for us. The other one is soon I’ll be putting on student profiles of jobs, that is something I want to go through the new head of the department, so we can have their profiles up on our website, so job searchers and employers in the area will see the profile and say ok this looks fantastic, let’s see if we can contact Alana and get a person up and running.

For a participant from the Devi Mandir, LDIPC’s platforms expanded the exposure of their organization,

The thing is, I think they sort of help out more with the media capacity side of it, sort of getting the word out there, which is an excellent help because they are reaching the broader community beyond our congregation members like we have a TV show and newsletter that goes out to the congregation members who know about us but they are helping build our capacity with the broader community.

Other resources LDIPC produces such as its quarterly funding update have been well received by different community organizations. A participant from the Baha’i faith heaps praise on this initiative,

What [an LDIPC staff member] is doing now and she is on the ball because part of their mission statement and mandate because is to provide any information to the not for profit sector and service providers, she has been giving out very detailed lists of organizations where community groups can go and get funding. Which I think is good because let’s face it the community groups are so busy
particularly the non-profits, they don’t have a lot of time and the expertise to do this kind of work. So, I think that is a very good initiative.

A participant from the Devi Mandir affirmed the benefit of this update, “they make us aware of grants that is out there, that is a major help to us.” KPR has benefited from LDIPC’s role as an information hub, “the school board is a large organization where maintaining community partnerships can be challenging with the sheer number of community organizations. As the LDIPC centralizes information and contacts, it can help KPR sustain and develop relationships.” Having LDIPC personnel sit on their Ethno-Cultural and Diversity Advisory Committee, has paid dividends for the Town of Whitby,

Having the representative on our town of Whitby committee is beneficial just to get the regional perspective. The abilities, resources, information that they have is useful because they are much further down the road than we are in terms of diversity than we are. And we are looking at more than just immigrants they can provide that information.

Participation in LDIPC has also helped cast certain organization’s perceptions in a new light. As illustrated by a participant from Forest Brook Community Church, “some of the spin-offs are by participating, the church does get recognized by other community members and leaders as a community leader.” CDCD has had a similar experience, a participant elaborates:

Participant: …it’s helped us build our reputation too. Part of our reputation comes from the fact that we are at that LIP table and we are being represented by the Regional Government as being experts in an area. Ever since the LIP started, we have had a lot of people from these organizations we may not have traditionally worked with get in touch with us about different projects. So it’s actually helped us make some connections, we might have had the connections in the past but probably not in the same way we do now. So the LIP has helped us make connections to help us further our mandate. And helped us build the partnerships we need to help further the community mandate.

Researcher: It’s helped other organizations you have worked with in the past see you in a new light?
Participant: Yeah I think so and I think its helped us see them in a new light as well. It goes the other way, we have engaged with different partners around the table in a different way than we have in the past because they are part of the LIP.

Variability is obviously a reality of LDIPC interaction thus far. Because of its broad-based nature and the varying levels of diversity competency throughout the sectors it works with in Durham Region, it does not look like this will change soon. Variability is to be expected as it is as much a product of the circumstances LDIPC is working in as something that can be solved or that LDIPC has control over. Variability should be treated not as a problem but something that has to be managed. Managing variability with voluntary terms of participation is challenging but the key to doing this successfully is ensuring participating organizations have a clear idea of their options and how to engage with LDIPC. Based on the results of this chapter, LDIPC, although still relatively new, needs to take steps to improve in this area. The data does not suggest LDIPC needs to change what it is doing but rather expand who has awareness of and access to what it is doing. The next chapter will examine how this variability plays out in a regional context and whether LDIPC has been given the tools to work effectively within it.
CHAPTER 7
“We’re Always Special:”
Regional Municipal Involvement, Regionalization, and the LDIPC

“We’re always special,” was the reply provided by a participant from DCDSB when informed of the unique situation of LDIPC, a regional scale with two tiers of municipalities, in comparison to other LIPs in Ontario. Although intended in a sarcastic manner, the participant’s response captures the ‘special’ circumstances LDIPC has had to develop from and operate within. Unlike other LIPs across Ontario, functioning at a neighbourhood or municipal level, LDIPC is one of a handful situated at a regional level. Instead of dealing with one municipality or none in the case of neighbourhood LIPs, LDIPC must manage eight lower-tier municipalities and one upper-tier municipality, unquestionably, complicating its mandate. The other part of the quote, the ‘always,’ alludes to the reality of dealing with policy areas on a regional basis is nothing new for Durham Region, established in 1975. Yet, as part of COIA, LIPs mark the first time most municipalities, at least formally, have been involved in immigration or diversity. Therefore, as the designated recipient funder of LDIPC, the Regional Municipality of Durham is confronting a policy area to which it has little experience. This represents the other ‘special’ circumstance. Together, little is known about either development or how they relate, this chapter will attempt to build understanding of each, thereby addressing Objective 2.

Charting the history of the Regional Municipality of Durham’s involvement in immigration and diversity, the first section will trace Durham Region’s evolution in this policy area, culminating in its decision to apply for a LIP. Next, given the inherent challenges of having Durham’s LIP at the regional level and CIC’s open proposal
process, the plausibility of other options for Durham’s LIP is explored. Following participants’ insistence that Durham’s LIP be at the regional level, the role of the Regional Municipality in LDIPC is investigated. The fourth section marks the beginning of exploring the other ‘special’ circumstance, delving into the question of whether Regional Municipal involvement has helped ensure regionalization and what regionalization looks like in this context. The following section takes this question one-step further examining if LDIPC has been able to achieve regionalization in practice. The final section asks if regionalization is feasible considering the variability of attitudes towards and approaches to diversity across Durham and the scope and variety of LDIPC’s tools to address these. Findings for this chapter rely primarily on results from thematic analysis of interviews, Regional municipal minutes, Regional municipal reports and primary documents from LDIPC compliment the primary data.

7.1 Prodded or Proactive? Regional Municipality of Durham’s Involvement in LDIPC

According to multiple participants and as verified via different primary documents, settlement and diversity work in Durham is not a recent development. As highlighted by a participant from the Baha’i faith, diversity work began decades ago, “if you look at the history and all the work and accomplishments in terms of promoting diversity work and settlement, 70’s till this day it’s been done by ethno-cultural organizations.” A participant from CDCD, the largest settlement service agency in Durham, verified this, “I do know there are people in this community, who have been doing diversity work in this community for decades, like decades. Since the 1980’s, CDCD has been working in that area (settlement work) since the 1980’s.” In the municipal sector, the City of Pickering first entered this policy area in 1987 with
Durham’s first Race Relations Committee, it acted as a committee of Pickering council. About a decade later, employing a similar model, the municipality of Ajax in 1997 and later the municipality of Whitby in 1999 introduced committees of their own.

Eventually, momentum reached the Regional level. In February 1999, a delegation including the Chair of the municipality of Ajax’s Race Relations Advisory Committee, a Race Relations and Ethnocultural Officer from DDSB and a local Vice Principal made a presentation to Regional Council recommending the creation of a Regional Race Relations Committee. More specifically, the delegation requested,

The Regional Municipality of Durham forms a Regional Race Relations and Equity Committee, with a paid coordinator to administer strategic plans and programs. The committee needs to adopt a proactive strategic approach to its race relations, antiracist education, human rights awareness, and equity and access work.

(Regional Minutes, 1999)

After reviewing the request via a Regional Municipal report, the following recommendation was made to Regional council, “that since the issue of race relations is of community-wide interest the focus should be external rather than internal and the leadership role of these groups should remain community based rather than government driven.” Another delegation with a similar composition made a presentation in 2002 to Regional Council with a comparable recommendation, nevertheless, with the same outcome (Regional Municipality of Durham 2007).

Interestingly, throughout the 1990’s and early 2000’s, not the same individuals but like minded ones pursued similar objectives with other institutions in Durham Region, notably, the DRPS and DDSB, albeit, successfully. A participant from the Canadian Jamaican Association of Oshawa, a member organization of the Inter-Agency Network, a group responsible for advocating for diversity causes explains
Participant: We wrote a letter to the chief (police chief) to set up a, because one of the things you receive is recommendation here also about setting up, recommend police commissioner thing and we read it to them and the chairman of the police and someone named brown met and then we had 4 people, the solicitor general came and then they implemented a multicultural policy, we (inter-agency network) had a lot of input in it. The police committee relations (diversity committee) was the first one in Durham and we were the ones who started, we had written to the chief and I remember one

Researcher: And that was why they developed their diversity action plan committee?

Participant: Exactly. The same thing with the board of education. [Then DDSB ethno-cultural and equity officer] was the first one to implement an inter-cultural policy because we went back to them, we go back and see there, we are not talking about waiting, we want to be pro-active and we want to be in the planning stages.

In part, because of their work, both the DDSB updated its policies on Multiculturalism and Ethno-Cultural Equity while the DRPS developed a Diversity Advisory Committee. Conversely, in the case of the Regional Municipality of Durham, resistance to advocacy efforts around diversity was particularly formidable. A participant from the Canadian Jamaican Association of Oshawa describes the resistance,

Our (Inter-Agency Network) strategy was concrete on municipalities because that is your first line and that is what we did for years. And then it helped us a lot. When you go to the Region, there are going to discuss it with the municipality. I believe in protocol. When we went to the Region, we went to the municipality first. Then after they accept us, we went to the Region. And that’s where they rejected us for a long time. I don’t know who is there now, but there was resistance to change more than anything else at that particular time.

This sentiment was shared by a participant from the Baha’i faith, “people in the Durham Region have lobbied the Durham Region to do diversity work for many, many years.”

The precise dates of when lobbying the Regional Municipality of Durham started and concluded is unknown, what is known is the date of Regional Municipality of Durham’s first official foray into any form of diversity work. Beginning in June 2006, the
Regional Municipality of Durham’s Social Services Department joined a consortium called the Durham Region Consortium of Partners Serving Immigrants (DRCPSI) (Durham Region Consortium of Partners Serving Immigrants 2007). The Consortium was developed first to ease integration of services amongst settlement and language service providers in Durham but its primary objective was to put together an application for Welcome Centres. In the words of a participant from CDCD, “it was about a year, year and a half into the consortium’s work that the Region started coming to the table.” Less than a year later, April 2007, Colleen Jordan, a Regional Councilor from the Town of Ajax, during a meeting of the Regional Health and Social Services Committee, requested a report highlighting diversity and inclusivity committees across Durham and if a committee of this nature should be developed at the Regional level (Regional Municipality of Durham 2007). Upon release, the report proposed that, “consideration be given to the formation of a corporate diversity committee and that staffing resources needed for such a committee be part of the 2008 budget (Regional Municipality of Durham 2007).” The one caveat to this consideration the report made was a “substantial financial commitment” would need to be made based on the experiences in other Regions (Regional Municipality of Durham 2007).

Consideration as to what a Regional Diversity Committee might look like continued until late November 2007 when a Regional Report was released outlining a possible model and structure while, most significantly, recommending a committee be developed (Regional Municipality of Durham 2007). The report made the following recommendations:
1) THAT, a Regional Diversity Committee be struck, with representation from relevant Regional departments as well as appropriate community partners
2) THAT, the Regional Diversity Committee oversee the development of a Regional Diversity Strategy that would;
   a) assist in coordinating existing diversity initiatives and
   b) develop new initiatives to contribute to the current and future integration of new immigrants in Durham Region; and
3) THAT, the committee be co-chaired by the Chair of the Health and Social Services Committee and the Commissioner of the Social Services Department.

(Regional Municipality of Durham 2007, 1)

On December 12, 2007, these recommendations were put before Regional Council and approved. Some time, between when approval for consideration began (April 26, 2007) and the notifications of request for proposals for LIPs were released (February 6, 2008), staff from the Social Services department of Durham Region learned about the LIPs (Regional Municipality of Durham 2009). Upon discovering this, the Regional Municipality of Durham in partnership with Community Development Council of Durham and Durham Workforce Authority, submitted an application for a LIP with the municipality as the primary applicant. Shortly thereafter, March 18, 2008 via a report, the name of the Regional Diversity Committee was changed to the Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council. The rationale for this was to ensure consistent language between the Regional Diversity Committee and the Federal Government, thus, boosting the likelihood of success of the application (Regional Municipality of Durham 2009).

Much work ensued on behalf of the Regional Municipality of Durham before they received funding from the Federal Government including community consultations and the assembly of an Advisory Group to oversee the process by which the strategy and the council were formed, ensuring it was “reflective of the broader community, considerate of the needs of all sectors, and was indeed community driven” (Regional Municipality of
Durham 2009). As a participant from CDCD states, “so there was Regional, I wouldn’t say the Region funded it, but they provided staffing and support to get it going before the federal funding came through.” Nevertheless, as underlined by a participant from CDCD, the Regional Municipality of Durham identified the need and committed to a diversity committee prior to the LIP RFP notification, “if you look at the history, it first became a committee of council, before the call. Before we got the money.” Other participants affirmed this.

The key question is timing, why, in June 2006, did the Regional Municipality of Durham develop an interest in participating in the immigration and diversity policy arena? When asked, this seemed to be a mystery to participants. In the words of one,

Where did the mandate come from people like [Durham Region staff member] to start looking at settlement? I don’t know. All I know is she started showing up at the table (DRCPSI table). I am not sure how that happened.

While the explanation for the Regional Municipality of Durham’s first step into diversity remains unclear, the reasons for establishing a Regional Diversity Committee and later applying for a LIP are not. Experiencing changing demographics over the past decade, participants identified this as a pull factor in the Regional Government’s involvement. A participant from CDCD explains, “I think the Region got on board with this stuff because it had to do with demographic shifts. They started to realize in the last ten years that their community was more diverse.” The other shift propelling Regional Government involvement is economic. Dependent on manufacturing, the Region’s economy was hardly hit by the 2008 recession, as mentioned by participants and LDIPC itself in its Diversity and Immigration Community Plan, LDIPC serves as a piece of a larger
economic development strategy designed to aid and enhance the transition from a manufacturing to a knowledge based economy (LDIPC 2011).

Another reason, or perhaps more accurately a factor, was the availability of upper level government funding. As established by participants, the Regional Government did commit to a Regional Diversity Committee prior to the RFP from CIC for LIPs. However, this commitment seems to be made with knowledge or awareness of upper-level government funding opportunities in this policy area. After granting a mandate to give consideration to the formation of a Regional Diversity Committee on April 26, 2007, little discussion or dissemination of what a possible committee may look like occurred, at least publicly until the release of a Regional Report recommending a committee be struck. By this time (November 29, 2007), the Regional Report recommended a particular model, a model that was chosen based on its “success in securing funding from CIC” in other jurisdictions (Regional Municipality of Durham 2007). The same report states, “informal dialogue with CIC has indicated that applications for funding for specific projects would more likely meet with success if they were part of a larger Regional strategy rather than a series of independent initiatives” (Regional Municipality of Durham 2007). The report continues “initiatives similar to that proposed in this report have been 100% funded. The funds are paid directly to the agency considered the lead of the specific project… No financial contribution would be made by the Region.” While not explicitly stated as such, together, these three components, the model, region wide diversity strategy and 100% federal funding, form the basis of what would become the LIP policy.
At the same time, CIC had indicated to the Region, that DRCPSI’s Welcome Centre proposal, submitted February 13, 2007 and pending when this report was released, would have a greater chance of success if part of a Region wide diversity strategy (Regional Municipality of Durham 2007). Participants from both school boards confirmed this.

This knowledge clearly seems to have influenced the Region’s approach, as there was little development of the Regional Diversity Committee prior to the decision to apply for a LIP and integrate the existing initiative into a possible LIP council. There was also a short period between the endorsement of a Regional Diversity Committee (December 12, 2007) and the decision to apply for a LIP (February 2008). Furthermore, within the report, there was no discussion of what may occur if the Region were unsuccessful in its funding procurement or what alternatives funding or otherwise may be considered. The Region does detail the minimal costs that would be incurred if they were able to obtain upper level government funding (Regional Municipality of Durham 2007).

In less than two years, the Regional Municipality of Durham has moved from merely dipping its toes in the diversity pool to jumping in the deep end, expanding its commitment to diversity from being a supporting partner in the DRCPSI to taking the lead as the designated recipient funder for an annual six figure multi-level government federally funded settlement and diversity initiative.

### 7.2 The Only Option? Durham’s LIP at the Regional Level

According to the RFP for LIPs, although CIC mandated the participation of municipalities in some capacity, it was not necessarily in that of the primary applicant (CIC 2008). In light of Durham Region’s cautious course of entry into the diversity arena
and it being far from the first organization engaged in diversity work in Durham, it is worth exploring if there were other options for the lead organization for Durham’s LIP. Exploration is more pertinent considering Durham Region’s variable settlement patterns. Currently, 96% of newcomers to Durham settle in one of the following four municipalities: Pickering, Ajax, Whitby and Oshawa. With only 4% going to the other four municipalities, can immigration or diversity be classified as a regional issue? Would it not be more practical and efficient to form a coalition or collaboration of some nature between the most affected municipalities? In the eyes of participants, regardless of the merits of such an approach, the likelihood of this occurring is minimal. When the researcher proposed this option and asked if it might happen, answers ranged from, “No. No. No.” (participant from City of Oshawa) to, “No I just wouldn’t see it happening” (participant from Town of Ajax) to, “no I think they would look for regional leadership” (participant from the Town of Whitby).

This last response touches on the consensus amongst participants that the LIP should be at the regional level backed by the Regional Municipality of Durham. In the words of a participant from DCDSB, “I think again being from a large organization that encompasses several townships and cities… if I was deciding who was going to get a LIP and I had to fund three towns or three cities that our next to each other, I might as well fund the Region.” A participant from the IISG spoke of the unifying benefits of a regional approach, “just to have that level of government it catches the attention or priority of, it wasn’t just one municipality, they saw it as a whole region all the municipalities agreed we have to pay attention to our diversity issues and so I think it is important to have the
backing of the Region there.” Another participant discusses the consequences of not having it at a regional level,

No because I figure that to my mind, it’s going to do this, there is going to be a comfort level with Ajax-Pickering, Ajax-Pickering is going to lead the charge and its going to filter into Whitby and its going to filter into Oshawa. I’m from Oshawa, I’m born and raised there so I can say anything I like, Oshawa at least to me doesn’t feel like a welcoming community, I think if you’re a person of colour or different, you wouldn’t feel comfortable in Oshawa. Oshawa’s got its issues, so you can see as people start to get more and more comfortable, then they will start to get more comfortable, so if we only looked at it as an Ajax-Pickering issue, then you might as well build a nice big wall at the side of Oshawa so people won’t come that far, so to me, it gives a broader perspective because of the trickle across that will happen over time.

Participants thought having LDIPC at a regional level would not only produce a horizontal effect but also a vertical one. A participating consultant elaborates, “what the regional piece puts a stamp on is this behavior is now politically correct and socially acceptable. They legitimize it in a sense.” A participant from KPR supported a similar view, “having this council at a regional level has been helpful as it helps advance views and backs it up with political leadership and support.”

Besides the support for the LIP policy at the regional level, a few participants received the impression, although the RFP for LIPs permitted either community organizations or municipalities to act as the lead, that the LIP was designed for Regional government leadership. A participant from CDCD explains,

Yeah, you know what, the regional government is relying on federal funding to push this forward now but its federal funding that could not have been resourced by anyone else, the regional government had to be involved in it. No else could have accessed that funding in Durham Region. The LIP funding was not meant for anyone else, it was meant for municipal governments at the high level. They need to be given credit that they actually went after these resources for our community.
A participant from LDIPC confirmed this, stating that the “LIP in Durham would not have happened particularly at the regional level without the Regional Government’s participation.”

7.3 Stationary to the Speed of Light: Regional Municipality of Durham’s Role in LDIPC

Credit in this context is an interesting concept. By not contributing their own and relying on upper level government money does this diminish the level of credit the Regional Municipality of Durham deserves for their work on LDIPC? A few participants from faith-based and ethno-cultural based organizations seem to think so. But there is another dimension which cannot be dismissed. As opposed to other forms of upper-level government funding, funding for the LIPs was not simply assigned or anointed, nor was it mandated from the federal government in the sense of it was going to be a program each place would receive regardless of their interest. For LIPs, an RFP was released with the expectation that different places apply for a limited pool of available funding based on their interest. Following suit, the Regional Municipality of Durham allocated the appropriate resources and attention for a successful application. In concert with its lead partners, as a participant from CDCD highlights, “the Region provided the staff and support in terms of [LDIPC staff member], and both CDCD and DRLTB contributed resources in terms of time, expertise, and this all happened prior to the money. There was money invested and in kind money.” Thus, applying was a choice and reflected a commitment on behalf of the Region both to this opportunity but also to diversity. Ever since, the Region’s commitment has shown little sign of fraying. According to a participant from Durham College, “I would say it’s the Region that has taken the lead on
it too. I would say they have been driving it.” A participant from Northern Lights, as did many others, shared a similar impression,

I think they’ve been a big player in terms of they are on the council and obviously they hold the funding and what not. It’s pretty important. I would say they have definitely played a big role, I know [said LDIPC staff member] has been involved a lot in all of that. The fact that they’ve got, like the portal, is the whole Durham Region, it’s not municipal it’s not whatever, its Durham Region. So I would say they have played a really big role…

As reiterated by a participant from Durham Workforce Authority, there has been plenty of evidence to support this, “I couldn’t say enough about the Region of Durham, they have done a great job on a lot of things.” Some of these ‘things’ include LDIPC’s most notable initiatives. Durham Region took the lead on applying for the immigration portal, in concert with several of its own departments. Together, the committees that were convened to help develop and maintain the portal represented, as confirmed by a participating consultant and participants from the Ajax Public Library and municipality of Pickering, the largest regional building exercise in Durham Region’s history. Although not an LDIPC specific initiative, in terms of their role in helping acquire Welcome Centres (which was significant and will be discussed in the next chapter), in the words of a participant from CDCD, lead organization on the Welcome Centre in Ajax, “the LIP helped leverage funding, helped the school boards leverage some of their funding to help the LIP, they leveraged funding from within the Region to help set up the Welcome Centres. These were all sort of one time funding things that were needed to help set the Welcome Centres up.”

Other contributions, according to a participant from LDIPC, by the Regional Municipality of Durham comprise “providing facilities for meetings, clerical assistance, and political support from Regional Chair Roger Anderson to Co-Chairs of the Regional
Health and Social Services Committee.” Lastly, as the primary holder of the CIC contract, Durham Region holds the responsibility for the contract’s deliverables.

7.4 Beyond the “Corridor of the 401:” Regionalization within an LDIPC Framework

With Regional Municipality of Durham involvement and participant consensus the LIP be at the Regional level, comes the expectation all of Durham Region be involved. This may seem like a no-brainer but Durham Region’s discrepancies in terms of diversity, 96% of newcomers reside in one of four municipalities, with only 4% in the other four (see Table 7.1), mean Durham’s variable settlement patterns present challenges in meeting this expectation. A participating consultant’s apt observation reaches the heart of this issue, “when I look at this and when I look at the big picture, Durham Region is more than what I call, the corridor of the 401, Oshawa, Ajax, Whitby, Pickering and Clarington. Look at Brock, Scugog and Uxbridge, how do you get those people in the community and involved…. ” Getting each municipality involved at a Regional level marks the first part of LDIPC’s challenge. Previous research suggests the absence of a regional approach has turned varying levels of diversity into various approaches to diversity (Cullen 2009). Within this context, enter LDIPC’s regional approach and the second part of LDIPC’s challenge is how, how does LDIPC address and accommodate this variability?

Although a sub-committee of the Regional Health and Social Services Committee, as an advisory body with no formal authority, LDIPC does not function like a standard regional committee. As a participant from Durham College stated, LDIPC does
not rubber stamp each initiative. There are some resolutions that quorum must be achieved on but not every initiative receives consensus from the council. At the same time, unlike other regional committees such as the Durham Agricultural Advisory Committee or the Durham Region Environmental Advisory Committee, LDIPC does not have representation from each municipal government.

Every action LDIPC takes or every initiative it develops does not require regional consensus before moving forward. Thus, regionalization within an LDIPC framework takes on a new meaning. It does not look like standard regionalization in the sense of eight municipalities deciding on a course for the Region (although this did happen to some extent in the consultations and planning stage prior to the plan being developed but purely in an input capacity and later the plan did receive approval from Regional Council). Moreover, it is not the Durham Region unilaterally deciding the policy course and expecting all municipalities to follow suit. Regionalization for LDIPC means each municipality contributing to, participating in, having access to resources and working with LDIPC to bolster its diversity competency. It is a much more decentralized piecemeal approach and while it does resolve some of the typical pitfalls of regionalization, it far from guarantees instant collaboration and cooperation from different parts of Durham Region.

7.5 Does Regional Government Participation Equal Regionalization?

LDIPC has acknowledged on several different occasions the challenges associated with regionalization. In its application for the immigration portal, it stated, “Durham experiences both ends of the settlement spectrum, from high concentration in Ajax, Pickering, and now Whitby, to lower concentrations in eastern and north Durham”
Prior to LDIPC’s inception, questions were raised about regional representation and achieving regionalization. During a meeting of the Regional Health and Social Services Committee on December 3, 2009, Committee members questioned how having one municipal representative would be sufficient to represent all local municipalities (Region of Durham 2009). As LDIPC was still in its development stages, no firm answer was provided. Nevertheless, giving all municipalities a seat on LDIPC given the model LDIPC must adhere to based on certain CIC requirements is difficult. In the same meeting, Committee members suggested one rural representative and one urban representative as opposed to a municipal representative (Durham Region 2009). Although not formalized as such, in practice, this is essentially the path LDIPC has followed. As LDIPC shares Co-Chairs with the Regional Health and Social Services Committee, one of which is a Regional Councilor from a designated municipality, LDIPC is thus represented by another municipality outside of the municipal representative by default. So far, a Regional Councilor from Oshawa held this position during LDIPC’s development stages while upon formalization of LDIPC in November 2010, the Mayor of Brock was assigned and still holds the position. LDIPC’s municipal representative was originally Ajax, in the development stages, and is now Whitby. Hence, since formal operations began LDIPC has maintained one rural and one urban representative. Given LDIPC’s structure, this is more than reasonable regional representation. However,
regional representation could be reached or at least enhanced through a specifically
designed working committee for municipalities.

As outlined in Chapter 6 (see Section 6.4), regional representation on LDIPC has
not translated to regional awareness of LDIPC and regional participation in LDIPC
initiatives. To recap, in terms of LDIPC initiatives with the highest participation numbers
such as consultation sessions for the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan,
immigration portal committees and LDIPC’s public launch, most municipalities,
exceptions being more rural based municipalities such as Uxbridge and Scugog, were at
least invited and for the most part participated and contributed. Outside of these
initiatives, more municipalities especially ones further east such as Oshawa and
Clarington and north, Scugog and Uxbridge were increasingly unfamiliar with other
LDIPC initiatives and events. Conversely, municipalities with higher concentrations of
newcomers, particularly Ajax and Whitby had more developed and thorough
relationships with LDIPC. As described earlier (Section 6.5), libraries, arranged the same
depicted across Durham as municipalities, experienced a similar situation with
significant discrepancies in terms of awareness and participation levels between Ajax,
Pickering, Whitby, Oshawa and Clarington, Scugog, Uxbridge, and Brock.

In the municipal sector, roughly a year after formalization of LDIPC, LDIPC
reached out to all municipalities in Durham asking to them to consider applying to fill the
position of the municipal representative and to provide a contact for future
 correspondence (see Appendix F). In early 2012, invitations were sent out to all eight
municipalities for a human resources event featuring Lionel Laroche on March 23, hosted
by the Durham Region’s Human Resources (HR) Department in partnership with LDIPC
Participants from municipalities with less awareness of LDIPC such as Clarington, Scugog, Uxbridge, and even Oshawa reported no knowledge of the HR event while a participant from Uxbridge was aware of the correspondence regarding the request for applications for the municipal representative seat. Again, the library sector illustrates a similar situation where despite LDIPC outreaching to DMLA and Library Executive Directors Roundtable, participants from Uxbridge and Brock reported no interaction with LDIPC while a participant from Scugog described interaction as “moderate.” In LDIPC’s 2012 annual report, it did state, “much work remains to be done” with Durham’s “agricultural communities;” thus, to some extent acknowledging, what these findings point to, disconnect between LDIPC and municipalities with lower numbers of newcomers.

7.6 Obstacles to LDIPC Regionalization

The source of disconnect and perhaps more intensive future participation, according to numerous participants, in part, was resource-based. Asked if having limited staff resources would be a limitation to participating in different LDIC initiatives, a participant from Scugog Public Library responded,

Oh absolutely. We only have 2 full time staff… So yeah that’s a big issue for us because there are so many, one of the limitations of a public library too is more than any other organization, is it’s all things all people, so we have so many different initiatives that people are coming to us and wanting us to participate in and you can’t do all of them, you have to pick and choose.

When asked the same question, a participant from the municipality of Scugog echoed these concerns, “yeah, absolutely. Absolutely, same scale.” A participant from the municipality of Clarington re-iterated this, “due to limited resources, we are not very
involved anymore,” while a participant from Clarington Public Library indicated staff resources could be a limitation in participation moving forward.

Another challenge to regionalization from a lower-tier municipal perspective is uncertainty surrounding where diversity as a policy fits with municipal structures. Unlike Durham Region, which has been mandated with participation in this policy area through the LIP via CIC, municipalities at the lower-tier level still have no formal or legal mandate to address immigration or diversity; it is a choice not obligation. Hence, municipalities especially those with lower levels of diverse populations are still navigating this policy terrain and for some, it has yet to emerge as a self-identified need. As a participant from the municipality of Oshawa remarked,

I think to in municipalities just from my very brief experience, there seems to be some, how do I put it, I don’t want to say confusion because confusion is too strong a word, but where all of this should reside. Should it reside in your Culture and Recreation department or should it reside in your HR department?

The answer to this question is unclear as different departments of different municipalities have been involved in LDIPC initiatives. For example, in the case of Ajax, individuals from the CAO’s Office and the Department of Recreation and Culture, Pickering, individuals from Culture and Recreation, Whitby, individuals from Economic Development and Parks and Recreation, Oshawa, individuals from Economic Development and Community Services, Clarington, individuals from Economic Development and Planning. Other municipalities have not had participation in LDIPC initiatives. The varied approaches to LDIPC by municipalities represent very different perceptions of immigration and diversity, complicating the regionalization picture further. Furthermore, although said departments have participated in LDIPC initiatives it does not mean, they are actively leading diversity initiatives internally in their
municipalities. As related research demonstrates, many municipalities, regardless of diversity levels, have yet to adopt pro-active diversity policies (Cullen & Clow 2011). Naturally for LDIPC, it is easier to work with municipalities who have or are working on diversity policies such as Ajax with its diversity plan or Whitby with its ethno-cultural and diversity committee, because they can assist within established policies and frameworks and for the most part, there is like-mindedness. Alternatively, municipalities yet to establish diversity policies or a specific approach, it is more difficult for LDIPC to inhabit a particular role. Similar logic applies to libraries where the divide is strikingly similar. However, simply because municipalities or libraries in areas of Durham with lower levels of immigration have not yet developed strategies to respond to diversity does not mean there is not a need.

7.7 Looking Beyond the Numbers: Finding Diversity ‘Needs’ in Unexpected Places

In fact, participants outside municipalities with high concentrations of newcomers in different sectors identified several needs or situations where LDIPC could play a supportive or guiding role. When discussing the need to become more diversity competent, a participant from one municipality remarked,

But it’s happening now (diversity in the community), we can start to see it, it’s on the very edge and it’s just on the edge but it’s still on the edge, we are not equipped this department, this branch, we are not equipped, we are not ready. I, myself, have a very high level of understanding to know, I don’t know the nuances and we should already be getting trained and ready.

Another participant from a municipality had witnessed the consequences of not addressing diversity where there is a need, “we still in this day and age are counseling managers about discriminatory hiring practices like blatantly discriminatory hiring practices. And that shocks me in this day and age.”
Other participants, such as a participant from Clarington library, are starting to see a need, “we are starting to see a need for Clarington.” A participant from a municipality outlined the need for action related diversity on a different front, dealing with international investors,

Participant: Well, what has changed since you and I spoke in 2010 was we know have large international companies that want to invest here. And I need support to know what their business practices cultural are, I don’t want to be turning someone away and offending somebody by the way I normally do business.

Researcher: And unintentionally.

Participant: And unintentionally, yeah. So it’s a huge, there is a huge need for us and I actually didn’t know who to talk to or turn to try and get some assistance.

A participant from a different municipality identified a similar problem, albeit with consequences,

A lot of immigrant investors coming to… [the municipality]. In many cases, staff members have not known how to deal with these individuals and have lost investment opportunities because of a lack of social and cultural understanding. It’s a real problem.

Clearly, participants have established a need for diversity action in unexpected, at least numerically speaking, places.

7.8 Regionalization for LDIPC: A Double Edged Sword

The smart strategic decision LDIPC has made in their regionalization efforts is not acting unilaterally. Not that they have the authority to do so, but they have not worked above different municipalities, but with them. This is important as the likelihood of an initiative succeeding if Durham Region was dictating terms, as indicated by numerous participants from the municipal sector is minimal. Instead, LDIPC has worked in a collaborative, supportive manner, relying on the tools it has at its disposal not
imposing an agenda or particular direction on its participants or collaborators working with those interested on a voluntary basis. Working within a region with variable settlement patterns this approach makes the most sense. Yet, it has not yielded the results LDIPC would hope for. Part of the reason for this is the voluntary approach goes both ways.

When discussing the complications of regionalization presents, a participant from IISG made the following response, highlighting the benefits of a decentralized networked approach:

But in some ways, that is the beauty of the model, it’s not just about what’s happening at a regional level, it’s much more about tapping into to all these sectors and the one or two people who represent a sector but who have multiple agencies and contacts behind them so that where the activity is happening is at the level, it’s not about waiting for government to go and do that but really engaging the community in your sector or crossing over sectors or building across sectors to say as a community, this is what we want to be involved in and this is what we can do together, not waiting for someone to be ok we need that and we need that, what do we know that’s needed and what can we with our resources and what can we facilitate to make room for others in their sphere of influence also. I think from a community development perspective it makes a lot sense it’s about encouraging and facilitating what’s happening at the grassroots level.

Ideally, this is how LDIPC would work. Yet, the key piece of the participant’s response is the concession that this will only work “in some ways.” Unfortunately, in other ways, it will not. For municipalities and other organizations in areas with high concentrations of newcomers, not only part of LDIPC initiatives but also part of other diversity networks, this approach will and has paid dividends. Still, for organizations outside these areas, where previous research demonstrates they are not part of these networks (Cullen & Clow 2011), this approach is problematic. Nor has LDIPC helped provide the opportunity to integrate into these networks. Limited outreach has been met with a minimal response and has given little knowledge of how to engage. Similarly, LDIPC’s decision to hold
virtually all of its events it leads or partners on, in Ajax and Pickering, further limits exposure. A participant from Northern Lights, a region wide service provider, explains, “I think even though, its (LDIPC) Durham Region, it’s very focused in Ajax/Pickering, very. Like all the events that happen, anything that really takes place is in Ajax-Pickering….”

The product of this, as illustrated by participants, is a lack of awareness about LDIPC. Fortunately, when informed of the nature of LDIPC initiatives, many participants especially in the municipal sector saw opportunities for working with LDIPC. Perhaps these opportunities may be the start of fruitful relationships. Of course, regardless of whether this pans out, it will take time. Meeting LDIPC’s objectives of establishing a “culture of inclusion” and building “settlement capacity” is difficult enough in areas ripe for this type of change, the challenge multiples when trying to achieve such goals in areas with less exposure and experience on these issues. Simply waiting for organizations in these areas to pro-actively respond, given the challenges they face will not wield the desired outcomes LDIPC seeks. Further engagement will be required.

The issue of time relates to a larger issue around funding terms. Although designated as a planning body, LDIPC operates on an annual contract, renewed annually. While there is no sign this funding will disappear soon, given it is a short term contract, it remains a possibility. Further clouding the situation is the uncertainty surrounding what will transpire if the funding is pulled. A participant from CDCD believed this to be important, “yeah, I think that is actually a big issue. I don’t know what is going to happen if the federal funding disappears.” A participant from the Baha’i went one step further, asking, “what if the LDIPC folds at some point because of finances, what do we say?
Goodbye to everything?” Considering the Durham Region’s cautious course into the diversity and immigration policy area and its tepid commitment to diversity prior to knowledge of upper level government funding opportunities, these are legitimate concerns. What may shed some light as to what could transpire if funding changed is the Durham Region’s internal foray into diversity. In 2011, the Durham Region applied for funding to develop policy initiatives internally to address diversity. Recently, they learned their application was unsuccessful. Since then, they have not backed away from their commitment but have acknowledged the scope may not be as great and it will have to be spread out over a longer period.

Either way, these circumstances influence LDIPC’s ability to commit to and conduct long-term planning goals, the type of which will be needed in Durham with areas of lower levels of immigration. Yet, at the same time, these circumstances have produced noticeable impact on the diversity and immigration front in Durham Region, much of what will be explored in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 8
“I Think Its One of The Best Things CIC Has Ever Done:”
The LDIPC Effect

The previous chapter explored the limitations of LDIPC’s funding terms; this chapter will explore the outcomes. When asked to describe LDIPC’s impact, a participant from CDCD stated, “I think its (LIPs) one of the best things CIC has ever done.” This remark may seem hyperbolic, but, coming from an employee of CDCD, an organization delivering the brunt of CIC funded settlement services in Durham and on the frontlines of settlement in Durham for decades, it is well placed. More importantly, it embodies the drastic change Durham has experienced since LDIPC’s inception and therefore sets the tone for this chapter, which will document different aspects of LDIPC’s impact (Objective 3).

The chapter begins with arguably the most noteworthy change, the addition of settlement infrastructure. Infrastructure wise, Durham has moved from no Welcome Centre, a short-lived diversity newsletter and an outdated ethno-cultural directory pre-LDIPC to two Welcome Centres, a multi-faceted quarterly diversity newsletter, and a multi-media informational web-based portal post-LDIPC. Together, this trifecta, created and managed (*Citizen*, Portal) or supported (Welcome Centres) by LDIPC, has established a platform which has played a part in breaking down silos, sectorally and municipally, previously hindering Durham’s approach to settlement and integration. As documented in the second section, results demonstrated organizations had an increased awareness of organizations involved in immigration and diversity, the opportunity to forge relationships with organizations outside their sector on diversity, and in many cases were more diversity conscious, because of LDIPC activities.
As the next section shows, change is reflected in Durham’s new settlement model. Collectively, what has emerged under the LDIPC model is a connected and coherent settlement system, which has broadened its reach beyond the specific organizations traditionally responsible for settlement to include a number of non-specific sectors. No longer is settlement and diversity, specifically the domain of traditional settlement organizations, increasingly, organizations outside the settlement sector are helping to ease the settlement process and address diversity in a multitude of ways. Section three highlights the collective impact of this new model including change in several areas, most notably, an increase in the attention and profile of diversity issues and the removal of any stigma associated with newcomers.

Although most participants identified these changes, as the final section demonstrates, not all were convinced they were because of the work of LDIPC. Some participants, albeit a minority, thought they were merely the result of other initiatives started before LDIPC and now reaching their capacity while others believed there to be larger societal and culture forces at play. Certain participants questioned the reach of LDIPC’s impact and many raised concerns about the sustainability of select LDIPC initiatives.

Taken together, there is plenty of evidence to suggest Durham has made considerable progress towards reaching LDIPC objectives like “building settlement capacity” and “creating a culture of inclusion.” Although there is not a lot of historical data to compare, what data there is suggests, LIPs may not be the best thing CIC has ever done but it might be one of the best things CIC has ever done for Durham Region. Findings for this chapter rely primarily on results from thematic analysis of interviews,
Regional municipal minutes, Regional municipal reports and primary documents from LDIPC compliment the primary data.

8.1 Disconnected to Inter-Connected: Settlement Infrastructure Pre-LDIPC to Post-LDIPC

Discussion of Welcome Centres is nothing new for Durham Region. As a participant from DCDSB stated, settlement and select employment service provider organizations “have been talking about Welcome Centres for ten years.” Although a mainstay of the settlement service conversation, only in the past few years has Durham acquired them, curiously, within the time frame LDIPC has been in full operation. Based on this timeline, it would be easy to suggest Welcome Centres would not have happened without LDIPC and this would be not entirely inaccurate, at the same time, it would not be entirely accurate either. In 2005, organizations in Durham with the highest stakes in settlement formed the DRCPSI first to ease integration of services but primarily to develop an application to CIC for a Welcome Centre. An application was submitted in February 2007 and sometime in 2008, DRCPSI learned it was unsuccessful.

There were multiple reasons for this. One, in the words of a participant from CDCD, CIC felt that applicants had not “built a case and part of building that case was you haven’t really demonstrated that you are ready to work together.” Two, part of working together meant ensuring certain organizations participated and other organizations identified and bought into the need. A participant from DCDSB explains,

The federal government said we need, no let’s say this. Other Welcome Centres in York Region started their Welcome Centres via a municipal decision rather than a partner decision to have a Welcome Centre. So we were kind of told, if you want something you need to get buy-in from the municipality, you need to have other people say you need it, not just you.
Later, in 2008, the Regional Municipality of Durham received notice of its successful LIP application and work began on establishing LDIPC. Shortly thereafter in 2010, during applications for CIC’s modernization process, Durham was approached about another application for Welcome Centres. According to a participant from CDCD, “CIC approached us as communities, specifically, the LIP, CDCD and the Unemployed Help Centre and said they wanted to implement Welcome Centres (all organizations part of DRCPSI would become part of the process the one exception being VON Canada).” Eventually CIC’s offer resulted in two Welcome Centres, one in Ajax, the other in Pickering.

Interestingly, by the time Durham was approached about Welcome Centres, LDIPC’s planning stages were complete and its operations were in full swing. After expressing doubts about Durham’s ability to work together, many participants believed the establishment of LDIPC convinced CIC otherwise. As stated by a participant from CDCD,

And I think actually the LIP is probably part of the reason it (Welcome Centres) went forward. The way the LIP demonstrated was that we had a broad base of community support for this type of settlement service in Durham. That is what the LIP demonstrated. So do I think the LIP played a role in say moving Welcome Centres forward, yeah I think they did. But it wasn’t, it may not have been an active role in the sense they had to go out and lobby for it. It was they demonstrated that our community was ready to work together.

A participant from LDIPC seconded this view, stating the development of LDIPC demonstrated a “maturity” on behalf of Durham Region. With LDIPC as a partner in both Welcome Centres and the Regional Municipality of Durham as the primary holder of CIC’s LIP contract, CIC secured the municipal participation they were seeking.
Outside of what LDIPC demonstrated, LDIPC also played a role in the establishment process. Aside from what was already described in section 7.3 of the previous chapter, a participant from CDCD believed LDIPC,

Played a big convening role. They helped do a lot of the negotiations, bringing the partners together, they helped develop the partnership agreements which are pretty complex as you could imagine, so they helped a lot with the negotiations between the partners by acting as a neutral third party.

In addition, in the words of a participant from CDCD, LDIPC “helped make it (the process of acquiring Welcome Centres) a very healthy process.”

Although it is important not to under-estimate the role LDIPC played, it would be an over simplification to say they were the factor responsible for pushing Durham over the hump. Other factors not present during Durham’s first Welcome Centre attempt include a different upper-level government funding climate, different personnel at CDCD (one of the lead applicants), and through two different pieces of research (CDCD 2010; Earle et al. 2011), demonstration of a need for Welcome Centres by the Durham community to an extent the previous application lacked. Furthermore, to imply LDIPC was the X factor would discount all of the groundwork completed prior to LDIPC and while still in its infancy stages. As a participant from CDCD aptly stated, “There were a lot of organizations while primarily, the Unemployed Help Centre, CDCD, DRLTB, and the school boards who put in a lot of work for years before the LIP was even considered.” LDIPC itself has acknowledged as such, giving most credit to these organizations in their description of the Welcome Centres unveiling ceremony in The Citizen (LDIPC 2011).

In sum, each Welcome Centre is federally-funded. Therefore, perhaps the most significant contribution LDIPC made in Durham’s pursuit of Welcome Centres, was leveraging the federal funds it received to demonstrate, via its establishment, that
organizations in Durham could work together, and via its research, that there was a need for further integration of services, ultimately, making a case for additional federal funds via Welcome Centres.

In the summer of 2002, possibly the height of grassroots diversity activism in Durham, Dynamic Publishing started Durham Region’s first mass publication aimed at diversity, *Multicultural Durham*. In its inaugural issue, its founding publisher described the publication’s purpose in the following way:

> In a community as diverse as Durham Region, I am always inspired by the efforts of hardworking citizens and organizations to promote unity, tolerance and acceptance through community-based initiatives. Some of the ideas being promoted in our communities are contained in the pages of this publication. You’ll read of the locally driven efforts, the successes that have been achieved and the path we all share in seeking common ground and a peaceful future.

In practice, this purpose translated into a publication with a light journalistic flavor but focused mainly on highlighting diversity work in Durham and the associate organizations involved in it. Although noble in its goal of promoting civic work in the area of diversity, as Durham’s population was rapidly diversifying during this period, *Multicultural Durham* was partially an attempt by Dynamic Publishing, a division of Metroland Printing, the publisher responsible for most of Durham’s local newspapers, to establish a presence within some of Durham’s less established but growing ethno-cultural communities. Unfortunately, Metroland could not procure a sufficient level of advertising to maintain the publication and it was discontinued in the summer of 2004.

Fast forward to 2009 and LDIPC reincarnates the concept of a widely circulated diversity publication with the creation of *The Citizen*. Although not identical in purpose and content, there are many similarities with *Multicultural Durham* and each perform a common function as a diversity education and awareness tool for the general public. In
this capacity, participants had nothing but praise for *The Citizen*. Commendation included a range such as on the one hand the following from a participant from IISG,

The other thing would be *The Citizen* that has come out, I mean you see it all over the place, the range of topics and people and events that are covered in there and the fact that they are given attention in the context of diversity and immigration newsletter, then I think that significantly increases the profile (of diversity) in the region…

On the other hand, when asked about how helpful it was for staff, a participant from the municipality of Whitby stated,

Yeah I think that’s beneficial just to be aware of what’s going on in other communities. It’s beneficial for our committee to see and create new ideas and awareness of what’s happening on a regional level. I do think that’s beneficial document or initiative.

Unlike *Multicultural Durham*, *The Citizen* has sustained itself for four years and, according to a participant from LDIPC, its circulation continues to grow, raising the question, what accounts for its survival? Given its reception, one could argue, the culture of Durham has evolved to be more conducive to this type of initiative compared to when *Multicultural Durham* existed; however, the more substantial reason seems to be its funding source. As an initiative of a federally funded publicly body, *The Citizen* does not have to worry about raising revenue, thus, leaving it to focus on developing content and expanding circulation, a situation *Multicultural Durham* never operated within.

Prior to LDIPC’s birth, the most expansive regional diversity resource was an ethno-cultural directory. Posted on the Regional Municipality of Durham’s website, the directory contained a brief profile of each ethno-cultural organization in Durham including contact information. When this researcher first came across the list in late 2007, it had not been updated in over a year, a symbol of the priority placed upon it. With a
Regional Diversity Committee a certainty by this time and a LIP coming in the near future, this resource would not receive another update.

Post-LDIPC, Durham’s most expansive regional diversity resource is the Durham Immigration Portal, whose features begin not end with contact information for ethnocultural organizations and multiply to include the essentials for settling and to how to launch a business. As with The Citizen, the portal was established with upper-level government funding, in this case, funding from the province of Ontario. Similarly like The Citizen, the Durham Immigration Portal received considerable acclaim from participants. In the words of a participating consultant, “I don’t talk to any person now without giving the portal first because when they go to the portal, from whatever service you need, you can find it and get it. Quite a big help as along as getting access and information is concerned.” A participant from JHS went one-step further,

I mean that portal is a fabulous tool not just for newcomers or people wanting to come to Durham but for general service providers. There is nothing like that out there. Go on there and you are going to find out everything about Durham on there, your statistics, anything you want to know about Durham.

8.2 New Funds Solving Old Problems

What may be the portal’s greatest impact, along with the Welcome Centres and The Citizen, is not so much the benefits individual participants are receiving but what it is pushing Durham Region collectively to do. A participating consultant explains

The Durham Immigration Portal was huge, I think The Citizen paper, was huge, I think it’s helping as a communication tool, its forcing collaboration across the region with those tools, those key tools. So now you have, I think before you had municipalities operating in a silo and now this gives them an avenue, a venue for working more collaboratively and the organizations.

Although the participant refers to municipalities, what they suggest is applicable to all sectors. Consequently, these pieces (Welcome Centres, The Citizen, Durham Immigration
Portal) in concert with LDIPC’s council itself are not only forming the backbone of Durham’s settlement infrastructure but are helping alleviate decades old settlement problems such as Durham’s siloed approach to settlement (Cullen 2009; Cullen & Clow 2011). Nearly all participants from a range of sectors agreed Durham’s silos, sectorally and municipally, had been broken down. A participant from DDSB describes the change,

Participant: So I find we are not working in a bubble anymore, when I first started when I was. That’s changed completely. We are sharing information back and forth, students are going through, I shouldn’t say going, clients are coming through the system, there is a beautiful flow to it.

Researcher: So the silos have been broken?

Participant: Yeah, we’re all working together…

Other participants from the library, employment services, settlement, school board sectors and a participating consultant all shared a similar view in one form or another. The most remarkable example of progress in this area lies in the funding proposal application process for CIC’s modernization. A participant from CDCD, provides a breakdown,

So what we did through the LIP was we made contact with anyone who identified they had an interest in applying. So even if they were not an existing, approved, funded agency we put out information as far and wide as we could through all of the different mechanisms to find who has an interest in applying for CIC funding. And we convened a series of meetings and we did a gaps analysis and a needs assessment and then we collectively agreed on where the groups were, where there was some duplication and where there were opportunities for particular organizations to take on particular pieces of that strategy. Which was the first time that has ever happened in Durham, ever and we were one of the only communities in Ontario that did it. We were actually recognized for having great leadership in Durham for going through that process, so effectively what we did was we had a real, honest, candid conversation about needs and strategies and who had the desire, expertise, and ability to respond to that. And everybody agreed to the final plan, every organization whether they were….
A participant from Northern Lights, another participating organization speaks to the composition of the group,

And, it was useful because it brought together, it was unique in the sense that it brought together the so called power players, the ones who has been around a long time with more of the newer, especially around the faith communities, it brought them into the mix. So it was the well established, the new, the big, the small, it was kind of everyone at the table. So it was refreshing that way.

Clearly, this was an important step forward for Durham, one made possible, according to a participant from CDCD, because of LDIPC; “and if it hadn’t been for the LDIPC, that wouldn’t have happened.” Consequently, despite, according to participants of CIC funded organizations, having no clauses in their contract mandating any type of participation with any LDIPC activities, LDIPC has no doubt helped further integrate CIC funded organizations.

Other statistics validate LDIPC’s role in reducing silos between Durham’s service providers. As evidenced by Figure 8.1, 88% of organizations reported they had an increased awareness of organizations involved in immigration and diversity in part because of LDIPC.
Moreover, as Figure 8.2 shows, 68% of organizations felt LDIPC provided them the opportunity to forge relationships with organizations outside of their sector on immigration or diversity related issues. A participant from the Oshawa Public Library describes one such opportunity,

One of the best things that has happened is that they bring all these different people to the table and it gives us a chance to share and brainstorm because all of us we’re the rabble-rousers back home, we’re on the front lines we can make things happen up to a point and that’s how things seem to get done here.
8.3 The Diversity Ensemble: Durham Region’s Settlement Model 2.0

As much as these statistics reflect a reduction in silos, they also point to the emergence of a new settlement system, one that is inclusive, broadly-based and as far-reaching as Durham as ever known. In short, LDIPC has substantially altered Durham’s settlement landscape. No longer is settlement and diversity the sole domain of organizations, funded or mandated specifically to serve newcomers. Yes, they are still the foremost settlement service providers and probably still among the most influential actors but now they are one among many actors. With LDIPC, starting at the executive level, organizations previously little involved in any form of diversity work internally or externally are now participating in formulating settlement strategy and developing diversity initiatives. This expansion extends beyond non-specific organizations sitting around the LDIPC table, to non-specific organizations across Durham.
At a basic level, expansion means a farther-reaching settlement system. Upon arrival, ideally, newcomers would connect with one of Durham’s Welcome Centres or at the very least, an organization whose function is to serve newcomers. In reality, as research shows, the unpredictability of settlement ensures this is far from a guarantee, sometimes, where newcomers begin their quest is anyone’s guess. Yet, as illustrated in Figure 8.2 (above), with more organizations gaining a growing level of awareness of the organizations involved in immigration and diversity, the likelihood of them being able to direct newcomers to the appropriate organizations, if one arrives at their door, has greatly increased.

At a higher level, many organizations have voluntary asked or requested LDIPC’s presence on their board of directors. According to a participant from LDIPC, at last count⁴, LDIPC staff sit on 26 boards and committees including boards of trades and chambers of commerce (only Whitby Chamber of Commerce and Ajax-Pickering Board of Trade), YMCA, Durham Legal Clinic, Durham Region Unemployed Help Centre, Kinark Diversity Committee, Town of Whitby Ethno-Cultural and Diversity Advisory Committee, Durham Committee for Social Innovation, Durham Region Immigrant Service Providers, Durham Libraries Multicultural Alliance, Regional Municipality of Durham’s Internal Diversity Committee, three Welcome Centre Committees and the PFLAG Committee of Diversity.

As board members, LDIPC staff serve as the voice of diversity, with the goal of “embedding the needs of all populations into planning processes, hiring practices, and program planning” within these organizations (LDIPC 2012). LDIPC’s presence has helped organizations apply a diversity lens to their work. For example, in the summer of 2013.

⁴ As of September 19, 2013
2012, the Regional Municipality of Durham conducted a business survey and thanks to the participation of LDIPC, consisted of questions related to immigrants in the labour force. A participant from IISG elaborates, “there’s a business survey happening this summer (2012) and they were able to get some questions on diversity and immigration in the workforce and that’s important.” Durham Legal Clinic is another organization who has experienced a shift in thinking. A participant from CDCD describes the change,

For example, the legal clinic, their mandate is not to serve immigrants and refugees, their mandate is to serve the community. However, through the various processes, conversations and meetings (with LDIPC and Ajax Welcome Centre), they have identified that they absolutely have an interest and an opportunity to contribute to the service delivery continuum (of diversity).

Each of these organizations corresponds with nearly half of participating organizations, who reported being more diversity conscious because of their work with LDIPC (see Figure 8.3).

**Figure 8.3**

| Has the emergence of LDIPC prompted your organization to be more diversity conscious? |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| YES   | NO   |
| 47%   | 53%  |

A participant from the City of Pickering provides an example,
I do think it has had a great impact on our awareness and what I can do. Like I said with the diversity committee, they operate on a four year term, so when they renewed their term, last year. They really wanted to review their terms of reference and mandate and they used, they looked at other municipalities as a best practice model just to see what’s in other municipalities. And I think that came from an awareness that other municipalities and other organizations are doing similar work and we have to come back to what is really important not just celebrations and more about the committee and what we should be striving to do. So more of a policy-driven, needs identification more than just celebratory events and I think that was probably more of an offshoot of this heightened focus on newcomers and really how do we make sure people come, feel welcome and are engaged. So I do think they were offshoots that was spread from the council and the region’s work.

Similarly, a participant from Northern Lights thought working with LDIPC has bolstered the organization’s diversity knowledge,

But two main areas where we’ve looked at is cultural competency and what that means to Northern Lights as an organization, like how do we want to ensure from a client perspective, like setting up service delivery that we are showing that we have that diversity and ability to deal with newcomers and just diverse individuals. So that (LDIPC) has brought that to the forefront. But the other piece has been more looking at newcomers overseas, so even before they arrive. And the portal played a large part in just getting us to start thinking about it, we haven’t actually gone forward with anything yet. But thinking around why aren’t newcomers prepared when they come here, when they have at their finger tips, all kind of resources, so that tells you that there is something sort of breakdown between Canada and the country the newcomer is coming from, wherever right, so that has got us kinda of thinking outside the box, how do we set up newcomers before they come. So we do actually get quite a few overseas inquiries through website whether its people who want to settle here, whether its companies who want or are involved in sending students here to study, so we actually get a fair number of inquiries that, so I would say that knowledge we have acquired from the LDIPC and the portal has really allowed us to think outside the box in that kind of way.

Other examples include Forest Brook Community Church being made more aware of the make-up of the community and the needs associated with that including thinking about how to better serve the community and Durham Workforce Authority examining how to invite an LDIPC staff member to join the Employment Ontario Providers Implementation Team. A participant from LDIPC also saw evidence of change in the adoption of
inclusive language in corporate and strategic plans of different organizations in different sectors. Considering LDIPC’s objectives of “building settlement capacity” and creating a “culture of inclusion,” an organization adding an LDIPC staff member to their board or readjusting their thinking about diversity may seem like a minor change, frankly, it is not. Every time a single organization takes a step forward on diversity, it is one less step it has to take and one-step closer to being in a position to not relying on specific organizations but being able to serve newcomers in an equitable and inclusive manner, thus, building settlement capacity. It may look unglamorous, but this is the crux of LDIPC’s strategy, starting conversations and shifting thinking. Thus far, as figures 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3 indicate above, this strategy is working.

Moving forward, LDIPC’s continued success will depend on critical mass. At this point, it is progress not problematic that slightly more than half of participating organizations identified having an enhanced level of diversity consciousness because of LDIPC activities, yet, in order to keep organizations interested and other organizations willing to engage, diversity must become something where not addressing it becomes the exception rather than the rule. Once diversity reaches critical mass, it changes the terms of participation and more importantly the cost-benefit ratio. Organizations stop thinking about whether they can afford to address diversity or in what way and start thinking about the costs of not doing so, particularly, perception amongst their peers and their organization’s reputation. Small signs of these forces surfaced amongst participants. One participant, acknowledging their organization had not been as pro-active on diversity as it should be, credited the influence of LDIPC in changing the environment around diversity; accordingly, propelling their organization forward,
I think it really does help us for them to have this community plan so we can align ourselves as an organization to this, I think it really does, its powerful, because this is where the community is going, we will look bad if we are left behind, so that gives me this language where you will, if everyone else is integrating newcomers into their communities and we’re not you look bad as an organization. Ultimately, there is the stick at the other end, because you will look bad, if you don’t keep up, it’s important to do a good job, we want to do a good job. But I do think it let us know, these are things that they’re interested in, this is what the community is keen about.

A participant from John Howard Society, pointed to the necessity of participating in initiatives of this nature as part of their organization’s mandate,

Not necessarily but you know what that is all a piece of how you position your organization and your program and John Howard has a big presence in the community and not just employment and literacy, so the expectation for us is that managers are participating in that, I see myself as I need to be doing that, that is part of what my job is…

Although only these participants identified collective forces that influenced their participation, no participants were intentionally or directly asked. Nevertheless, some participants, such as a participant from the Whitby Public Library, hoped the introduction of LDIPC would help make their existing diversity work less difficult, “Our hope is, it is helping the community in general which will help us. The community at large is well served by it, that’s most certainly a good thing.” The core of this quote speaks to another piece of the critical mass puzzle, the closer LDIPC gets to critical mass, the easier it will become for more organizations to participate and/or to address diversity. If LDIPC is doing diversity work, building awareness, boosting its profile, heightening its popularity and changing minds, eventually, it will make it easier for other organizations to start this type of work, the path of resistance lessens.
8.4 Diversity at Large 2.0: Marching Towards Critical Mass

At a micro scale, with slightly more than half of participating organizations becoming more diversity conscious with the help of LDIPC, it would seem LDIPC has a large hill to climb before reaching anything resembling critical mass. Undoubtedly, LDIPC has work to do, but only looking at a micro level, asking participants how LDIPC has helped or hindered their organization, negates what is happening at a macro level, where participants identified more profound changes, just as essential to achieving critical mass. As a political body, it would be safe to assume LDIPC had some type of political impact and in this case, according to participants, this assumption would be correct. A participant from the Town of Whitby verifies this, “Yeah, again I would say it’s come to more of a political awareness. There is more of an expectation for councils and mayors to respond and make diversity a priority.” Another participant from DDSB affirmed this, “The LDIPC has helped raise the profile of immigration, it has put the issue on the agenda, politicians are talking about it.” Similarly, as a member of multiple chambers of commerce and one of their primary objectives relating to the labour market outcomes for newcomers, again, one would expect LDIPC to have had some impact within the private sector and this is the case. A participant from DDSB typifies the impact,

I think just making businesses aware. Businesses’ aware of the impact of the newcomers in the area. I think that is the main (impact) one.

What would be less expected, especially given LDIPC’s relatively short existence is progress on creating a “culture of inclusion.” This would not be because of the amount of attention or allocation of resources LDIPC put towards this but rather because of its abstract nature and longer timeline, cultural change rarely happens swiftly. Surprisingly,
participants cited numerous instances indicating otherwise. Illustrating cultural changes within the employment sector, a participant highlighted the following,

A change in the culture for sure. You want to tell me, I am in Durham for 5 years and I have gone to EO (Employment Ontario) meeting and I’m sitting there and I am looking at the people I am with and I am more or less the only minority that is sitting there and you listen to the conversations and you listen to people talk about diversity and they are so way off track. Now I go back to meetings and I can hear conversation that makes sense to me. I remember the first time [an LDIPC staff member] called me and I asked her what does diversity mean to you? And I can see the changes, not that its 100% better but its noticeable change.

A participant from the Ajax Public Library reported seeing comparable changes, pointing to organizations beginning to deliver diversity programs to diverse populations for the first time. Outside of programming, participants identified broad and generic cultural changes. In the words of a participating consultant,

For example, issues over recognizing that there are different faiths and different holidays. Knowing that you need to celebrate and multiculturalism is not just about hosting events for food it’s about accommodating different belief systems or holidays or valuing them, it’s also recognizing you don’t have to get rid of a Christmas Tree in order to celebrate other holidays. You don’t throw out one, you bring them together. I think the awareness is changing. A greater understanding and the will is there. There is a realization Durham is not the same, it’s just not British or European folks here anymore.

A barrier to inclusion is the perception that newcomers are not similar to but separate from the members of a host society, particularly those from a visible minority background. This perception often leads to stigma being attached to newcomers. Among the many changes participants credited LDIPC with, arguably the most significant was LDIPC’s role in helping remove this stigma. When asked if they agreed with this finding, a participant from CDCD stated,

I do in a variety of ways. We have worked with all different kinds of organizations in all kinds of different capacities and settings and we have absolutely seen cultural shifts at organizations and I think that is really exciting.
You see it in a variety of plans, Kinark, for example, has certainly made a huge effort in terms of their own competence.

Unfortunately, not every organization was given the opportunity to answer this question but those that were in the library, settlement service, employment and school board sector all agreed.

A participant from DCDSB describes the broader change,

Okay, so you know, I was raised in Oshawa, so you know what the culture is, its very not welcoming back in the day. Its not the most diverse place in the world, so I think there is a lot of that stigma in terms of employers and maybe not for me or as a school board, like this is what we do, we deal with newcomers every deal but in terms of libraries, in terms of employers, other community members, other sectors dealing with diverse populations, like you don’t have to ask me that question, because we teach ESL, it’s a diverse population, you don’t have to tell me what they need, I know what they need but if you’re going to talk to real estate agents and the police department and businesses and say Durham is a changing community and we have to make it a welcoming place for them, then that is going to have a greater impact then telling the language diversity coordinator that diversity is important, like what have we been doing for all these years.

The timing element in this quote is meaningful because it highlights change but also exemplifies how much change. The depth of change in itself, according to participants is exceptional. A participating consultant provides context,

But the fact that this (LDIPC) has actually been started is a big plus. In previous years, to talk about the fact that immigration and welcoming immigrants would be something in Durham people would look at you as where are you coming from? So this in itself, it is a big plus for the Regional Government to have thought about this, initiated it, and now we have a way with adjustments on modifications to improve efficiency in the program, we are quite on the way to making good progress.

While describing the work of the LDIPC council in the acquisition of Welcome Centres, a participant from Durham College illustrated a similar change, “So just getting that support (from LDIPC members) would suggest that there has been a shift in thinking to
recognize that this (Welcome Centres) is something that is important in Durham Region that may not have happened ten years ago.”

In terms of the impact of LDIPC, depth does not exclude breadth. Evidence suggests the scope of change is significant but in certain areas also widespread. For example, as shown in figure 8.4, 82% of organizations reported seeing a change in attention and profile devoted to immigration and diversity since the implementation of LDIPC.

**Figure 8.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you noticed any change in attention, profile, or services devoted to immigration or diversity in the Durham Region since the implementation of LDIPC?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 28

As a participant from CDCD stated, “You’re right, I think to be fair to the LIP they have started to raise the awareness around the value and need of diversity in our community, they certainly have. And that is a very important first step.”
8.5 Understanding LDIPC’s Limits: Progress is Rarely Problem-Free

Conversely, although few participants questioned change some did question whether it should all be attributed to LDIPC. A participating consultant felt LDIPC had been the beneficiary of excellent timing has diversity work started prior was starting to peak,

You already have a diversity heritage thing going on long before the LDIPC was in place. You already had the makings of a Welcome Centre already going in Pickering, you already people like me and others going out in the community trying to educate, you already had faith-based organizations already doing a lot of this kind of work to bring awareness and educate people. It’s sort of like planting a garden, all the nutrients were there, everything was planted, all they had to do was jump on board. Soil was ripe for it.

A participant from the Town of Whitby suspected it was changing demographics that accounted for the increased attention but did believe LDIPC played a role, “now is it having an effect on the community? Perhaps but that might just be the result of the growing diversity and immigration.” Another participant from Whitby, albeit from the public library, thought there was another reason, “Again, I think there is a general awareness but how do you connect or quantify that whether it’s the council that’s doing that or it’s the latest census release and there is some media attention and that reflects it.”

While these participants questioned the extent of LDIPC’s role in building diversity awareness, other participants wondered about awareness of LDIPC in general. A participant from the Town of Whitby posed the following question, “if we went out to the community and said what are your thoughts on LDIPC? They’d probably say I don’t know what you are talking about.” Participants from the library sector and employment service sector went further, suggesting fellow employees would have virtually no knowledge of LDIPC if asked. A participant from Forest Brook Community Church
made a comparable observation with an interesting caveat, “I doubt very much your average person on the street would be aware that LDIPC exists. I think it’s much more of an organizational catalyst.” With this in mind, as LDIPC is not a traditional service provider and works with organizations not individuals, this begs the question: how important is it for residents of Durham to be aware of LDIPC? This question revisits the contribution issue raised in relationship to the collaborative nature of LDIPC initiatives in Chapter 6. If LDIPC works with organizations to improve their diversity competency and ultimately, the clients of those organizations benefit from improved service, how vital is it for clients to know that LDIPC played a part or what part? As long as the outcome is positive, does LDIPC’s contribution need to be attributed?

These questions tie well with another issue facing LDIPC, sustainable participation. If LDIPC’s contribution is not attributed at least at an organizational level, will this affect future participation? Although too early to tell, participation in Durham Region’s portal committees may give some indication. After experiencing considerable broad-based participation in the development stages of the portal, virtually every participant said attendance has sagged, in some cases, dramatically, in the maintenance phases. A participant from Northern Lights describes the situation,

So initially, it started out really strong because it was oh hey we got deadlines. And it did start to dwindle quite a bit especially since the portal is up and running and now they’re trying to maintain it. I think that they have had a little trouble, perhaps even more trouble with commitment and participation. And it’s hard.

When asked if this situation were to persist, possibly affecting sustainability, a participant from CDCD replied, “No, the energy is really there.” Another participant from CDCD bolstered this claim, saying the drop in portal attendance is a reflection of portal members focusing on different initiatives associated with LDIPC.
8.6 Upper-Level Government Funding and LDIPC: The Power of Place

Answers to these issues lie beyond the scope of this research but one thing is certain, in the words of a participant from LDIPC, LDIPC’s impact has been “exceedingly positive.” While there is still progress to be made on some of LDIPC’s loftier long-term goals such as ensuring the “bulk of diversity and immigration work being done in Durham region will fall under, align with, or connect to, the LDIPC community plan [LDIPC 2011],” considerable progress has occurred on central objectives like “building settlement capacity” and creating a “culture of inclusion.”

Some organizations were tackling diversity, in many cases, competently, prior to LDIPC (Cullen & Clow 2011); however, by encouraging, exposing, educating, and equipping organizations to address diversity and bringing more organizations into the diversity game, LDIPC is expanding diversity’s reach, scope, and ultimately, its footprint. Much analysis in this chapter has revealed the importance of upper-level government funding but a critical question must be asked, is upper-level government funding the silver bullet? It appears the answer to this question is not entirely.

Alone, upper-level government funding is not much use. It must be applied and allocated appropriately to become useful. Those who are able to do this effectively extract value from it. In the case of LDIPC, its value creators are its staff. Participants expressed near unanimous support of and praise for LDIPC staff. A participant from IISG elaborates,

I find [LDIPC’s staff members] extremely creative and willing to try and its not just them but obviously those are the people I see doing the work, it may be directed at higher levels but extremely creative in thinking about who to bring together around what issues and how to continue to raise to make people aware that this is our community, that its changing, that we need to be responding to that
change and that building a healthy, vibrant community means being inclusive and they are looking at all different ways of raising that profile….

A participant from ICCAD expressed positively similar feelings,

Oh yeah. [Said LDIPC staff member] comes. We are constantly in touch with each other. Partners actually with the things I do outside in the community, so, they are very forthcoming with the information that is happening and they want to have the input of the community before they decide. That willingness is there, which I’m really grateful for….

Other adjectives used by participants about the staff included “pivotal,” “fabulous,” “dedicated,” “strategic,” “champion” and having an “open line of communication.”

Outside of Durham, Excellence Canada recognized the Social Service department of Durham Region (department in which LDIPC staff work out of) awarding the Level 4 Gold Award. Part of this award included work of the LDIPC council (LDIPC 2012). As a result, LDIPC staff was invited to take part in the development of quality criteria around diverse workplaces.

This finding speaks to the place-based nature of the LIP policy. If upper-level government funding were the silver bullet, LIPs across Ontario would share a success level similar to Durham something both research shows and participants pointed to as not being the case. This reality highlights the limits of upper-level government funding, funds cannot simply be parachuted into certain places with expected ideal policy outcomes. In light of this, understanding how the common elements of the LIP policy (upper-level government funding, structure, and composition) interact with a particular place and how the distinct elements (scale, contract holder) influence this interaction is a worthwhile pursuit. As this chapter marks the end of the findings chapters and the beginning of the discussion chapter, these themes will be discussed. Moreover, by comparing the results of this research with the current body of work on localized immigration policy within the
fields of governance and regionalization, the ensuing discussion will ultimately contribute to and shed light on one of the questions raised in the introductory chapter, whether the case of LIPs can be classified as local innovative policy or limited initiative policy.
CHAPTER 9
From the Lowest Level Comes the Largest View:
Bringing Local into Focus in the
Governance and Geographies of Immigration

This concluding chapter discusses key findings from the Durham Region, Ontario case study in relationship to the fields of literature outlined in Chapter 2. Contextually, Chapter 2 highlights the disproportionate attention first tier cities receive in the immigration literature, particularly Toronto in the Canadian context. To some degree, given Toronto’s unique circumstances, this is understandable. However, the overwhelming and laser like focus on Toronto comes at a cost. Because of the overemphasis on Toronto, the Canadian immigration literature as currently constructed is unreflective of emerging immigrant realities. Nowhere is this more apparent and ultimately problematic than in settlement, where the settlement process is inherently local. Increasingly, newcomers settle in more diverse types of communities (Murdie 2008; Watt et al. 2008; Segral 2012). Yet, there is relatively little research examining the settlement process in areas beyond first tier cities, and thus a gap in knowledge. In fact, in this area, Toronto’s shadow looms large as general understanding of settlement is influenced by Toronto-based research. The nature of this research as it relates to such issues as funding sources (Richmond & Shields 2004; Lim et al. 2005) or direct service provision (Lim et al. 2007) is poorly applicable or transferable to other places as a result of Toronto’s unique settlement landscape. Even places such as Peel or York with immigration levels comparable to Toronto have voluntarily acknowledged their differences. In short, Toronto’s uniqueness limits the usability of its findings. Hence, based on current trends, there is a need to know how different locales receive and settle newcomers.
With the implementation of COIA, opportunity knocks to break this overemphasis. COIA has provided the investment, mandate and autonomy via LIPS to correct this imbalance. With it, comes the prospect to learn how other places settle newcomers, seeing as virtually every other place settles newcomers differently than Toronto. Findings from LDIPC, marking the first time the impact of a regional LIP has been studied, demonstrate not only the beginning of charting a new research course but also the value of such a path. Documented in the findings chapters and discussed in comparison to other LIPs in this chapter, the research has found innovative and locally based ways Durham has addressed settlement through LIPs, beyond that of what would be considered standard settlement research. In doing so, the research contributes to learning how different places settle newcomers, building a more comprehensive understanding of settlement generally and providing the opportunity to develop knowledge, in this case, transferable and applicable to more places. Places like Durham may not have a high concentration of newcomers but that is precisely the source of their value as the inclusion of places outside first tier cities in greater numbers helps develop a more diverse and rich understanding of newcomer settlement and integration.

With that in mind, thus far, the thesis has situated its research in the literature and disseminated its primary findings; the objective of this chapter is to bring these two pieces together, demonstrating the value of extracting local data in an under-studied area and applying a local lens to concepts typically studied at a national or sub-national level.

The chapter begins documenting the changing nature of governance by describing the development and structure of LDIPC, identifying the nature of LDIPC’s relationship with the sectors involved in immigrant settlement and its role in helping facilitate a
welcoming community while emphasizing the importance of employing a local governance approach to understand settlement to meet the first objective (i.e., *Describe the development and structure of LDIPC and identify the nature of LDIPC’s relationship with the sectors involved in immigrant settlement and its role in helping facilitate a welcoming community*). Maintaining an emphasis on the local, next, the chapter examines the regional nature of LDIPC including the role of the Regional Municipality of Durham and regional infrastructure in developing a regional approach to settlement, thereby verifying the existence of a previously undocumented local regionalization dynamic and debate, to address the second objective (i.e., *Examine the regional nature of LDIPC including the role of the Regional Municipality of Durham and regional infrastructure in developing a regional approach to settlement*). The chapter then delves into a discussion of the implications of localization of immigration policy, comparing pre-LIP and post-LIP eras by assessing the impact of LDIPC, particularly its unique components, to accomplish the third objective (i.e., *Compare pre-LDIPC and post-LDIPC eras, assess the implications of LDIPC particularly its unique components*). The following sections wade into the reflection process, first, highlighting limitations of the present research, and second, mapping areas for future research. Finally, the thesis concludes by describing the macro forces influencing local actions, commenting on the future path of LIPs including suggesting the need to bolster their viability and ensure their sustainability.

**9.1 Adopting a Local Framework: Incorporating Governance into the Settlement Outlook**

The first objective was to describe the development and structure of LDIPC, identify the nature of LDIPC’s relationship with the sectors involved in immigrant settlement and its role in helping facilitate a welcoming community (see Chapters 5 & 6).
Prior to LDIPC, Durham Region had a history of disparate governance relations within the settlement sector. Coordination and collaboration were minimal while cooperation was difficult to come by (Cullen & Clow 2011). Post-LDIPC, findings suggest governance has improved significantly. Much of this is attributable to the new settlement system under LDIPC, one that is inclusive and is closer to becoming all-encompassing. No longer is settlement and integration the domain of a few specific or CIC funded service providers, it now includes multiple sectors. LDIPC itself, with representatives from 14 sectors, many previously non-participants in anything related to settlement, is but one example of this. Besides bringing multiple sectors together through the council at an executive level, LDIPC has organized numerous events and initiatives like the immigration portal, further building relations amongst and between participating sectors. Nearly all participants mentioned networking as a benefit of participating in LDIPC activities. Moreover, participants’ awareness of organizations involved in immigration and settlement increased exponentially (see Figure 8.1).

Developing awareness, creating networking opportunities and convening sectors on different initiatives, has helped, according to numerous participants; break down silos previously hindering Durham’s settlement system (Cullen 2009; Earle 2008). Progress in this area has also meant narrowing the gap between the number of specific and non-specific organizations working together. For some specific organizations like CDCD, in the views of a participant, working with LDIPC has led some to see the organization in a different light, in the process, opening up new opportunities for partnerships. Within the specific sector, LDIPC has played a role in developing closer and more collaborative working relationships amongst CIC funded organizations, highlighted by LDIPC’s efforts
in convening an array of organizations for a pre-proposal meeting prior to organizations submitting their application for CIC’s modernization process. By Durham Region standards (Cullen & Clow 2011), results are extremely positive, however, by LIP standards it is unclear as there is little research available to compare.

Part of the reason for such little research is the stage of LIPs. As Chapter 2 noted, most LIP research has not reached the point of studying impact, only potential impact (Bradford & Andrew 2011) and strategic plans for impact (Kobayashi et al. 2012). The other part is the nature of the settlement literature. Traditionally, settlement research explores issues such as funding sources (Richmond & Shields 2004; Lim et al. 2005), direct service provision (Lo et al. 2007) and the geography of services (Wallace & Frisken 2000; Truelove 2000) but rarely does it venture outside of the settlement sector. Enter LIPs. In the case of LDIPC, it conducts a slew of different activities with the ultimate goal of moving organizations, and ultimately Durham Region, forward on the diversity file. How LDIPC does this is varied (see Chapter 6), but its objective essentially boils down to equipping organizations to become more diversity competent. This is new. LIPs are unconventional in the sense, they are adopting original approaches to diversity and building settlement capacity in ways policy-makers and researchers are only beginning to understand (Bradford & Andrew 2011). Therefore, traditional definitions and ideas of understanding settlement capacity and how it is built need to be expanded to incorporate these approaches to settlement to learn both how they work and what their outcomes are. The Pathways to Prosperity research network has started down this path (Bradford & Andrew 2010; Tossuti & Esses 2011; Kobayashi et al. 2012).
Research findings demonstrate the value of adopting a local governance approach to examine these new realities. Given LIP’s multi-sectoral makeup, new governance, with its emphasis on understanding how the processes of networking and steering occur through various sectors in the production of policy outcomes is an effective way to generate research dissecting the intricacies of LIPs (Walters 2004). In the case of LDIPC, employing a new governance approach yielded insights into the effectiveness of the welcoming communities approach to settlement, the philosophy shaping the LIP spirit and guiding LIP activities. As shown in Chapter 6, documenting each sector’s relationship with LDIPC uncovered what sectors LDIPC interacted with, to what extent, how LDIPC operates, the nature of engagement with each sector and which sectors have benefited most from LDIPC’s presence. Lying in this data set are answers to the above questions regarding how LIPs are building settlement capacity. For example, LDIPC has helped organizations apply for grants in terms of writing and references, promote their organization or their organization’s events, develop or review diversity sensitive policies and documents, hosted or co-hosted diversity training sessions, sat on organization’s boards or committees in a diversity consultant capacity and developed numerous diversity resources, most importantly infrastructure such as *The Citizen* newsletter and immigration portal.

At the same time, the findings suggests LDIPC has been able to convene and include all sectors necessary to establish at minimum a foundation of pieces able to develop a welcoming community. Of course, within this council, there have been varying degrees of involvement and interaction. Participants from general service sectors like employment services and school boards reported having the highest and most varied level
of participation. Similarly, libraries and municipalities, albeit with regional disparities, had steady levels of interaction. Unquestionably, the outlier was the ethno-cultural sector, accruing barely any benefits and experiencing the lowest levels of interaction. The reasons for this are puzzling. First, as outlined in Chapter 6, why is there such inconsistency between the ethno-cultural sector and every other sector, when comparatively, other sectors share a modest level of consistency as it relates to interaction? Second, LDIPC made progress in addressing many of Durham Region’s diversity related problems, why after research identified this (Cullen 2009; Cullen & Clow 2011), have ethno-cultural organizations continued to be excluded?

Third, exclusion becomes more perplexing when thinking about LDIPC’s mandate (LDIPC 2011). In a nutshell, LDIPC’s work revolves around improving the settlement process and ultimately system, something research illustrates ethno-cultural organizations play a key role in (Cullen & Clow 2011). LDIPC has excelled at bringing diversity to the mainstream, mainly through working with general service providers. Yet, as important as it is for mainstream organizations to be equipped to serve diverse populations it is just as important ethno-cultural communities be aware of these services and feel comfortable accessing them. Hence, part of bringing diversity to the mainstream, entails bringing diverse communities to the mainstream, something LDIPC has done little of with ethno-cultural communities, leaving half of the settlement equation unaddressed.

A participant from ICCAD explains the product of this situation,

Yes. The people (immigrants) will not go to them, like we have Welcome House, CDCD, JHS, UW, why are people still coming to us because they are not comfortable to speak with these people. The culture is first of all, that we do not talk about our own problems in public, they are not sure whether the person they are talking to would have an understanding or just listening to us will make

---

5 The LDIPC has done this to some extent with faith communities via faith tours (Citizen 2011).
lasting impressions. They want to speak to someone who understands the pain or suffering they are going through. This one gentleman has been calling me, hasn’t got a job in six years now, and I am trying my very best to make sure that I send his resume here and there, they are not comfortable speaking about their miseries to someone who does not understand, so that is why it is important to reach out and have that knowledge, not standing and allowing people to come to you. We have to reach out to the communities at large and bring them into this world, so the people have a sense of belonging and without any reluctance and without any fear of anything backbiting or having an adverse effect. Building of trust is very important and a lot of organizations has failed to do that.

It is not within the realm of LDIPC’s mandate to act as a front-line service provider; however, it would fall within LDIPC activities to connect mainstream organizations with ethno-cultural organizations as a convener, something it has done on other occasions with different sectors. This suggestion is merely one way ethno-cultural organizations could help meet LDIPC’s objectives, thus, begging the question, why has LDIPC expressed such little interest in what could be a useful partner?

There is one possible explanation. LDIPC has, according to a participant, admittedly, focused less on CIC funded organizations, instead focusing more on general service organizations, where a greater need was identified. As CIC funded organizations form part of the specific sector, has LDIPC inadvertently extended this decision to include the ethno-cultural sector? If yes, why were faith groups, who perform a similar function in the settlement process not part of this decision as well? Moreover, if this were true, the decision would have been made on questionable evidence considering prior research LDIPC had access to (Cullen 2009; Cullen & Clow 2011), underlining the considerable challenges the ethno-cultural sector faces.

Clearly, for LDIPC, there is a role the ethno-cultural sector could be playing. That said, is the lesser role played by ethno-cultural organizations representative of its place, as much as it is a conscious decision? Considering Durham’s ethno-cultural sector is
under-developed, particularly compared to Toronto’s, LDIPC’s tendency to gravitate towards mainstream organizations may be reflective of its options. In other regions with comparable levels of immigration, like Waterloo Region, ethnic and religious associations have had similar rates of participation (Waterloo Region Local Immigration Partnership Council 2010). This is consistent but opposite to what is occurring in the Toronto West LIP (Bradford & Andrew 2011). There, settlement organizations and ethno-cultural organizations comprise the bulk of as well as the most influential seats around the LIP table. This has been problematic, as its composition has been perceived as a clique, limiting its ability to procure broader involvement, thus, hindering its role in helping develop a welcoming community, a key LIP objective (Bradford & Andrew 2011). Together, these findings contribute to the literature on ethno-cultural organizations, shedding light on their role within LIPs across Ontario, a dynamic receiving little attention. Findings also confirm “the significance of ‘place and context’ in shaping LIP dynamics” (Bradford & Andrew 2011, 19), found in earlier LIP research while mirroring another interesting place based development.

Research focused on Toronto indicates one of the reasons mainstream organizations including the City of Toronto have progressive diversity policies is because of the advocacy of the settlement and ethno-cultural sector (Lim et al. 2003; Kataoka & Magnusson 2007). As agents of change with a mandate for change, it is little surprise how many settlement agencies and ethno-cultural organizations migrated towards Toronto’s LIPs. Conversely, in Durham Region, for a period, mostly throughout the 1990’s and early 2000’s advocacy was the domain of ethno-cultural and to some degree, faith-based organizations (Cullen 2009; Earle 2008). Since then, for a number of reasons
(Cullen 2009), advocacy from this sector has cooled. In several ways, arguably, LDIPC has stepped into the gap. Although not perceived as what many would traditionally call an advocate, by encouraging, exposing, educating, and equipping organizations to address diversity, LDIPC is certainly working within the confines of what advocacy entails. It may not be advocating on behalf of a certain group with a specific goal or utilizing typical advocacy means such as protesting but it is trying to influence others and it does have a cause, diversity. Although its sales message is wrapped in a more corporate-oriented tone, plenty of advocacy-based language appears throughout LDIPC literature (LDIPC 2011).

LDIPC’s other distinguishing feature, at least compared to advocacy based organizations in Durham, is the source of its funding. As a publicly funded body it is unique and raises some interesting questions. What role does this play in LDIPC’s advocacy? Are LDIPC’s overtures received differently because it is a publicly funded multi-sectoral body? What advantages does it amass that traditional advocates may be unable to utilize? Although findings prompted such questions, answers remain outside the realm of the research. Nevertheless, findings signify change for Durham Region in advocacy coming from a top down as opposed to bottom up source and have re-framed perceptions of what advocacy looks like and what it can be.

In addition, it adds an interesting dimension to the regionalization debate. It could be assumed as Toronto is the focal point of immigration research, a strong, developed settlement and ethno-cultural sector is a prerequisite for diversity change (Frisken & Wallace 1997; Lim et al. 2003). Without it or a high concentration of newcomers (Good 2009), the source necessary for change seems absent, making change difficult though not
impossible. Results from LDIPC indicate otherwise. Durham Region meets neither of these criterions. Nonetheless, through LDIPC Durham has managed to produce positive, noticeable change on the diversity front, showing there are other approaches, in this case, LIPs, to becoming a more welcoming and diversity competent community. This finding pushes the gauge further on the general understanding of what is required to develop appropriate settlement conditions and create diversity change within specific places.

9.2 Adding a Local Layer to the Regionalization Debate

Findings also represent a contribution to the regionalization debate at the provincial or national level. As illustrated in Chapter 2, over the last decade, the federal government has relinquished much of its selection policy authority (Baglay 2012). During the same time, the federal government expressed its preference for a more equitable distribution of newcomers (Derwing & Krahn 2008). To some degree, the former policy change helped advance the latter policy goal (Watt et al. 2008; Segral 2012), albeit with one oversight, lack of support for non-traditional settlement places (Walton-Roberts 2005). Despite a re-direction of newcomers, there was not a redirection of settlement funds accompanying newcomers. Criticism has been levied at this misstep, as the federal government seemed to overlook the settlement side of the immigration equation, creating an imbalance (Walton-Roberts 2005). Although not representative of a massive federal expenditure (Burr 2011), in Ontario, at least, LIPs are starting to correct this imbalance through their placement in non-traditional settlement locales. Places such as Timmins and North Bay received as part of their LIP contracts, settlement services for the first time (WCI February 2012; Kobayashi et al. 2012) while results from LDIPC demonstrate evidence of an improved settlement system and a multiplication of
settlement capacity because of LIP funds. Policy-wise, the outcome is increased settlement capacity in places outside Toronto and therefore, an ability to absorb a larger number of newcomers. Looking at regionalization as a provincial or national debate, it points to progress on the settlement side of the debate.

The development of LIPs has also prompted a re-consideration or re-thinking of the scale of the regionalization debate, as it is now more relevant at the local level. The second objective of the research examined the regional nature of LDIPC including the role of the Regional Municipality of Durham and regional infrastructure in helping facilitate a regional approach to immigration (see Chapter 7). Historically, in Durham Region, the idea of regionalization is fraught with complications. Introduced in 1975 by the government of Ontario, the Regional Municipality of Durham, was not, to put it lightly, welcomed with open arms by what was now the population of Durham Region. Recently, there is a growing recognition of the merits of regionalization as the social planning council, United Way and the public transportation agency have all evolved into regional entities within the last decade. Although signifying the merits of a regional approach, these examples do not make achieving regionalization any easier especially in the policy area of immigration where differences within Durham are most profound (see Chapter 3). Consequently, pre-LDIPC, regionalization attempts were non-existent though lack of regionalization remained a handicap (Cullen 2009).

Born into fractured regional circumstances, LDIPC has been able to overcome certain obstacles but regionalization has been out of its reach. In terms of representation, LDIPC’s executive council has secured several regional service providers as well as urban and rural municipalities. In practice, regional participation has been harder to
fulfill. LDIPC has managed to bring most suburban municipalities into the fold, a step forward and something previously unattainable in Durham Region. However, further east or north in Durham, there is less likely participation in or awareness of LDIPC especially within the lowest populated municipalities. Participants from these places reported challenges to participation ranging from lack of resources such as staff to uncertainty around where diversity, policy-wise, fit within municipal structures. Curiously, many of the same participants identified specific diversity needs, many of which seemed to present an opportunity for LDIPC to play a role. Clearly, there is disconnect here, the question is the source.

In this case, it seems to be the agent (LDIPC) rather than the structure (LIPs). Although semi-rural and rural municipalities showed little interest in adopting diversity policies prior to LDIPC (Cullen 2009), this research identified opportunities left untapped due to lack of awareness about LDIPC. The lack of movement on the diversity file by any of these places since LDIPC’s inception exemplifies this further. As a result, it is difficult to extrapolate the potential of LIPs in addressing the regionalization dynamic, as not every place was extended an equal opportunity of participating. Nevertheless, evidence does suggest rural municipalities were under-served. In contrast, rural municipalities outside Southern Ontario with LIPs have experienced success (Bradford & Andrew 2011), thus, raising the question in which framework are rural places best served and where will they be able to exercise the most agency? Interestingly, the needs of rural municipalities in Durham align with other rural LIPs as it relates to immigration, those primarily being economic (Kobayashi et al. 2012). However, this is where similarities end. Unlike rural municipalities in Durham, other rural municipalities with a LIP not only
have larger populations but actively courted and applied for them (WCI February 2012). Whether rural municipalities in Durham had an opportunity to do this is unknown. However, considering where diversity fell on their radar in the years leading up to LIP call for proposals (Cullen 2009), the likelihood of pursuit, if given a chance by CIC, seems extremely low.

Bearing that in mind, the type of regionalization LDIPC is practicing (see Chapter 7), based on working with municipalities at their current level of diversity competency towards a reachable place at a mutually agreed upon pace seems to be the most favourable option for LDIPC to move towards regionalization. In that sense, it is less LDIPC’s concept of regionalization is flawed; it is more so, its execution needs to be less flawed. As this research marks the first case study of a regional LIP, there is relatively little research to measure the merits of LDIPC’s approach and to evaluate how it compares on an urban-rural continuum to the York LIP or an urban continuum to the Toronto LIPs. As these regionally based LIPs, along with others reside in the most populous municipalities across Canada, there is bound to be more points of comparison in the near future, making researching regionalization at a local level more pertinent and prevalent while legitimatizing the presence of a regionalization dynamic at the local level.

9.3 Implications of Localized Immigration Policy: Understanding the Latest Step

The previous sections applied a local lens to specific concepts, governance and regionalization; this section will continue to utilize that lens to examine the impact of LIPs as the next extension of localization of immigration policy. The third and final

---

6 There is an article on one Toronto regional LIP, however, it contains little discussion of regional dynamics (Bejan & Black 2012)
objective of the research compared the pre-LIP era to the post-LIP era examining the implications of LDIPC; in particular, its unique components (see Chapter 7 & 8). With LDIPC, knowing the past is not a prerequisite for understanding its impact but it certainly paints a more remarkable picture. As illustrated in Chapter 3, Durham Region’s challenges with immigration have been documented (Cullen 2009; Earle 2011; Cullen & Clow 2011), this research demonstrates how LDIPC has addressed these challenges. A little more than five years ago, adjectives such as disconnected, uncoordinated, limited, narrow, and the most popular, siloed, were used to describe, often without dispute, Durham’s settlement system (Cullen 2009). Today, these adjectives at minimum would be borderline unfitting, at maximum, marginally relevant, mostly because the conditions that gave rise to such adjectives are largely moribund. Settlement infrastructure has evolved from short-lived, unstable, unsustainable pieces to stable, reliable, sustainable pieces, highlighted by the acquisition of Welcome Centres, something Durham had been trying for years to attain.

Besides building settlement capacity, new settlement infrastructure has helped mitigate other challenges. For example, bringing together specific organizations via Welcome Centres and general and specific organizations via the immigration portal has helped eliminate silos municipally and sectorally, resolving many of the governance challenges identified in Chapter 3. The ensuing cross-fertilization led participants to reporting more opportunities to forge relationships with organizations outside their sector and referencing increased awareness of organizations involved in immigration and diversity. Evidence such as the proposal process for CIC’s modernization program point to further integration of CIC funded organizations and a willingness to include non-CIC
funded organizations, both signs of improved governance. The result is a more inclusive, broadly based and far-reaching settlement system, one that has entered a new stage.

Logistical developments have fostered broader change. Several participants said the emergence of LDIPC prompted their organization to be more diversity conscious (see Figure 8.3). More than three quarters of participants noted seeing change in attention, profile, or services devoted to immigration or diversity since LDIPC’s inception (see Figure 8.4). Moreover, participants identified numerous examples of cultural change, most notably, progress in removing the stigma around newcomers. There were hints from some participants, explaining their organization’s newfound attention towards diversity or their participation in LDIPC, to be a product of their organization’s mindfulness around their perceived reputation on diversity, a consideration illustrating the penetration of diversity awareness in Durham’s culture.

In several ways, findings corroborate much of the literature. LDIPC is consistent with the greater number of LIPs (Bradford & Andrew 2011; Burstein et al. 2012), successful outside Toronto. Inside the GTA, LDIPC shares success levels similar to the peripheral regions than the City of Toronto (Bradford & Andrew 2010). Thus, confirming variability amongst LIPs within the GTA and showing the largest divergence between the City of Toronto and its surrounding regions. Consequently, shining light on the limitations of discussing the GTA as an entity, homogenous or not, as it relates to LIPs or the broader immigration literature. Simultaneously, demonstrating a need to acknowledge and understand the role of place in immigrant settlement. This speaks to an emerging trend amongst LIPs, geographic location for the most part, does not seem to dictate success.
As a regional entity, again, LDIPC contrasts with Toronto. Notwithstanding a shorter existence, the little research completed on Toronto’s regional LIPs compares unfavourably (Bejan & Black 2012). Albeit with a different set-up, Toronto’s LIP has incurred more difficulty in achieving progress with fewer results. The other comparable is Peel (Bradford & Andrew 2011; Stasiulis et al. 2011), which did demonstrate positive findings but at a much earlier stage in its development. With that in mind, LDIPC is distinct and indicates success can be had with a regional scale, but is only one of an assortment of regional set-ups across Ontario. Therefore, it cannot be said with certainty, operating at a regional scale is any marker of success for LIPs.

What can be said is findings contribute to the growing success story of LIPs with one exception. Unlike other LIP research, this research moves beyond strategic plans (Kobayashi et al. 2012) or potential (Bradford & Andrew 2011) to focus on impact. Consequently, pushing the LIP conversation from the design and implementation stage to the operations stage, learning what is possible and realistic.

LDIPC’s impact is more illuminating considering its starting point. As illustrated in Chapter 4, prior to LDIPC, there was dialogue around exploring a regional diversity initiative of some nature, but nothing concrete. Chapter 3 illustrates problems this created. Still, after the Regional Municipality of Durham formally committed to developing a regional group of some nature devoted to diversity, little work was complete prior to applying for a LIP (see Chapter 7). Compared to places with successful LIPs such as London or Peel (Burstein et al. 2012; Stasiulis et al. 2011), who built on previous initiatives or integrated a LIP into current initiatives, Durham Region started from
virtually scratch including a regional municipality with minimal experience in immigration policy.

Much of Durham Region’s LIP success stems from the pieces LIPs have incorporated into local settlement policy. The addition of municipalities has been a boon for Durham Region. Previously hindered by the absence of a regional approach to immigration (Cullen 2009) and lacking any type of regional body for diversity matters, the Regional Municipality of Durham by acting as the contract holder for LDIPC has stepped into the void. According to participants, Durham Region is occupying a place, in terms of size and scale; other organizations are unequipped or unable to. Some participants went as far to say a LIP was implausible not only at a regional level but also at any scale or format without Durham Region’s participation. Although inexperienced in diversity matters, Durham Region’s presence and reach has been able to bring mainstream service providers and institutions to the diversity table, helping facilitate LDIPC initiatives. Multiple participants re-enforced the essential role of Durham Region, with few questions raised about its commitment or leadership.

In this sense, LDIPC matches other LIPs where municipalities have been a critical component in success (Burstein et al. 2012). What remains unexamined, at least as far as LIP leadership goes, is whether municipalities are a critical piece or the critical piece. As noted in Chapter 7, although there was expected municipal participation in some capacity, LIP RFP’s were open to primary applicants besides municipalities. While municipalities are contract holders in a slight majority of LIPs, there are LIPs with other contract holders, namely settlement service agencies. Obviously, results from LDIPC indicate LIPs with municipalities as the contract holder can be successful but there is
little knowledge from other LIPs to call it the superior choice. It would seem settlement service agencies might face more obstacles in implementing a welcoming communities approach because they operate within a settlement bubble and may not have the same connections with other sectors in the community but this is purely speculative and may be more problematic in some areas such as London versus others like Toronto. Nevertheless, Toronto LIPs do not contain municipal involvement and rank amongst the poorest performing. Either way, more knowledge is needed to compare.

Upper-level government funding is the other component enabling change in Durham. After a history of non-involvement, it was a factor in ensuring the regional municipality’s participation. Although most participants were sure a diversity initiative of some type would have happened regardless, they did acknowledge upper-level government funding augmented the size, scope and speed of LDIPC initiatives. Durham’s new settlement infrastructure, responsible for much progress LDIPC has made, was either started and/or sustained by federal or provincial government funds. As much as participants credited upper-level government funding as an enabler, concerns were expressed it could quickly and unexpectedly become the opposite, a disabler. As noted in Chapter 7, LIPs are funded on an annual contract basis. Re-applying annually does not necessarily mean renewal. This situation coupled with the Regional Municipality of Durham’s historical reluctance to support financially diversity initiatives raised apprehension amongst some participants. Unease may be somewhat placated by LDIPC’s steady and successful record of securing funding. However, what happens if upper-level governments pull LIP funding? This touches on some of the broader changes COIA has implemented in local settlement policy.
As highlighted in Chapter 2, pre-COIA, local settlement policy remained encumbered by a number of long-standing issues, lack of funding for settlement services (Richmond & Shields 2004; Sadiq 2004), *de facto* role of municipalities (AMO 2008; Carter et al. 2008; FCM 2009) the disparate relationship between stakeholders involved in the settlement process (McIssac 2003; Frisken & Wallace 2003) and intergovernmental uncertainty (Mwarigha 2002; Omidvar 2003). By some marks, COIA has made successful changes, the introduction of municipal involvement and upper-level government funding being the most obvious. At least in Durham, LDIPC has improved relations amongst CIC funded organizations. Moreover, at a higher level, for a period, in fact, for much of this case study’s period, it curbed inter-governmental uncertainty (more on this later). In recent years, this development has begun to unwind. Since COIA’s temporary extension expired in 2011, the government of Ontario and government of Canada have been unable to complete a new settlement agreement (MCI 2010), leaving LIPs operating under a cloud of uncertainty, forcing them to confront the real possibility of what to do if their primary funding source disappears. On the one hand, such is the nature of dependence on upper-level government funding, on the other, to put it crassly, why mess with such a good thing, especially when it can be and has been avoided. With politics pervading the situation (Biles et al. 2011), when intergovernmental certainty will be restored is anyone’s guess. In the meantime, politics, while jeopardizing much of what LIPs have accomplished unintentionally legitimizes something worth exploring, a discussion of LIP funding sources.
9.4 Research Limitations: Yield Accordingly

Before moving forward, it is important to reflect back. As much as the thesis has made contributions, like all research, there are caveats. Although participation reflected high levels of representation within certain sectors, no sectors had full participation. At the same time, the data set does not represent equal input from each sector, for a myriad of reasons, there were higher numbers from specific sectors, see Chapter 3. The objective was to interview sectors research demonstrated played a role within the settlement process. As a result, sectors outside were not equally represented. This choice may reflect favourably or unfavourably on LDIPC but it must be noted LDIPC’s impact is measured from these perspectives and based on this criteria.

Not service providers in the traditional sense, LIPs are a part of and designed primarily to improve the general settlement service system. Because of this, research has centered on interviewing service providers and focused at a service provider level. Ultimately, service providers are responsible for serving newcomers. In order to understand the complete impact, the next logical step would be to interview newcomers, something this research did not do.

Although supplemented in some cases with primary documents, interviews were the primary method of data collection. Accordingly, data was collected in an individual-to-individual fashion often in a private setting; the data set reflects how participants chose to reveal information in this manner. Considering the collaborative nature of LIPs, future LIP studies would be served well using focus groups as the primary data collection method; understanding the peer dynamic may provide insight into how LIPs function.
9.5 Where Do We Go From Here? Areas of Future Research

Outlined briefly in Chapter 2, LIP funding is contract based. Explored with great depth and breadth as it relates to traditional service provision (Richmond & Shields 2004; Lim et al. 2005), contract funding has received little attention in a LIP context. This seems like a ripe area for research given the problems identified with short-term contract funding (Richmond & Shields 2004) and the LIP’s supposed long-term planning mandate. In short, to a certain degree, LIP funding seems at odds with its goals.

Looking outside LIP goals, the other side of the funding web worthy of future examination is whether LIP investment in communities has had a multiplier effect. In other words, have other policy goals benefitted from LIP investment. For instance, has LIP funding help produce improved settlement outcomes for newcomers? Or have the establishment of LIPs helped attract more newcomers to non-traditional settlement areas? Understanding LIP’s role will develop knowledge needed to make their contribution more effective in reaching these types of goals.

Although LIPs receive upper-level government funding, it is far from a level playing field. Besides various CIC contribution levels based on numerous factors (Kobayashi et al. 2012; Burstein et al. 2012), municipal financial contributions to LIPs or their initiatives diverge across Ontario. With some places benefitting from an extra boost, worth knowing is first why, second, does it give them a leg-up and third, at what stage did it happen, at an earlier stage to help get the LIP up and running or at a later stage because the LIP made a difference and the local municipality wanted to build on it? Moreover, would these places be better prepared if LIP funding were to be withdrawn, would municipalities be more likely to step in to fill the gap, and what options would
they have to do so? All are valid questions and if answered would shed light on the place-based nature of LIP financial dynamics.

Another LIP component determined by place is configuration. LDIPC is part of a select category of regionally based LIPs but is only one of many LIP configurations. Simcoe County counts 18 municipalities, urban and rural, as part of their LIP while in Northwestern Ontario, 32 municipalities joined together to create a LIP, illustrating the range in which LIPs operate. This research demonstrated the difficulty of getting eight municipalities engaged over a large geographical area, what type of challenges emerge when the geographic area and number of municipalities is doubled or quadrupled? It may seem like an unfruitful exercise to contemplate what these circumstances can create but if newcomers are going to settle across Ontario, different approaches must be tried and subsequently examined to determine what is effective.

At this point, the bulk of LIP research is Ontario based (Bradford & Andrew 2011). For good reason, until recently, Canada’s only LIPs were situated there. In the planning and implementation stages, LIPs or councils similar in concept but not in name are starting to appear elsewhere (Stasiulis et al. 2011). A next direction of research should be to study LIPs outside Ontario and to compare on a number of levels to the current body of research. Doing so, should not only reveal different provincial approaches, which is useful considering many federal and provincial agreements are in the process of negotiation or will soon expire, but will also open a realm of possibilities for comparative provincial studies.

On an empirical level, understanding a place’s circumstances prior to LIP development may in fact, expose what has made certain LIPs successful. Unfortunately,
there are few LIP studies including background (Burstein et al. 2012), thus, making it difficult to examine. However, wherever possible, this may be a sensible pursuit. In this research, one participant suspected LDIPC’s success was a product of past work, that LDIPC was a case of perfect timing. Although this does not hold up entirely, it may have played some part because previous circumstances in many ways dictated the composition of LIPs. In Durham, for instance, the minimal number of specific organizations made it relatively easy to decide what organizations would participate, but more importantly lead the LIP. Durham’s greater path of resistance stemmed from persuading mainstream institutions and organizations to participate. In this case, Durham is starting with a less complicated settlement landscape and a relatively blank slate in terms of roles and responsibilities.

Conversely, somewhere like Toronto with a much more dynamic multi-faceted settlement landscape faces a tougher process trying to include all organizations (Bradford & Andrew 2010). Not to mention, the history, competition and politics that is sure to cast a shadow over the process. It may be easier for Toronto to convince mainstream organizations to participate but to include them at a cost of excluding another settlement service agency, for reasons of functionality, would it be worth it? Toronto faces the balancing act of maintaining fairness in both the settlement and general service sector to ensure a smooth functioning LIP. Based on this, places such as Durham with fewer immigrants and less specific service providers seem pre-disposed to LIP success; nevertheless, more knowledge is needed to corroborate this.

Within Durham, as rationalized in chapter 3, this research relied on the sectors research demonstrated played the most active part in the settlement process. Throughout
the primary research collection process, there were many indications to some degree, LDIPC purposely focused on general service organizations. While some adjustments were made upon learning this, there was not enough notice to change the make-up of participants. Because of this, what is needed is a sample consisting of a greater number of general service organizations. Such a sample may indicate more positive results than what have been found. Similarly, as many of LDIPC’s objectives were business-related (LDIPC 2011), a study focusing on impact in the business community would expand insights about LDIPC. In addition, although it was covered to some extent, looking at the strategic plans and corporate documents of organizations pre and post LDIPC would provide the opportunity for a quantitative analysis.

9.6 The Future of LIPs: Fad or Final Step in the Localization Frontier?

Perhaps reflective of the minimal output on the impact of LIPs, little discussion exists pertaining to their future. What have emerged are two diametrically opposed directions, elimination or expansion. Elimination is not as drastic or sudden as it sounds (Wiginton 2012). LIP development is an incremental process, starting with planning, then moving to developing a community plan, next implementing that community plan, within, ideally, a five-year period. After this period, the LIP dissolves, the rationale being by this time, communities are now better equipped to address immigration with the necessary partnerships in place (Wiginton 2012). In theory, this might work, but evidence suggests otherwise.

Consider the theory as it relates to Durham Region. Currently, based on these criteria, LDIPC would be close to the end of its lifespan. As this research demonstrates, much change has occurred and Durham has a more informed idea of how to address
diversity. Yet, as acknowledged officially (LDIPC 2012), there is much more work to do, notwithstanding such long-term goals as trying to “create a culture of inclusion.” Removing the diversity agent of change from a place historically lacking a diversity champion and starting from a lower diversity benchmark (Cullen & Clow 2011), when it is experiencing diversity change seems counter-productive. Not to mention, LDIPC provided the pieces enabling progress. Altering the current form of LDIPC, which has proved successful, runs the risk of limiting future change and endangering recent achievements.

In other words, dissolution could be destructive, making LIPs a fad not the future of local settlement policy, like many others anticipate them to be (Bradford & Andrew 2011). Conversely, expansion would entrench LIPs as the centerpiece of local settlement policy, pushing them ever closer to becoming the final step in localized immigration policy. Expansion is predicated on endowing LIPs with increased responsibility, more specifically, assigning authority over local CIC financial allocations (Burstein et al. 2012). Increased input and influence over local CIC finances would presumably further the profile of primary LIP stakeholders while giving discussions of LIP priorities a new level of importance, leading to an expected increase in participation (Burstein et al. 2012). All benefits yes, however, benefits rarely occur without drawbacks. Changing LIPs mandate will alter the fabric with its community partners, a risky step when collaboration is the bane of LIPs existence and effectiveness. If organizations perceive LIPs purely “as financial negotiating spaces” (Burstein 2012 et al., 11), their usefulness could quickly be jeopardized.
Extending LIPs increased influence also changes the terms of LIP participation for community partners. It also has the ability to infringe on their impartiality, a key asset. In the case of Durham, LDIPC’s neutrality played a significant role in facilitating a region wide strategic approach to CIC’s modernization application process. The likelihood of this occurring surely would have decreased if LDIPC’s neutrality was compromised in any way. LIP participation is voluntary; LIPs lack authority to guarantee participation, thus, perception is everything. How will LDIPC’s perception change if it is seen as choosing or aiding one organization over another for a CIC contract or grant? The outcome could be polarizing, causing some organizations to withdraw their participation. This would limit LIPs ability to bring all organizations in a sector or perhaps other sectors together to address other parts of LIPs mandate. As demonstrated in Chapter 5, LIPs terms of interaction are inherently fragile; they need every tool and advantage at their disposal to ensure broad-based participation.

One of the most appealing LIP features is local autonomy. Dependent on upper-level government funding, LIPs are relatively free and flexible to meet their objectives in a variety of ways. Adding a layer of responsibility, especially one of a procurement nature seems premature. As Pero (2011) states, more time is needed to evaluate the impact of LIPs. As noted previously, this research is some of the first highlighting the general impact of a LIP. LIP research is still in the infant stages and LIPs themselves, launched on a staggered timeline are only starting to realize what they are capable of. As a concept, LIPs have yet to be shaped fully and are in the process of being fully formed. As Chapter 5 indicates, communities of some LIPs are just learning what LIPs are all about. At the same time, the assortment of scales, configurations and places amongst
LIPs multiply the opportunity for a proposal of this nature to experience difficulty. Let us learn and see what LIPs are capable of before the mandate is muddled.

At this point, a plausible and promising option would be to expand LIP funding. Funding for LDIPC was described by a participant from LDIPC as “adequate.” If LDIPC’s progress were a product of “adequate” funding, more than adequate would undoubtedly unleash a wave of possibilities and opportunity. Increased funding would expand the boundaries of LIPs while opening the door to more innovative and creative ways to build settlement capacity. It may also solicit the scope and breadth of LIPs reach by expanding their presence.

Increased LIP funding may seem like the most probable option with the path of least resistance, however, achieving any type of LIP reform in the tumultuous intergovernmental immigration climate is much easier said than done. LIPs were conceived during the COIA era, beginning in 2006 and lasting until 2011. Historically, this period is an outlier in government of Ontario and government of Canada immigration relations (Seidle 2010; Siemiatycki & Triadafilopoulos 2010). Marked by certainty and stability, COIA represents the first time these two governments have managed to complete a comprehensive immigration agreement, a notable aberration. LIPs were one of the many innovative and promising features COIA spawned (Seidle 2010). Post-COIA, promise has amounted to positive results, improved settlement outcomes and increased powers for the City of Toronto (Andrew & Abdourhamane 2011). Besides LDIPC’s results, a product of LIPs has been a start towards re-balancing the amount of attention on Toronto versus the rest of Ontario. LIPs have helped break the ice in many places and pushed those places previously idling on immigration to moving forward.
Overall, there is plenty of evidence to support the view found within the literature that COIA has started a new era in immigration and settlement policy (Stasiuslis et al. 2012; Biles et al. 2011).

Yet, after breaking the ice in numerous areas in its first period, it has failed to leave the first intermission. Since expiring in 2011, it has puttered along surviving barely on temporary extensions. Thankfully, LIP funding has continued, albeit without increases or discussion of any reform. How long this will last is unknown. Either way, the future of LIPs and the subsequent impact they have on their communities remain inextricably linked to a new COIA. Caught between the politics of the government of Ontario and government of Canada, a supposed new era soon threatens to return to the ways of the old era, where instability and uncertainty were the norm, possibly erasing much of what has been accomplished. Despite the immense level of positivity surrounding COIA at its inception and its impressive results, negotiations remain in stalemate. In the meantime, until a new deal is reached, both governments should keep in mind, this appropriate Canadianism, no team has ever played 20 minutes of hockey and won the game.
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Appendix A
Local Immigration Partnerships: A Case Study of Innovation in Regional Governance from Durham Region, Ontario

Semi-Structured Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Participant’s Name</th>
<th>Date/Time/Location</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section A  Interaction with the Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council (LDIPC)

To start, I would like to ask basic questions about your organization’s relationship with the LDIPC.

A1. Did your organization participate in either of the LDIPC’s consultations for its diversity plan on the following dates October 17, 2008 and/or March 24, 2010?
   YES  NO

A1a. If YES, please describe.

A2. Did your organization participate in any of the surveys (online), interviews, or focus groups conducted by the LDIPC as part of it consultations for its diversity plan?
   YES  NO

A2a. If YES, please describe.

A3. Did your organization attend the public launch of the LDIPC on March 4, 2011?
   YES  NO

A3a. If YES, please describe.

A3b. If NO, was your organization invited?

A4. Has your organization attended any information sessions, workshops, or training sessions related to diversity/cultural competency or any of the LDIPC’s activities?
   YES  NO

A4a. If YES, when and what was the purpose of said session or workshop?

A4b. If YES, did your organization receive any literature on best practices for diversity?

A4c. Has the LDIPC given your organization other tools to help serve newcomers?
A5. Has your organization participated in LDIPC council meetings?
A5a. If YES, in what capacity?

A6. Has the LDIPC probed or consulted your organization around service needs in its sector?

YES      NO
A6a. If YES, please describe.

A7. Has the LDIPC inquired about using or promoting any of your organization’s practices or events?

YES      NO
A7a. If YES, please be specific.

A8. Does or did your organization sit on any of Durham Region’s Immigration Portal Committees (durhamimmigration.ca)?

YES      NO
A8a. If YES, which committee?

Section B  Initiated Relations with the LDIPC

Next, I would like to ask a series of questions about whether your organization has initiated relations with the LDIPC and if it has gained anything from its relationship with the LDIPC. As with Section A, Section B questions center on your organization’s relations with the LDIPC.

B1. Has your organization made any outreach attempts to the LDIPC?

YES      NO
B1a. If YES, what was the nature of this outreach.
B1b. If NO, why not?

B2. Has the emergence of the LDIPC prompted your organization to be more diversity conscious?

YES      NO
B2a. If YES, please explain.
B3. Does your organization have an increased awareness of organizations involved in immigration and diversity and their activities in part because of the LDIPC?

B4. Have you noticed an increase in demand for your service or increased awareness of your services since the advent of the LDIPC?

B5. Do you feel your organization has been given a fair opportunity to participate in and contribute to the LDIPC and its activities?
   YES  NO

B5a. If YES, why?
B5b. If NO, why not?

B6. Have you noticed any change in communication, collaboration, coordination, or cooperation on immigration or diversity related issues in your sector since the advent of the LDIPC?

B7. Has the LDIPC provided your organization the opportunity in any form (consultations, focus groups, workshops), to forge relationships with organizations outside your sector on immigration or diversity related issues?

B8. What benefits has your organization derived either from working with the LDIPC or participating in LDIPC led initiatives?

Section C    Perceptions of the LDIPC

In this section, I would like to ask about your general perceptions of the LDIPC based on your observations and experience as a member of an organization involved in the settlement and integration of newcomers in Durham.

C1. How would you describe the impact of the LDIPC on the Durham Region?

C2. Have you noticed any change in attention, profile, or services devoted to immigration or diversity in the Durham Region (place not government) since the implementation of the LDIPC? In other words, do you notice an increased awareness about diversity since the emergence of the LDIPC?

C3. Has the LDIPC helped build infrastructure between service providers and sectors involved in the settlement and integration process?

C4. Has the LDIPC assisted in establishing a higher level of connectivity and a better rapport amongst organizations and sectors involved in the settlement and integration process?
C5. Would you describe the process behind the design and implementation of the LDIPC as “community driven”?

---

Section D  Big Picture Thoughts on the LDIPC

To conclude, I would like to garner your thoughts on the overall impact of the LDIPC.

D1. How would you describe Durham’s approach to settlement and integration?

D2. What are the most pertinent immigration related issues in Durham?
   D2a. How do you think the LDIPC has addressed these?
   D2b. How do you think it could address these?

D3. What role do you think the Regional Government of Durham has played in the LDIPC?
   D3a. Would Durham have a Local Immigration Partnership without the Regional Government’s participation?

D4. Is there anything you would like to add that we have not already touched on?

D5. Can you please suggest other organizations, agencies, or individuals whom I should interview?

THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.
YOUR FEEDBACK IS GREATLY APPRECIATED
AND YOUR INPUT IS EXTREMELY VALUED!
Local Immigration Partnerships: A Case Study of Innovation in Regional Governance from Durham Region, Ontario

Semi-Structured Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Participant’s Name</th>
<th>Date/Time/Location</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section A  
Internal Activities of the Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council (LDIPC)
To start, I would like to ask basic questions about your organization’s activities in both a consultative and operational capacity.

A1. The LDIPC held consultations for its diversity plan on October 17, 2008 and March 24, 2010, besides these dates did the LDIPC conduct additional surveys (online), interviews, or focus groups as part of it consultations for its diversity plan?
   YES      NO
   A1a. If YES, please describe.

A2. Does the LDIPC record the minutes of its meetings?
   YES      NO
   A2a. If YES, are these minutes publicly available?

A3. Does the LDIPC maintain a general e-mail list serve?
   YES      NO
   A3a. If YES, please explain.

A4. What is the status of the sub or working committees originally proposed as part of the LDIPC structure?

A5. Currently, how many progress reports has the LDIPC completed?
   YES      NO
   A5a. If YES, please describe.

A6. Can you please explain the process behind the community report cards for the LDIPC?
Section B  External Relations of the LDIPC

Next, I would like to ask a series of questions about the external activities of the LDIPC.

B1. Do the LDIPC staff sit on any committees of other organizations?

B2. Has the LDIPC entered into any partnerships with other organizations involved in the settlement and integration process?

B3. What role did the LDIPC play in bringing the Welcome Centres to Ajax and Pickering?

B4. How does the LDIPC assist or help equip organizations involved in the settlement and integration of newcomers in Durham?

B5. Have you noticed any change in communication, collaboration, coordination, or cooperation on immigration or diversity related issues amongst organizations involved in the settlement and integration of newcomers since the advent of the LDIPC?

B6. Has the LDIPC helped build infrastructure between service providers and sectors involved in the settlement and integration process?

Section C  Perceptions of the LDIPC

In this section, I would like to ask about your general perceptions of the LDIPC as an organization that had a clear idea of Durham’s handling of immigration prior to the establishment of the LDIPC as well as first-hand knowledge of Durham’s handling of immigration presently.

C1. How would you describe the impact of the LDIPC on the Durham Region?

C2. Have you noticed any change in attention, profile, or services devoted to immigration or diversity in the Durham Region (place not government) since the implementation of the LDIPC? In other words, do you notice an increased awareness about diversity since the emergence of the LDIPC?

C3. Would you describe the process behind the design and implementation of the LDIPC as “community driven”? 
Section D  Big Picture Thoughts on the LDIPC

To conclude, I would like to garner your thoughts on the overall impact of the LDIPC.

D1. How would you describe Durham’s approach to settlement and integration?

D2. What are the most pertinent immigration related issues in Durham?
   
   D2a. How do you think the LDIPC has addressed these?
   D2b. How do you think it could address these?

D3. What role do you think the Regional Government of Durham has played in the LDIPC?
   
   D3a. Would Durham have a Local Immigration Partnership without the Regional Government’s participation?

D4. As the LDIPC has developed what challenges has it faced?

D5. What does the future hold for the LDIPC?

D6. Is there anything you would like to add that we have not already touched on?

D7. Can you please suggest other organizations, agencies, or individuals whom I should interview?

THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.
YOUR FEEDBACK IS GREATLY APPRECIATED AND YOUR INPUT IS EXTREMELY VALUED!
Appendix C
Blair Cullen  
Frost Center  
TC  

June 15, 2011  

File # -22163  
Title: The governance of Immigrant integration: A case study of Durham Region, ON  

Dear Mr. Cullen,  

The Research Ethics Board (REB) has given approval pending minor revisions to your proposal entitled "The governance of Immigrant integration: A case study of Durham Region, ON".  

A list of required amendments, as per Tri-Council guidelines, is attached. Please do the following:  
1) Make these changes, and resubmit 1 copy of the revised versions of the pertinent document(s) to the REB c/o the Office of Research.  
2) Include in your resubmission the list of required/recommended revisions provided here, and indicate how you have addressed them.  

The resubmission will be reviewed by an expedited review as soon as possible, and an approval letter will follow if the required amendments have been satisfactorily addressed.  

You have 30 days from the date of this letter to submit your revisions. Please remember that no project can start without final approval.  

If I may be of help in answering any questions or clarifying any of the points raised here, please contact me.  

With best wishes,  

Karen Mauro  
Compliance Officer  
Research Office  

Phone: (705) 748-1011 ex. 7050  
Fax: (705) 748-1587  
Email: kmauro@trentu.ca  

c.c.: Dr. Rory Coughlan  
Chair, REB  

Trent University  
Research Ethics Board
Appendix D
Consent Form

Frost Centre for Canadian Studies and Indigenous Studies, Peterborough, ON K9J 7B8
Blair Cullen: blaircullen@trentu.ca Supervisor: Mark Skinner: markskinner@trentu.ca
Office of Research: Tel: (705) 748-1011 x 7050

Nature of the Project:

As part of Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s (CIC) modernization program, how immigration services are organized and delivered are changing, marking a fundamental rethink in settlement policy. Across Ontario, changes are playing out differently in different places. In Durham, the most notable development is the establishment of the Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council (LDIPC). The LDIPC represents a change to a more broad-based approach to immigrant settlement and integration. Yet, little research has been completed to understand the impact of the LDIPC or other Local Immigration Partnership (LIP) councils.

The focus of this research, “Local Immigration Partnerships: A Case Study of Innovation in Regional Governance from Durham Region, Ontario,” is to chart the impact of the LDIPC and examine whether the LDIPC has helped address Durham’s immigration challenges. The goal of the research is to interview up to 60 organizations in the following sectors: ethno-cultural organizations, employment services, school boards, settlement service organizations, religious organizations, libraries, and municipalities.

Funding has been generously provided by:

As a participant in the above project, I understand the following:

1. Data will not be shared with other organizations. Data will only be used as part of my MA thesis and in possible scholarly publications. A final report will be provided to all participating organizations.
2. No personal identifying information will be used but reference will be made to the sector your organization is in (i.e. a municipalities, ethno-cultural organizations).
3. The interview will be audio-recorded with your permission. All data will be stored securely on a password protected computer and viewed only by myself and my thesis supervisor, Dr. Mark Skinner of Trent University. The interview should take approximately one hour.
4. Participation is entirely voluntary. You may decline to answer any question, end the interview when you feel appropriate and withdraw your participation up to two weeks after the interview.
5. Individual’s responses will be quoted verbatim in the thesis but as bullet #2 states; no personal identifying information will be used.

Participant Name: __________________________________________

Signature of Participant: ______________________________________

Signature of Researcher: ______________________________________

Date Signed: ______________________________________
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Appendix E
## Breakdown of Interviews by Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Ajax</td>
<td>Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pickering</td>
<td>Pickering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Whitby</td>
<td>Whitby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oshawa</td>
<td>Oshawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality of Clarington</td>
<td>Clarington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Scugog</td>
<td>Scugog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Uxbridge</td>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Region</td>
<td>Brock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethno-Cultural Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durham Tamil Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil Academic and Cultural Society of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Polish Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Loreley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Alliance of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Canadian Cultural Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian-Jamaican Club of Oshawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajax-Pickering Congress of Black-Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Cultural Council of Oshawa-Durham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith-Based Organizations</th>
<th>Employment Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baha’i Faith</td>
<td>Northern Lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devi Mandir</td>
<td>Durham College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Brook Community Church</td>
<td>META Vocational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IISG</td>
<td>JHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRLTB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Boards</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPR</td>
<td>Anonymous #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDSB</td>
<td>Anonymous #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCDSB</td>
<td>Anonymous #3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F
Beverly Hendry  
Chief Administrative Officer  
Township of Scugog  
Box 780, 181 Perry St.  
Port Perry, ON L9L 1A7  

May 17, 2011

Dear Ms. Hendry,

On behalf of the Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council (LDIPC), I am writing to invite your municipality to consider becoming involved with the Council. In March of this year the Community Plan was launched. The Plan, including the Terms of Reference is enclosed.

The LDIPC oversee the implementation of the Diversity and Immigration Community Plan. It has 17 members representing different sectors of the community. Recently, the municipal representative had to resign due to scheduling challenges. This leaves a vacancy.

The LDIPC is looking for a municipal representative that values the work of Diversity and Immigration, realizes the link between economic development and immigration, civic engagement and healthy communities and has the capacity to represent all eight municipalities in this role. Most members of the council are in leadership positions within their respective organizations, such as managers, policy staff or elected representatives.

We are sending this letter to all eight of our municipal partners, asking them to submit the names of interested parties to Audrey Andrews, Manager of the Diversity and Immigration Program at the Regional Municipality of Durham, who will in turn forward the names to the LDIPC for consideration.

The council meets 6 times a year for 3 hours and offers advice and guidance on the implementation of the Plan. Periodically, members are asked to lend their expertise to working groups or to a specific initiative.

This is exciting work, which we anticipate having a broad impact in the larger Durham community for years to come. Our municipal partners have been key to the success of the launch of www.durhamimmigration.ca, the publication of The Citizen and the development of The Plan. We hope you will consider a staff member from your office, joining the LDIPC.

If you would like to discuss this opportunity or need more information, please feel free to contact Audrey Andrews at 905-558-7711 ext. 2525 or audrey.andrews@durham.ca.

Sincerely,

Dr. Hugh Drouin  
Co-Chair, Local Diversity and Immigration Partnership Council