

LIP-Municipal Interactions and CIC's Strategic Interests

August 6, 2012

Meyer Burstein -- Victoria Esses -- Aurelie Lacassagne -- John Nadeau

A report by the Welcoming Communities Initiative

Funded By:



Citizenship and
Immigration Canada

Citoyenneté et
Immigration Canada

Table of Contents

Chapter 1:

LIP-Municipal interactions and CIC's strategic interests *page 3*

Chapter 2:

Observations *page 4*

Chapter 3:

London case study: Victoria Esses *page 12*

Chapter 4:

Ottawa case study: Meyer Burstein *page 23*

Chapter 5:

North Bay case study: John Nadeau *page 38*

Chapter 6:

Sudbury case study: Aurelie Lacassagne *page 49*

Annexes

Annex 1: Questionnaire guide *page 60*

Annex 2: Results of opinion leader study for case study cities *page 65*

Annex 3: Excerpt from LIP organizational best practices study *page 66*

Chapter 1: LIP-Municipal interactions and CIC's strategic interests

This report was commissioned from the Welcoming Communities Initiative (WCI) by the Integration Branch of Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Its purpose is to examine and describe the evolving relationship between Local Immigration Partnerships and their municipal hosts. CIC also wanted to know what impact the involvement of municipalities was having on the Department's ability to achieve its strategic objectives.

Rather than conducting a broad brush survey across all LIPs, the WCI adopted a case study approach. Four cities were chosen with a view to including Northern communities whose primary interest lay in economic development and population attraction, larger southern cities characterized by more complex and elaborate bureaucracies, and LIPs characterized by a wide variety of administrative arrangements, especially insofar as the LIP-municipal relationship was concerned. The four cities chosen according to these criteria were London, Ottawa, North Bay and Sudbury. The corresponding local researchers were Victoria Esses, Meyer Burstein, John Nadeau and Aurelie Lacassagne.

For each of the four cities, the study sought to collect information about the goals of the LIP and the context in which it developed; about the municipal and LIP planning structures and their evolution as a result of the LIP; and about the LIP's implementation and future prospects. Background information and evidence for the case studies was gathered from a variety of sources including:

- An analysis of LIP and municipal documents;
- Interviews with LIP coordinators, members of LIP Councils, city representatives on the LIP Councils, and senior city officials from municipal planning, economic development and social service divisions. The questionnaire guide used for the interviews can be found in Annex 1.
- An examination of other WCI projects currently underway or recently completed, including a review of LIP plans by the WCI's Research Domains; an analysis of organizational indicators pertaining to municipal activities in twenty-seven LIP jurisdictions; a survey of opinion leaders examining their perceptions of local government interest in immigration and immigration's contribution to economic, social and civic development; and a report proposing objective indicators for measuring the state of welcome in LIP communities.

Chapter 2: Observations

In looking at the four case studies, it is important to understand that each case originates as a set of initial conditions and possibilities, some taken, some rejected and others lost for reasons of aptitude, attitude and the presence or absence of supportive stakeholders or a supportive environment. It is also noteworthy that at this early stage in the life of the LIPs, a good deal of behaviour is experimental, without reference to tested pathways or blueprints.

Given this state of affairs, it is not surprising that the four cities have followed different trajectories, characterized by different LIP-municipal machinery and outcomes. Our goal in this chapter is not to critique the LIPs or the cities and the choices that were made. Instead, we offer a brief commentary on the progress that has been achieved to date and on the relationship between current LIP directions and CIC's strategic goals. We also take note of conditions that will need to be addressed if the LIPs and their municipal partners are to advance their relationships and realize the full potential of the LIP initiative.

CIC's strategic LIP objectives and potential LIP contributions

The five LIP goals that the present study relies on are derived from several sources. This multi-source approach was felt to offer a nuanced and accurate depiction of how Citizenship and Immigration Canada 'understands' the LIP initiative. The chimera thus constructed has four 'parents': CIC's modernization initiative; the Canada-Ontario immigration accord and annexes; the LIP call for proposals; and assorted presentations and exchanges with senior CIC officials from Ontario Region and NHQ's Integration Branch. Different 'parents' are more closely associated with particular objectives. The 'validity' of the objectives was confirmed with CIC through a short paper and a meeting in January 2012 before the case study analyses were initiated. In addition to CIC's strategic objectives, the study is also informed by the WCI's study of the characteristics of a welcoming community.

Below is the list of CIC's inferred strategic interests accompanied by brief descriptions of how these interests might be achieved by the LIPs:

- 1. CIC has a strategic interest in promoting longer-term integration and enhanced social, political and civic engagement. The LIPs contribute to this objective ...**
 - By convening local actors (community and institutional actors) and focusing attention on neighbourhood issues
 - By placing city recreational, cultural and educational programs at the service of LIP goals
 - By introducing new municipal measures or modifying existing programming relevant to long-term integration
 - By seeking to improve attitudes toward newcomers among members of the established community
 - By addressing Francophone minority community needs

2. **CIC has a strategic interest in improved economic outcomes. The LIPs contribute to this objective ...**
 - By engaging municipal economic development levers (especially in the North) and helping to promote newcomer attraction and retention
 - By capitalizing on municipal capacity to convene local employers and other economic actors
 - By improving local planning and programming to expand job opportunities, training, and mentorships
 - By developing more effective and realistic attraction strategies that address local interests
 - By addressing Francophone needs and attracting and retaining Francophone newcomers
3. **CIC has a strategic interest in improving planning and coordination to enhance service relevance and uptake. The LIPs contribute to this objective ...**
 - By expanding the range of critical actors involved in planning
 - By making use of local, tacit knowledge
 - By capitalizing on municipal planning expertise and staff resources
 - By creating opportunities for coordinating services and programs from a local perspective
 - By forging new links among service providers and mainstream organizations
4. **CIC has a strategic interest in leveraging additional support to broaden programming and share costs. The LIPs contribute to this objective ...**
 - By involving a wide range of federal and provincial ministries in planning and implementation
 - By engaging municipal services and municipal programs
 - By adapting and focusing municipal services and programs on newcomer needs
 - By encouraging local mainstream organizations to address newcomer needs and helping to build capacity among local institutions to help newcomers
5. **CIC has a strategic interest in promoting efficiency and reducing duplication. The LIPs contribute to this objective ...**
 - By creating or promoting fora for joint planning and for sharing information
 - By promoting service coordination and reducing local service overlaps and duplication
 - By promoting development of partnerships for service delivery

Readers need to bear in mind that **the question being addressed is whether the involvement of municipalities in the LIP initiative contributes to the attainment of CIC's strategic aspirations.** The study does not examine the larger question of how the LIPs might advance CIC's strategic goals.

Benefits and architecture of municipal involvement in the LIPs

It is clear from the case studies that cities have made important contributions to LIP planning and implementation. These contributions appear to depend on both structural and process features.

Empirical work conducted by the WCI in connection with another project points to the following relationships (see Annex 3):

Where cities were signatory to the LIP agreement:

- LIP plans were more likely to include measures aimed at mobilizing public support for integration
- Cities were more inclined to finance and provide in-kind support for planning activities
- Plans were more likely to be linked to information dissemination and Immigration Portals

Where cities actively participated in LIP planning:

- Special coordinating structures were more likely to emerge for linking the LIP to broader city processes
- Cities were more likely to modify and improve their immigrant liaison processes
- Cities were more inclined to finance and provide in-kind support for planning activities
- Plans were more likely to be linked to information dissemination and Immigration Portals

These results were supported by the case studies, though there was a degree of ambiguity with respect to holding the LIP agreement. Certainly, in London, the City supported the LIPs through programming and in-kind assistance, including administrative support, meeting space, and intellectual contributions by city staff. In Sudbury, however, this was less evident as the City maintained a strong focus on economic development and did not do nearly as much to further the expansion of the LIP.

Much stronger support was found for the proposition that active municipal engagement strengthened LIP planning outcomes, along with support for CIC's strategic goals. This was evident in London, Ottawa and North Bay. (It is noteworthy that neither North Bay nor Ottawa were signatory to the LIP agreement.) Municipal leadership and active municipal participation have enhanced the credibility of the LIPs, strengthened their capacity to form productive partnerships and expanded LIP access to mainstream institutions that play a role in newcomer attraction, integration and retention. The precise nature of the partnerships has depended on local circumstances and municipal interests. In North Bay, for example, municipal involvement generated support among private sector and government stakeholders for integration measures linked to economic development.

In addition to expanded partnership potentialities, and the influence and leverage this produces, municipal participation has also yielded improvements in LIP planning capacity (and, by extension, in planning outcomes) as well as contributing to the awareness and sensitivity of municipal staff in regards to immigrant integration. This has led to both increases and improvements in municipal services directed to immigrants. In Ottawa, City Council has formally agreed to improve services to immigrants, to address service gaps, and to undertake a number of practical initiatives that contribute to better integration. Similarly, in London, the City has committed to invest in areas of high need as identified by the London LIP. And in North Bay, municipal involvement resulted in the

production of resource guides, a connector program for professional networking, and improvements in the immigration portal.

The architectural of LIP planning, as noted above, is linked to the nature of municipal engagement and planning outcomes. A number of processes identified by the case studies may be considered as promising practices to be emulated. In London, Council members – including city staff – were involved in stakeholder consultations and were involved in drafting components of the LIP strategic plan. This promotes not only expertise but commitment. In Ottawa, the city was not directly involved in drafting the strategic plan, but City staff from a wide number of departments participated in different planning tables and are currently involved in virtually all LIP planning and decision-making structures. Again, this has resulted in greater commitment and closer ties between City departments and the Ottawa LIP, including a commitment by the City to integrate LIP planning with the City's own, formal, planning architecture. This will ensure that LIP objectives approved by the City are financially supported and monitored for compliance. Finally, in all four case studies, the cities created a special, internal liaison function to connect with the LIPs. The effectiveness of this structure seemed to depend on the seniority of the city official within the city hierarchy.

Benefits accruing to cities from LIP participation

Just as LIPs have much to gain from a strong municipal presence, municipalities have much to gain from participating in the LIPs. A key benefit for municipalities was the intelligence they acquired about the experiences, needs and priorities of newcomer communities. In London, City representatives indicated that, as a result of the LIP, they have a more nuanced understanding of London's immigrant communities, resulting in greater sensitivity to newcomer issues. Officials also noted that the LIP allowed the City to adjust its priorities in response to LIP priorities.

Precisely the same point was made in Ottawa. City officials cited the instrumental role of the LIPs in helping to improve immigrant services. The LIP was seen as a mechanism for bringing greater coherence to City's operations, helping to align corporate responses and services across different municipal departments. The LIP also provided the City with a capacity to interact with communities and neighbourhoods characterized by ethnic, cultural, racial and religious diversity (as distinct from interacting with individual consumers of services).

In northern cities, the main benefit cited by officials and other observers was the cities' acquisition of expertise in the area of social and cultural integration. This was seen as important in its own right but also for its contribution to making the cities more welcoming immigrant destinations, thus strengthening local attraction and retention measures. In this regard, the LIPs were seen as contributing to the cities' ability to leverage federal and provincial support, particularly in the area of procuring economic development assistance.

Pre-existing relations shape LIP development

It is important to recognize that LIP development is not a ‘greenfield’ operation. All four case studies confirm that preexisting structures and relations influenced the early development of the LIPs. Conversely, the emergence of the LIPs disrupted existing relations by introducing new actors into the process, including the municipalities and mainstream organizations. One way to think about the LIPs is as an exercise in managing relations by creating organizational incentives to form partnerships and undertake activities that support CIC’s strategic interests.

Because the case studies only briefly touch on the background of each LIP, we cannot make definitive pronouncements about the role of pre-existing relations in LIP development. Limited evidence does exist for the following three propositions which seek to capitalize on preexisting relations:

- A key consideration in choosing the lead agency (or agencies) should be the size and quality of its network and whether it is regarded as a leader in its field. This proved important in North Bay, London and Ottawa.
- Successful initial configurations involved partners whose networks were complementary. For this reason, joining cities with service provider organizations produced immediate synergies. Absent such configurations, process was slower.
- Leadership and vision are essential attributes for the LIPs because they need to operate across jurisdictions and to mobilize support based on consensus and suasion. Choosing organizations to champion the LIPs based on their leadership positions would serve the LIPs well. Again, a reading of the case studies will provide evidence to support this point.

Differences between North and South

As noted above, the study confirmed the existence of differences between southern and northern LIPs, a function of their relative size and the weight attached to demographic and economic concerns. While most LIP communities profess interest in attracting and retaining skilled immigrants and entrepreneurs, only in northern communities were these issues front and centre on municipal agendas. (Our case studies did not include small, southern communities but we know from other work by the WCI that attraction plays a similarly important role in smaller, rural communities in southern Ontario.)

As a result of this overriding interest, northern LIPs are closely linked with municipal economic development departments while southern LIPs are, generally, tied to community services and social development. The links with mainstream organizations and, more specifically, the links resulting from municipal participation, similarly reflect the different priorities of northern and southern LIPs.

Despite current alignments, there are hints that patterns may shift. While North Bay continues to focus on economic development projects, the close association between the City’s economic

development office and the North Bay Newcomer Network has increased municipal involvement in social and cultural matters related to newcomers. Economic institutions have also adjusted. For example, the North Bay Employment Committee has evolved into an Employer's Council with a broader mandate. In contrast, the City of Sudbury has retained its strict economic focus.

Interestingly, the greatest potential for leveraging provincial and federal support for newcomer attraction and retention may exist in northern communities that have long-standing connections to provincial and federal economic development agencies and resource ministries. In these circumstances, LIP-municipal partnerships – by supplying organizational capacity, bringing together expertise, and mobilizing community support for immigration – can achieve synergies that would not otherwise exist.

CIC needs to clarify its strategic interests

While the LIPs would not be surprised that CIC is interested in program coordination, leveraging resources, and fostering efficiency, they would be surprised to learn that they are expected to advance these objectives. CIC has not articulated clear and comprehensive goals for the LIP initiative. Our study, as noted earlier, had to compile goals from multiple sources. A clear statement of what CIC hopes to achieve using the LIPs would help stakeholders to evaluate their actions and would encourage them to align their efforts with the initiative's strategic directions (providing the right incentives exist – see below).

Notwithstanding the fuzziness that surrounds LIP objectives, there is evidence that the LIPs are leveraging support and improving coordination. Both Ottawa and London, for example, have expressed interest in broadening their engagement of mainstream organizations and both cities have endorsed plans that call for stronger collaboration among agencies across a range of policy areas. There is also evidence that the LIPs in Northern cities, in partnership with municipal economic interests, have captured the attention of economic development agencies for their efforts to attract and retain newcomers.

There is also evidence that municipal engagement is contributing to improved coordination. Examples may be found in London where the City has worked hard to facilitate coordination within policy spheres; similarly, in North Bay, the LIP-municipal partnership has produced an agreement among local organizations to specialize in their funding applications so as to develop local excellence rather than dissipating energy on futile, competing bids.

The critical point to be considered is that municipal and CIC strategic interests tend to coincide. This suggests that strengthening LIP-municipal connections would also advance CIC's goals. A key step in this direction would be to clearly identify what CIC's interests are.

Absence of corporate level machinery to support collective action

A key problem afflicting LIPs is the absence of coherent, collaborative pathways for municipalities as a group to exert influence with provincial or federal ministries. As it stands, local LIPs and municipalities are forced to interact with senior levels of government in an *individual* capacity. This greatly limits their effectiveness. There are no immigration-specific mechanisms to allow municipalities to join together to lobby for policy or program changes, or for shifts in financial allocations. There is, for example, no forum that would allow municipalities to consolidate their interests and seek changes from the Ministry of Education in the formula that allocates discretionary spending to school boards – more specifically, to changing the ‘rules’ linking immigration to discretionary school district allotments. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario could play this role but it would have to beef up its immigration capacity in order to coordinate and pursue cross-cutting LIP-municipal interests at the provincial and federal level. To date, the AMO has not pursued these issues outside the context of COIA meetings.

When the LIPs began, there was little reason to create coordinating mechanisms; now, such machinery is essential. Equipping municipalities and LIPs with vehicles for collective action would increase CIC’s leverage in the areas of health, education, housing and economic development. A similar strategy on the federal side would produce dividends in regard to employment programs, economic development and rural advancement. Collaborative mechanisms may develop spontaneously – the southwestern Ontario LIPs now meet regularly and some form of organization is being considered in Northern Ontario – but to be truly effective, CIC should (from a self-interested perspective) consider investing in special coordinating structures that are topic or ministry specific (that is, focused on health or education or employment). This could take the form of time-limited, LIP-municipal peer groups organized around policy topics or functional topics, such as media engagement.

Need to link financial incentives to LIP strategies

To date, LIP planning and strategy development has not been coupled to CIC’s policy, operational or financial management. Immigrant service provider organizations are free to pursue their ambitions without reference to LIP objectives (though some agencies have begun to reference LIP plans). The same menu of funding possibilities – based on CIC’s program and funding array – is available to service provider organizations regardless of local (LIP) strategic directions. Moreover, CIC’s calls for proposals to provide settlement services (including the most recent call) invite submissions to support the LIPs but do not encourage, much less require, agencies to state how their actions would support LIP directions.

Notwithstanding the lack of connectivity within CIC, LIPs are beginning to influence the plans, expenditures and activities of local stakeholders, including municipal agencies, United Ways and other institutions. Similar adjustments will be required of CIC if the Department is to capitalize on the ability of LIPs to leverage provincial, municipal and mainstream organizational support – one of CIC’s strategic priorities. In particular, CIC will need to give more thought to the fact that effective leverage requires

reciprocity ... meaning that CIC will also need to support LIP plans at a local level if the department is to attract support from other agencies.

Closely related to the question of financial support is the question of how best to equip LIPs with an ability to influence partners and stakeholders. This will require forming connections between LIP plans and two types of funding decisions: one concerning the overall allocation of support at the city level; the second concerning individual, targeted project expenditures. Both are needed if LIPs are to play an important role in the attainment of CIC's strategic objectives; however, the question of LIPs and funding will need to be handled with sensitivity. LIPs depend on collaboration for their success. If agencies come to view LIPs solely as financial negotiating spaces, their effectiveness would be seriously compromised.

Managing the transition to greater LIP influence will require a degree of maturity that can only evolve with time and evidence that organizations working together can grow the overall 'pie' instead of simply dividing it. In other words, agencies must be persuaded that collective action can bring incremental resources to the table by tapping non-traditional sources of support. [Note: The proposition of LIP influence with regard to spending decisions is less controversial when posed as follows: Is it conceivable, or sustainable, for CIC to invest millions of dollars to finance collaborative planning at the local level and then not be influenced by the results when it comes to financing local activities?]

Endowing the LIPs with more sway over financial allocations would also elevate the role of key LIP stakeholders, such as municipalities and mainstream organizations. Participation in the LIPs would also rise sharply and discussions around priorities would take on new significance. CIC has opened the box to a new set of institutional arrangements ... it now needs to equip itself with the appropriate controls to manage the forces that have been released.

Chapter 3: London case study - Victoria Esses

This case study describes the mutual influences and interactions between the London & Middlesex Local Immigration Partnership (LMLIP) and the City of London. Information was obtained from a variety of sources, including interviews with LMLIP members and City of London officials, and key documents from both the LMLIP (see <http://immigration.london.ca/about-us/LMLIPBackground.htm>) and the City of London (see <http://www.london.ca>). Overall, we conclude that the City of London has played a significant role in the leadership and success to date of the LMLIP, and that future progress will depend on the City continuing to work in partnership with the LMLIP to ensure continuing progress. Similarly, the LMLIP has ensured that the City of London moves forward in developing a more comprehensive approach to immigrant settlement and integration, and will continue to provide direction for the City as it works with stakeholders to realize its economic and social goals.

Background Context

Prior to the early 2000s, London had a reputation as a conservative and rather insular community that was not very welcoming to newcomers, whether from other parts of Canada or from other countries. A few community-based organizations such as the London Cross Cultural Learner Centre, London Urban Services Organization, and WIL Employment Connections provided essential services to immigrants. The United Way of London and Middlesex played an important role in funding settlement services and culturally appropriate programming, but the municipality showed little commitment or leadership in this area (with the exception of the City's Race Relations Advisory Committee). This changed in the early 2000s with the growing recognition that London would need to do more to attract and retain immigrants if it was to avoid a demographic and labour force crisis. The city's Creative Cities Task Force was put into place in 2004 in order to improve London's future growth and development. Driven by economic concerns and the realization that immigration and job growth are strongly linked, key messages coming out of the task force were that "Bluntly speaking, London has been perceived as not having an exemplary reputation for welcoming newcomers... London needs to present a fresh new face to the world and establish a stronger identity to promote our community as welcoming, diverse, safe and progressive. City Council must be the leader to set the standards for our city." (See [http://www.london.ca/Committees and Task Forces/PDFs/creative city final.pdf](http://www.london.ca/Committees_and_Task_Forces/PDFs/creative_city_final.pdf)).

A key outcome of the task force's report was the establishment in 2005 of London's Welcoming Cultural Diversity Steering Committee. This committee included representatives from community service providers, government and other stakeholders and, of note, was co-led and co-sponsored by the City of London and the United Way of London & Middlesex. This represented a key step by the City in becoming squarely involved in issues surrounding immigrant settlement and integration. The Steering Committee took a community development approach, focusing on local planning and engagement. Its action plan directed at five priority areas was finalized in 2006, and the Committee released a status report on

progress in each of these areas in 2008, at the same time as the Call for Proposals for the establishment of Local Immigration Partnerships in Ontario was issued.

Although members of the Welcoming Cultural Diversity Steering Committee initially wondered whether London needed a Local Immigration Partnership given the existence of the Steering Committee, The City of London and the United Way of London & Middlesex quickly saw the strategic advantages of establishing a London and Middlesex Local Immigration Partnership, including cooperation with other levels of government and with other locales, and expansion of the partnership. As a result, under their leadership, the Welcoming Cultural Diversity Steering Committee prepared the application for the LMLIP. With the establishment of the LMLIP in 2009, the Welcoming Cultural Diversity Steering Committee dissolved, with many key players taking leadership roles in the LMLIP, including the City of London and the United Way as co-chairs, with the City holding the LMLIP contract with Citizenship and Immigration Canada. The LMLIP explicitly committed to building on the foundation established by the Welcoming Cultural Diversity Steering Committee, including the “bottom up” approach to developing its strategic plan. Indeed, the City was particularly excited about the development of the LMLIP because of the opportunity for local planning and community building.

Structure and Goals

As mentioned, the City of London plays a key role in the LMLIP, with the Manager of Employment and Strategic Initiatives within the Department of Community Services serving as Co-Chair of the Central Council since its inception, and the City holding the contract with Citizenship and Immigration Canada. This builds on the City’s role in the Welcoming Cultural Diversity Steering Committee which preceded the establishment of the LMLIP. The Terms of Reference for the LMLIP, approved in November 2011, name the City of London as Co-Chair to 2014 in order to ensure continuity, with a review to occur in March 2014. Although the LMLIP Coordinator is not housed within City space, the fact that the City plays a Co-Chair role in the LMLIP and holds the funding contract means that the coordinator provides regular reports and meets frequently with the City lead to discuss ongoing activities and direction.

By virtue of its leadership of the LMLIP, and in partnership with the United Way of London & Middlesex, the City was able to promote broad membership in the LMLIP, including among groups and organizations that might not otherwise have participated, such as mainstream organizations and large employment organizations within London. Both the City and United Way are considered neutral parties because they do not deliver direct services, and this assisted them in being able to take strong leadership roles in bringing other groups to the table and having them participate in the LMLIP strategic planning and implementation. Their role as Co-Chairs of the LMLIP also contributed legitimacy to the LMLIP throughout London and Middlesex, further supporting its influence. In addition, the fact that the United Way was serving as Co-Chair with the City helped to allay concerns expressed by some community groups that the City might prove to be too “top down” in its approach or have a biased perspective that would threaten the LMLIP community development approach. It should be noted that although the LMLIP is intended to include both London and Middlesex County, Middlesex County has

relatively low immigration rates and thus has not been as active as the City of London, though a senior staff member from the County sits on the Employment Sub-Council and the County sends representatives to other Sub-Councils when possible.

The LMLIP is composed of the Central Council and six Sub-Councils, reflecting six needed areas of focus identified by the community: Employment, Education, Health and Wellbeing, Inclusion and Civic Engagement, Justice and Protection Services, and Settlement. The Central Council includes the LMLIP co-chairs, chairs of the six Sub-Councils, an equal number of members at large representing the lived experience of immigrants, a research representative from the Welcoming Communities Initiative at the University of Western Ontario, and representatives from funders (as non-voting members). Sub-Councils include those interested in participating based on interest in the area, including representatives from key stakeholder groups, immigrants, representatives from community organizations including ethnocultural organizations, members from other relevant networks, and representatives from Middlesex County where feasible. Of note, the City of London has representation on all six Sub-Councils, including representatives from the Chief Administrative Officer's (CAO) Department, Finance/Culture Office, the London Economic Development Corporation, Social & Community Support Services, Neighbourhood & Children Services, Parks and Recreation, Police Services, Fire Department, Public Library, and the Health Unit. The LMLIP has also held four community events to date in order to ensure that the community as a whole endorses and supports the activities of the LMLIP, with representatives of the City of London actively participating in all of these events.

Of note is also the fact that the LMLIP meeting minutes, reports, and other key documents are housed on the London Immigration Portal, funded by the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, with the City leading the Steering Committee that oversees the activities of the portal which is hosted on the City server. This has resulted in strong ongoing technical support by the City, and has helped to link the work of the LMLIP with other activities in London centred on immigration and diversity.

All of these activities, and the crucial connections made with the City of London, have helped to establish the credibility of the LMLIP and give it visibility within London, ensuring that information is shared with the community, and that a breadth of stakeholders remain engaged in the goals and activities of the LMLIP.

Though the City is particularly interested in the LMLIP in support of its economic development goals, it also sees the need to avoid "bad settlement outcomes" in London and views the LMLIP as working toward better cohesion and alignment of services for newcomers and a more welcoming attitude among established Londoners. In addition, the City sees the LMLIP as an opportunity to engage more fully with provincial and federal ministries, and through its participation in the LMLIP has developed strong links with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, and Citizenship and Immigration Canada. The City Co-Chair currently sits on the Municipal Immigration Committee and this has served to strengthen ties with the provincial and federal governments, as well as with other municipalities. The City Co-Chair has also put her name forward to sit on the new LIP Working Group, with the goal of establishing ties with other LIPs and provincial and federal

departments. Overall, the view is that a systems or holistic approach to immigrant settlement and integration is likely to be most effective.

City Involvement in LIP Planning

Through its role as Co-Chair of the LMLIP, the City has played a major role in the LMLIP planning process. The City and United Way funded and supervised the preparation of the initial proposal to Citizenship and Immigration Canada to establish the LMLIP. They then oversaw the development and community approval of the LMLIP Strategic Plan, Governance Documents, and Terms of Reference. At its busiest, this included leading weekly Council meetings to develop the Strategic Plan, and planning and hosting Community Events to ensure community support. The time devoted by the Co-Chairs during the planning phase averaged 10-20 hours a week of in-kind support to the LMLIP. The City also provides considerable in-kind administrative support and services to the LMLIP, including financial and legal services. In addition, the City provides free meeting space for Council and Sub-Council meetings, and access to data where possible. Less quantifiable but equally important, the City has given the LMLIP visibility within the community through links with City Council and the posting of LMLIP documents on the Immigration Portal website.

Through its leadership role, the City has had a direct impact on the LMLIP planning process and the outcomes of this process. For example, the City has contributed a strategic perspective, and facilitated the establishment of the partnership across the community. As mentioned earlier, the leadership provided by the City and the United Way ensured that a breadth of stakeholders came to the table and were engaged. Their participation also ensured a broad agenda for the LMLIP, repeatedly reminding the Central Council and Sub-Councils that the issues to be addressed are broader than solely providing services to immigrants. As discussed, the City is also well-represented on all of the LMLIP Sub-Councils, contributing to their more specific strategic planning, which fed the final planning document. Nonetheless, the City sees the LMLIP process as involving community planning and thus does not want to have an undue influence on the process.

The formal connection between the City and the LMLIP has also facilitated connections with City Council and other networks within London. Regular reports on the progress of the LMLIP have been provided to City Council, particularly to the Community and Neighbourhood Committee, with Council approving the initial agreement with Citizenship and Immigration Canada in 2009, and endorsing the LMLIP Strategic Plan in October 2010. Other presentations to City committees and departments have included presentations to: Community and Protection Services, Community and Neighbourhood Committee, Diversity and Race Relations Advisory Committee, and Social and Community Support Services. Strong links have also been forged with other established networks in the city, some of which are led or sponsored by the City, including the Child and Youth Network, the London Strengthening Neighbourhoods Strategy Group, the Networking for an Inclusive Community Group, the London Middlesex Immigrant Employment Council, and the Employment Sector Council of London and

Middlesex. Discussions with these groups have ensured that efforts are coordinated and that activities are not duplicated.

City Involvement in LIP Implementation

Building on its involvement in the LMLIP planning phase, the City continues to play an important role in the implementation of its strategic plan. The City Co-Chair will continue to serve until 2014, with the current workload described in the Terms of Reference as averaging 10 hours a week. This includes planning and co-chairing the monthly Central Council meetings, regular meetings with the LMLIP coordinator, and oversight of implementation activities. The City also continues to contribute in-kind administrative support and related services, space, and other logistical support.

The LMLIP strategic plan includes five high level themes highlighting intersecting priorities across the Sub-Councils. These are: increased access to supports and services for immigrants; improved communication to immigrants on accessing services and supports, and on cultural expectations; increased understanding and acceptance of diversity among host community; increased supports for service providers; and reduction of systemic barriers that impede immigrants' ability to fully engage in the community. Within each, specific recommended actions are listed. The strategic plan also includes detailed priorities and planned actions for each of the six Sub-Councils.

Consistent with its view of the LMLIP as a collaborative community-led initiative, the City sees its role in the implementation phase as mainly involving facilitation of the process, rather than direct implementation. This means helping to ensure that stakeholders continue to come to the table and are engaged, and supporting their activities in any way possible. Indeed, the credibility of the LMLIP, partly attributable to the leadership by the City and United Way, has ensured that stakeholders have remained engaged in the implementation phase. Through City Council and the immigration portal, the City has also continued to contribute to the visibility of the LMLIP and its activities. For example, a briefing note to MPs in the 2011 federal election stated that "London has a focused strategic approach to immigration" and made extensive reference to the LMLIP and its activities (see http://www.london.ca/Mayors_Office/PDFs/FedElection2011_Immigration_brief.pdf) in this regard. In addition, by linking with other networks in London, the City has ensured that the LMLIP implementation activities are not duplicating those performed by other groups, and instead build on what is already in place in the city. This is important for ensuring continued credibility and efficiency in the implementation process.

As a result of the positioning of the LMLIP as a community-based initiative with the City of London as one of two "stewards," the City has not committed to directly implementing any of the specific strategic plans of the LMLIP. As described in the next section, however, the City is closely attuned to the activities and new information coming out of the LMLIP, and, when it sees a need arise and dependent on funding, it will strive to make investments in areas of high need.

Structural and Process Changes at the Municipal Level Induced by LIP

A few changes in the City's structure and activities have resulted from its participation in the LMLIP. Of particular note, changes have occurred in the messaging of several City programs, and in the City's sensitivity in regard to making cultural investments. As an example, through the LMLIP, the City has become more aware of the diversity within the African community and has striven to increase its sensitivity by making cultural investments in this community. The City has also made a concerted effort to increase its outreach to immigrant and minority communities.

Representatives of the City also suggest that the LMLIP has helped to move immigration to the forefront of City planning and broadened its agenda in this area, with a clear commitment to "welcoming and celebrating diversity." It is suggested that the direction provided by the LMLIP has implications for future urban planning, hiring within the City, messaging of City programs, and cultural investments. It was stated that there is no going back and that the LMLIP will continue to provide direction to the City in this area for the foreseeable future.

Future Directions

A number of successes have resulted from the LMLIP-City of London engagement. The LMLIP has benefited from the City's prestige and credibility in the community and its convening capacity. The strength of the LMLIP leadership, with the City and United Way as Co-Chairs, has contributed substantially to its success to date. The Co-Chairs set the LMLIP on course, oversaw the development of its strategic plan with extensive community consultation and support, and are now leading the implementation phase. In turn, the City has benefited from its participation in the LMLIP. It has gained a more nuanced perspective on immigration to London and has developed a broader set of goals in this area, extending beyond the economic goals that might have initially driven its interest.

As indicated earlier, the City of London is expected to continue to Co-Chair the LMLIP with the United Way until 2014, at which time the Chair position will be re-evaluated. It was suggested that as the LMLIP continues to grow and evolve, the City and United Way may no longer be required as leaders for the enterprise. Thus, the City's leadership of the LMLIP would decrease as others step forward, though the City is willing to stay on as long as it is needed. Indeed, it was stated that success could be defined as "the City no longer being needed as the lead." Nonetheless, replacing the City and United Way would be a difficult feat, given the sustained investments of time and resources that they have provided, and the credibility with which they have infused the LMLIP. In addition, the benefits of having neutral parties as co-leads should not be underestimated.

Irrespective of whether the City continues to co-lead the LMLIP, it is expected that the conversations initiated by the LMLIP are now sustainable and will continue, and will help to direct funding investments by the City in this area. It was stated that the City will be closely monitoring the trends set by the LMLIP and that these will help to shape future City programming. The City clearly continues to see a strategic

advantage in being involved in the LMLIP, as stated in the City's Business Plan for Immigration Services for 2012-2016: "Citizenship and Immigration Canada's current modernization work, the work of the many LIPs throughout the Province, and the LMLIP Strategic Plan may provide strategic business and partnership opportunities in the future." This bodes well for the City's continued involvement in the LMLIP.

Annex

Interviewees:

Elisabeth White, Manager of Employment and Strategic Initiatives, Department of Community Services, City of London *and* Co-Chair, LMLIP

Huda Hussein, Project Coordinator, LMLIP

Ross Fair, Executive Director, Department of Community Services, City of London

Consulted on Report:

Kelly McManus, Director, Community Partnerships & Investment, United Way of London & Middlesex *and* Co-Chair, LMLIP

Members of the LMLIP Advisory Committee Instrumental in the Development of the LMLIP and Establishment of the Council and Sub-Councils

Mohamed Al-Adeimi, South London Neighbourhood Resource Centre

Rod Cameron, Fanshawe College

Jean-Pierre Cantin, College Boreal

Sheila Carson, Wheable Adult and Continuing Education Centre

Anthoula Doumkou, London InterCommunity Health Centre

Ana Maria Escovar, Fanshawe College

Victoria Esses, University of Western Ontario and Welcoming Communities Initiative

Andrea Hallam, London Heritage Council

Anne Langille, WIL Employment Connections

Valerian Marochko, London Cross Cultural Learner Centre

Kelly McManus, United Way of London & Middlesex

Beverley Payne, Wheable Adult and Continuing Education Centre

Jo-elle Rinker, YMCA of Western Ontario

Debbie Turnbull, Family Networks

Elisabeth White, City of London

Organizations and Associations Involved in Developing the 2010 LMLIP Community Immigrant Strategic Plan

- Access Centre for Regulated Employment
- ACFO de London-Sarnia
- Across Languages
- Afghan Social Committee of London
- AIDS Committee of London
- Anago
- Azeri Women's Group
- Brazilian Women of London
- Canadian Arab Society
- Canadian Council of Muslim Women
- Canadian Latin American Association
- Canadian Liver Foundation
- Canadian Mental Health Association
- Canadian Palestinian Association
- Carrefour des Femmes du Sud-Ouest de l'Ontario
- Centre communautaire Régional de London
- Centre for Addiction & Mental Health
- Changing Ways
- Childminding, Monitoring, Advisory & Support

- Childreach Centre
- Children's Aid Society of London & Middlesex
- Chinese Canadian National Council (London Chapter)
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada
- City of London
- Collège Boréal
- Community Living London
- County of Middlesex
- Crouch Neighbourhood Resource Centre
- Daya Counselling Centre
- Elgin, Middlesex, Oxford Local Training Board
- Ethnocultural Council of London
- Family Networks
- Family Service Thames Valley
- Fanshawe College
- Glen Cairn Community Resource Centre
- Goodwill Industries
- Hospice of London
- Hutton House
- John Howard Society of London & District
- Kala Manjari
- La Jornada Spanish Journal News
- Leads Employment Services
- Life Resource Centre
- Literacy Link South Central
- London Arts Council
- London Children's Connections
- London Community Foundation

- London Community Resource Centre
- London Cross Cultural Learner Centre
- London District Catholic School Board
- London Employment Help Centre
- London Health Sciences Centre
- London Heritage Council
- London Intercommunity Health Centre
- London Interfaith Refugee Sponsorship Alliance
- London Muslim Mosque
- London Police Service
- London Public Library
- London Regional Children's Museum
- London West NDP
- London Middlesex Immigrant Employment Council
- LUSO Community Services
- Magazine Latino
- Merrymount Children's Centre
- Middle Eastern Women's Association
- Middlesex-London Health Unit
- Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, Probation and Parole
- Muslim Resource Centre for Social Support and Integration
- Networking for an Inclusive Community
- North Park Community Church
- North West London Resource Centre
- Ontario Early Years Centres
- Ontario March of Dimes
- Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration
- Ontario Trillium Foundation

- Over 55 Inc.
- Pathways Skill Development
- Pillar Non-Profit
- Platinum Leadership Inc.
- Portuguese Congress
- Regroupement Multiculturel Francophone de London
- Réseau de soutien à l'immigration francophone de la région Centre-Sud-Ouest de l'Ontario
- Réseau franco-santé du Sud de l'Ontario
- Rotholme Women's and Family's Shelter
- Scouts Canada
- Sexual Assault Centre London
- Somali Association of London
- South London Neighbourhood Resource Centre
- Thames Valley District School Board
- The Canadian Iraqi House (London Chapter)
- The University of Western Ontario
- United Way of London & Middlesex
- Vanier Children's Services
- Welcoming Communities Initiative
- Wheable Employment Centre
- WIL Employment Connections
- Women's Community House
- YMCA of Western Ontario
- Youth Opportunities Unlimited

Chapter 4: Ottawa case study - Meyer Burstein

The Ottawa case study is based on a review of documents, interviews with key participants and a reading of federal and provincial policy documents and agreements. The documents include Ottawa's LIP Strategy, released in June 2011; assorted progress and strategy papers; reports from key meetings, including the Ottawa LIP's interactions with City of Ottawa committees; and minutes reporting on decisions by Ottawa's LIP Council, Steering Committee and Executive Committee. Interviews were conducted with Hindia Mohamoud (Ottawa's LIP Director), Carl Nicholson (Executive and Steering Committee member and Executive Director of the Catholic Centre for Immigration, which holds the LIP contract), Clara Freire (Manager, Client Service Strategies Unit, Community and Social Services, City of Ottawa) and Colleen Hendrick (Manager, Strategic Community Initiatives Branch, Community and Social Services, City of Ottawa). The report also draws on the author's extensive involvement in the development of Ottawa's LIP strategy and subsequent interactions with the City.

Background and context

Ottawa's Local Immigration Partnership (OLIP) began operations in October of 2009. It was developed as a joint venture between Ottawa's major immigrant serving agencies (coordinated under LASI: Local Agencies Serving Immigrants) and the City of Ottawa. The LIP agreement was assigned to the Catholic Centre for Immigration which houses the LIP Director and her staff and provides additional support.

While 2009 marks the formal start of OLIP, it does not mark the beginning of relations between the City and local settlement agencies. These have a somewhat longer provenance. It is noteworthy that the City has financially supported many organizations serving immigrants over the past 10 years.

In 2012, five immigrant serving organizations received City support totaling \$705 673. This represents a 92% increase since 2002, demonstrating Ottawa's commitment to supporting newcomers. Examples of services and programs funded by the City are:

- Recreation, education and training programs for children of newcomers during their stay at Reception House;
- Housing support services for new Canadians;
- Counseling programs and a Senior Home Support Program;
- Professional counseling services for low-income immigrants and refugees.

Since 2002, in addition to providing program support, the City joined the settlement sector in hosting a series of events that looked at the City's role as an employer, a convenor and a service provider. Numerous forums examined immigrant needs and assessed the quality, accessibility and uptake of municipal services. Over the years, the City also set up specialist committees to promote anti-racism and multiculturalism; it worked closely with the local settlement sector to reform Ottawa's Transit Services

to increase the hiring of minority bus drivers; and the City invited LASI to deliver in-house training and sensitization seminars to social service and social assistance officers.

Relations between the City and Ottawa's settlement sector are generally respectful and friendly. The feeling among major Ottawa settlement agencies is that they "have had the City of Ottawa in their crosshairs for some time and have acquired a reasonable understanding of the City's needs, interests and pressure points". Through long association, many people in senior positions in the City have become 'known quantities' to the settlement sector and the same holds for the city in regard to service providers.

Even before OLIP arrived, there existed a degree of trust in Ottawa that facilitated interactions among the City's major local players. This resulted from the fact that they had worked together and shared a broad appreciation of what the City required. From the settlement sector's perspective what was important was not just the City's financial clout and potential expenditure, but also its long-term commitment to the process.

One point worth stressing is that the 2007 decision by City Council to create an immigration web portal, supported by the federal and provincial governments, marked a turning point in the City's perception of the value of provincial and federal engagement. Funding, coupled with an analysis of the local labour market, provided an important impetus for increasing municipal interest in immigration and for the City's participation, a year later, in LIP planning. LIP was seen by the City as presenting only upsides: help to improve services to immigrants; and assistance in promoting the city and improving the retention of new arrivals, many with talent, entrepreneurial skills and investment capital. The LIP also provided the City with a potential vehicle for influencing expenditure by the federal and provincial governments that impacted within Ottawa's geographic boundaries.

Based on this assessment, the City decided to play a founding role in OLIP and has remained an active and supportive participant throughout the planning and implementation phase.

Structure and goals

The most important goals at the start of Ottawa's LIP process were inclusivity and commitment. The aim was to bring as many key players to the table as possible and to keep them there for the duration of the planning process. Vision statements and high level goals were configured accordingly.

The stated rationale for OLIP was that immigration would need to play a vital role in Ottawa's future; that immigrants' integration outcomes had deteriorated across Ontario; and that to address the problems and take advantage of the talents that immigrants possess, it would be necessary "to coordinate and build upon the accumulated experience of local institutions, through local planning processes". Against this background, OLIP's vision statement evoked "A vibrant, prosperous national capital of a bilingual and multicultural country, strengthened by the contribution of immigrants." More specifically, the statement articulated three high-level goals:

- a city made prosperous by improving the economic integration of immigrants
- a vibrant city benefiting from newcomers' intellectual and artistic expressions, resulting in greater cultural vitality and a broader global perspective
- an inclusive national capital that upholds and practices Canadian values, including bilingualism and multiculturalism.

To steer OLIP and to mobilize local support, three committees were developed by the LIP Director and members of her team (on which the City was represented): a seven member Executive Committee; a somewhat larger, nineteen member Steering Committee; and, finally, a thirty-three member LIP Council.

LIP Council served as the final authority for approving strategic directions and major initiatives, including OLIP's planning process and strategic LIP plan. Council met regularly and attendance was consistently strong. Meetings were generally hosted by the City which was heavily represented by three members of its senior management cadre, drawn from two divisions: one with responsibility for community and social services; the other with responsibility for cross-cutting strategic initiatives that had a time-limited footprint. This latter group has now been reassigned and incorporated into the Community and Social Services Department (through an internal city reorganization) but, significantly, it has maintained its involvement in OLIP. (Additional City institutions represented on OLIP Council were the Youth Services Bureau, Ottawa Community Housing and the Ottawa Library.)

Other important concentrations on Council (beyond the City) included the education sector (various educational institutions and school boards), the health sector and immigrant settlement organizations. Housing, police, libraries and the private sector were represented more sparingly, as were mainstream service organizations (such as the United Way). Francophone interests on Council were represented by the Réseau (Eastern Ontario Francophone network) and by representatives from French educational institutions. Neither the province nor the federal government were represented on Council.

A complete membership list is provided in the Annex.

While Council operated as a board of directors, vetting and approving high level decisions, the Executive and Steering Committees were more hands-on. Generally, this took the form of shaping how information was to be presented rather than changing its content. Content was developed at a series of stakeholder tables whose members were recruited from key sectors by the LIP Director and her team (in consultation with City officials). Neither the Steering Committee nor the Executive Committee attempted to substitute their judgement for that of the assembled work teams (more on this below), with few exceptions. Among these was a decision to elevate the importance of addressing Francophone needs and rejection of a proposal to concentrate on youth as a pre-eminent, cross-cutting priority. It was feared that elevating youth would preclude addressing the needs of other important target groups, such as women and the elderly.

As with other complex undertakings involving arrays of councils, committees and executive bodies, the Secretariat played a key leadership role in OLIP's development. This was partly structural – the Secretariat provided services to the various Committees – but it also developed organically through the Secretariat's active and widespread consultations, its research, and its stewardship of the planning process. As a result, the Secretariat successfully earned the support of Council, the Steering and Executive Committees, service provider organizations and community groups.

From the City's perspective, OLIP represents a significant evolution from the pre-existing LASI structure. One of the big differences has been that "it is now somebody's job to coordinate, to organize and to move shared agendas forward". Whereas the City's previous relationship with service providers featured a high level of strategic involvement, this did not translate easily into specific targets and commitments by either the City or local settlement groups. This made it difficult to build awareness of immigration initiatives within the Corporation and to elicit concrete commitments to integrate city and service provider strategies. Now that OLIP has engaged the City's planning and accountability machinery, this is, emphatically, no longer the case.

In choosing to work with OLIP, the City saw an opportunity to extend its influence externally and to bring greater coherence to its internal operations. Externally, OLIP created momentum for local mainstream and immigrant groups to join together. This helped the City forge relationships beyond the immediate service provider community with mainstream groups that have a role in immigrant integration. OLIP also enhanced the City's capacity to target communities and neighbourhoods characterized by ethnic, cultural, racial and religious diversity.

Internally, OLIP provided the City, and city staff, with a planning framework that, by virtue of the legitimacy it enjoyed with service providers and newcomer communities, could be used to forge a coherent vision, aligning corporate responses and services to newcomers across different municipal departments. OLIP was seen as providing an effective lever for mobilizing internal support around City Council's agreed directions and goals,

It is worth noting that while the City was able to articulate a strategy that involved local groups, it did not have a strategy for engaging the province or the federal government in regards to immigration.

City involvement in LIP planning

Ottawa mounted one of the more elaborate planning exercises conducted by an Ontario LIP. This began with separate, broad-based consultations and focus groups involving immigrant service provider organizations, ethno-cultural and community groups, and local employers and economic organizations.

Alongside these broad-based consultations, OLIP also undertook a series of literature reviews, historical studies, service inventories and research assessments. These were intended to set the stage for the main planning process, to build commitment among organizations for OLIP planning and to increase the

level of involvement by the City, particularly the economic development unit and the community and social services department.

The main part of OLIP's planning machinery was deployed in the summer of 2010. This took the form of a series of workshops, or tables, organized around six distinct policy or programmatic themes. The six planning tables consisted of:

1. An education strategy table
2. A health and well-being strategy table
3. A settlement sector strategy table
4. A language sector strategy table (which included translation and interpretation)
5. An economic integration strategy table (which included entrepreneurship)
6. A social and civic engagement table (which included culture and recreation ... this table was also referred to as the integration capacity building table)

Invitations to the planning tables were issued to the major local organizations associated with each theme. For example, the education table included representatives from the English and French language school boards, school trustees, service agencies offering educational services, and other institutions involved in the provision of educational or ancillary services to newcomers and their children. The social and civic engagement table, by contrast, brought together social service providers and representatives from the city's culture group, sports and recreation, crime prevention, youth services and other service organizations. Planning tables ranged in size from a minimum of eight people to a maximum of twenty-five participants.

Each planning table was provided with a short background research paper prepared by OLIP's secretariat and two workshops were scheduled. Workshop discussions were managed by a specially appointed chair – someone with stature and knowledge of the sector – and by the Secretariat's strategy coordinator. Each workshop lasted approximately two to three hours. Following the workshop, a paper was developed summarizing the discussion into a half dozen strategic priorities and related actions. This paper was returned to participants prior to a second meeting at which representatives were given an opportunity to amend their priorities and to rank them together with the list of actions.

In addition to the six planning tables (and twelve meetings), a seventh table was constituted from the Executive and Steering Committees to consider cross-cutting themes that had emerged at the other tables. The resulting discussion, focusing on the desirability of prioritizing target groups and the need for common media strategies, proved inconclusive. As a general observation, the sector tables, including the Steering and Executive Committees, struggled when challenged to make choices among competing priorities. Whenever choices were presented, members found it difficult to ignore the fact that choices implied winners and losers in the competition for funds.

Throughout the discussions, the City remained an interested and active participant. Senior city managers and city staff contributed considerable time to workshops and meetings, to reviewing

documents, and to helping the OLIP Director recruit participants and build support. The City was particularly active in contributing and helping to shape the economic integration planning table and workshop, the social and civic engagement table (the 'integration capacity development' workshop), and the health table. City officials participated in discussions of priorities, assessed proposed actions and reviewed and commented on OLIP strategy documents.

Interventions originated with staff from two different City Portfolios: the City Operations Portfolio, containing the Community and Social Services Department; and the Infrastructure Services and Community Sustainability Portfolio, containing the Economic Development Branch. Within the Community and Social Services Department, the manager of the Strategic Community Initiatives Branch and the manager of the Client Service Strategies Unit were particularly active at both the Executive and Steering Committees.

City involvement in LIP implementation

The City's appointment of a dedicated staff person to serve as a key liaison between the City and OLIP lent weight to OLIP's strategy development process and brought important local stakeholders to the table. It also led to the City's involvement in various OLIP projects. So far, this involvement has occurred in the absence of a formal, recurring city process linking OLIP to the City's own strategic planning process. Such a connection has yet to be formalized, though the process of building links and 'chaining' OLIP's strategic plans with those of the City has moved well forward from the initial, informal meetings with the Deputy City Manager, City Operations. Since those early meetings, OLIP has formally sought support for elements of the Ottawa LIP strategy from two, key planning committees - the Finance and Economic Development Committee (FEDCO) and the Community and Protective Services Committee. OLIP has also met with Ottawa's Mayor and, on several occasions, with the Deputy-Mayor (who is OLIP's champion within the City) to discuss how the City might support and act on OLIP's vision.

OLIP's interventions were designed to secure the inclusion of OLIP's goals in the City's Term of Council priorities. These priorities inform the City's strategic plan which integrates Council priorities, objectives, strategic initiatives and performance information. The City's strategic plan underpins the development of current and future budgets and shapes the City's long-term financial planning. Inclusion in the plan ensures targeted action by the City, including budgetary allocations and accountability requirements for specific actions.

The OLIP objectives that were approved by City Council focus on the need to integrate immigrants with a view to promoting economic prosperity; improving city programs and services to achieve equity and inclusion; and ensuring that the City's workforce is diverse and reflects Ottawa's population.

The specific actions that the City will take in the first year in order to achieve the Term of Council priorities are as follows:

- Creation of a municipal Immigration Network
- A scan and inventory of current municipal immigration initiatives

- Clearly articulated vision, values, and goals which align with OLIP
- Identification of two to three practical actions towards supporting Council's priorities (e.g. Immigration Portal Enhancement; Internship Pilots; Economic Development/Invest Ottawa initiatives, etc.)
- Coordination of information about service gaps, opportunities and successes that improve integration outcomes.

OLIP has provided the City with a rough template that maps strategic priorities and proposed actions for achieving those priorities. The coming months will provide a clear signal as to the size, scope and coherence of the City's response to OLIP's directions.

A number of specific activities involving collaboration between the City and OLIP are already underway. These include training for settlement counselors to recognize and address various health concerns; an expansion of the Youth Futures Program, creating educational and employment opportunities for minority youth who would otherwise not consider professional careers; micro-finance for local community organizations to pursue small projects; and an undertaking by the City's Human Resource group to improve city internships, cooperative placements and outreach. It would appear that the City is also favourably disposed to creating an annual diversity celebration that showcases local diversity and its contribution to Ottawa, as the nation's capital. This is seen as having utility for engaging the federal and provincial governments in local issues aimed at showcasing national and provincial achievements.

In addition to the specific actions that fall within the City's own sphere of responsibility, the City has also signalled that it intends to mobilize mainstream organizations to support OLIP directions. How exactly this will work and which strategic objectives the mobilization will seek to support has not yet been clarified. The City has also not yet specified what role, if any, it would like OLIP to play in mobilizing federal and provincial support for beneficial changes in the deployment of immigrant services. There is a presumption that having the City make joint cause with OLIP will add weight to calls for increased provincial and federal engagement, but this remains to be tested.

Structural and process changes at the municipal level induced by the LIP

There have been several important changes in how the City works with OLIP since its debut. Initially, OLIP was allocated to the City's corporate portfolio in a section responsible for strategic, time-limited projects. Recently, as a result of an internal City reorganization, the unit responsible for OLIP has been relocated to a new 'home' in the Strategic Community Initiatives Branch which is part of the Community and Social Services Department residing in the City Operations Portfolio. Notwithstanding its relocation, the Client Services Strategies unit has maintained its responsibility for OLIP.

In its new 'home', the City unit responsible for OLIP is charged with developing strategic initiatives and bringing them into the mainstream of the Ottawa City Corporation. Other cross-cutting projects being dealt with in this way include poverty reduction, housing and homelessness, long-term seniors' care and children's policies – all of which have significant connections to LIP goals. Mainstreaming OLIP raises

important questions about its long-term potential and CIC's intentions. In particular, it assumes that CIC will continue to fund OLIP or, if not OLIP, a local capacity to analyze, plan and coordinate aspects of settlement and integration services for immigrants. This is not a role that the City could easily take on by itself, or recreate. The sustainability of the LIP process is, thus, an important consideration for the development and viability of Ottawa's planning 'model'.

A second important change that has occurred since the inception of OLIP has been the formal approval by City Council of key LIP integration objectives. This has produced an alignment between the City's goals and priorities (as approved by Council) and those of OLIP. As a result, the City unit responsible for OLIP will need to ensure that the OLIP goals endorsed by Council (in effect, making them City's goals) are addressed comprehensively and coherently by the appropriate City departments. To achieve this, the unit is developing performance indicators that will measure progress against designated corporate and (de facto) LIP objectives; the indicators will be used to report back to Council on the City's achievements at the end of the 2011-2014 cycle, after which progress will need to be reported annually.

In addition to developing performance indicators, the Client Services Strategies unit will establish a city-wide committee of senior managers to oversee and coordinate actions within the City Operations Portfolio in support of the LIP (including cultural and recreational services, social services, etc). A further structure is also planned to connect the Operations Portfolio with the Infrastructure Services and Community Sustainability Portfolio which contains economic development and is located in the City Manager's Office. While the configuration of this final bridge remains to be worked out, it is clear that the City has been giving the matter considerable thought and is one hundred percent sincere in its efforts to improve its corporate response to immigration.

Other changes worth noting are an upcoming revision and expansion in the use of the City's Equity and Inclusion Lens which is funded, in part, by Status of Women. OLIP was a member of the Equity and Inclusion Lens Reference Group and also participates in a number of other standing committees run by the City. These include language services, social recreation strategy development, equity and diversity, and a poverty committee. All have connections to OLIP's Action Plan.

At a process level, the most important development that has occurred is the expectation by integration stakeholders - created by OLIP and by the City - that intergovernmental relations, service provisions, and policy developments in the area of immigration will be analyzed and mediated through OLIP and City-initiated structures. This does not mean that grants applied for by individual service provider organizations must first be vetted by either OLIP or the City; but it does mean that there now exists an expectation that agencies will endeavour to support the OLIP plan and will seek out opportunities to advance its objectives. Whether OLIP will be asked to formally sanction applications for support remains to be worked out. This topic will be picked up again under Future Directions.

Future directions

OLIP's future success will depend on its strategic actions and capacities, on corresponding actions by the City of Ottawa, and on enabling and supportive measures by the federal and provincial governments.

More specifically, Ottawa's success depends on:

1. The ability of the City to convert City Council's support for OLIP objectives into concrete, measurable and manageable actions by the Corporation going forward to 2014. The challenge will be particularly acute in the economic development area where there is a need to go beyond economic integration and to link OLIP to economic development and investment. Success will depend on the degree of support that OLIP is able to command within the City's senior management cadre, as well as on the skills and effectiveness of the bureaucrats who are responsible for converting Council's endorsement of OLIP goals into actions linked to the City's planning machinery. OLIP has an enormous stake in ensuring that the City is able to demonstrate success when Council reviews its achievements in 2014.
2. The ability of OLIP to convert ideas into concrete and actionable proposals for which it is able to mobilize support. OLIP faces an important leadership challenge. This will require it to consolidate and, in some areas, expand support at the community level while, at the same time, making (and acting on) strategic choices that involve both winners and losers, and offering guidance to funders. Recently, the Partnership's stakeholders have encouraged OLIP to develop an independent identity from its host agency and founding partners.

In terms of skill sets and penetration, OLIP will need to strengthen its economic credentials (so it is able to participate more forcefully and persuasively in discussions about promotion and recruitment) as well as broadening its connections with mainstream institutions. As it does this, OLIP will also need to build its internal capacity, adding staff and analytic capability so it is able to successfully manage the expansion in its workload and the additional attention it is drawing to itself through actions such as the planned 'diversity day'. The pace of development and the support that OLIP enjoys will quickly be capped if OLIP is unable to deliver on its commitments and to mobilize the additional support it needs for this purpose.

3. Investments by third parties, chiefly the federal and provincial governments, in enabling mechanisms that will help OLIP to realize its potential and contribute to the achievement of CIC's strategic objectives for the LIP initiative. (These 'investments' will be clarified in the overview report.) Other parties with an important role to play include the Welcoming Communities Initiative, which can provide research and analytic support, and organizations such as the United Way, which has both the financial and moral capital to advance OLIP objectives.

Annex: Documents and Committee Memberships

Ottawa Local Documents

City of Ottawa & the OLIP Process: Ideas, Synergies & Opportunities, internal document, Ottawa, July 27, 2010

City of Ottawa in the OLIP Process, advisory memorandum by Hindia Mohamoud, LIP coordinator, regarding OLIP's city strategy, July 28, 2010

OLIP Steering Committee Minutes, Ottawa, September 2, 2010

Evolving the OLIP Governance Structure: Considerations to Support Discussion, internal document, Ottawa, October 14, 2010

Top Research Priorities: All Sectors, internal LIP document, Ottawa, January 25, 2011

Opportunities for City of Ottawa Leadership and Engagement in the Ottawa Immigration Strategy, internal LIP document, Ottawa, April 12, 2011

Presentation to Executive Management Committee, internal LIP document, Ottawa, May 5, 2011

City Departments mapped against OLIP Strategic Priorities, internal LIP document, Ottawa, May 10, 2011

Ottawa Local Immigration Partnership Strategy: Final Report, Ottawa, June 7, 2011

Presentation to City of Ottawa Finance and Economic Development Committee (FEDCO), internal LIP document, July 4, 2011

Economic Development Strategy Implementation Plan: Report to Finance and Economic Development Committee, City of Ottawa, July 2011

OLIP Progress Report for CIC's Annual Report, internal OLIP and CIC document, Ottawa, September 26, 2011

Presentation to the Mayor of Ottawa, internal OLIP document, Ottawa, November 14, 2011

Mapping of Intersections between City of Ottawa's Strategic Priorities and OLIP's Strategic Priorities, internal OLIP document, Ottawa, November 14, 2011

City of Ottawa Term of Council Priorities Report to the Finance and Economic Development Committee: 2011-2014, City of Ottawa, March 15, 2012

Provincial and national documents

Canada Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA), November 21, 2005 (with a particular focus on Annex F Partnerships with Municipalities)

Modernization Initiative: Community Settlement Planning and Organization Pilot Study, Meyer Burstein, prepared for Citizenship and Immigration Canada, May 2009.

Ontario-wide and Toronto LIP Calls for Proposals; issued February and April 2008, respectively.

LIP committees and membership

OLIP Executive Committee Members

1. Caroline Andrew (Chair)
Director, Centre on Governance
Ottawa Welcoming Communities Initiative
2. Hindia Mohamoud
Director
Ottawa Local Immigration Partnership
3. Dick Stewart
Private Citizen
4. Jephtée Elysée
Business Consultant
Y Enterprise Centre, National Capital Region YMCA-YWCA
5. Clara Freire
Manager, Client Service Strategies
Community and Social Services, City of Ottawa
6. Colleen Hendrick
Manager
Community and Social Services Department
City of Ottawa
7. Carl Nicholson
Executive Director
Catholic Immigration Centre

OLIP Steering Committee Members

1. Caroline Andrew (Chair)
Director, Centre on Governance
Ottawa Welcoming Communities Initiative
2. Hindia Mohamoud
Director
Ottawa Local Immigration Partnership
3. Ronald Bisson
Principal, Ronald Bisson and Associates
Private Citizen

4. Naini Cloutier
Director, Community Services
Pinecrest-Queensway Community Health Centre
5. Jeffrey Dale
Private Citizen
8. St-Phard Desir
Coordinator
Réseau de Soutien à l'Immigration Francophone de l'Est de l'Ontario
6. Jephtée Elysée
Programs Manager
Conseil Économique et Social d'Ottawa-Carleton
7. Wali Farah
Director of Programs
Ottawa Community Immigrant Services Organization
8. Clara Freire
Manager, Client Service Strategies
Organizational Development & Performance Department
City of Ottawa
9. Suzanne Gagnon
Private Citizen
10. Jacqueline Lawrence
Diversity and Equity Coordinator
Ottawa-Carleton District School Board
11. Jack McCarthy
Executive Director
Somerset West Community Health Centre
12. Hamdi Mohamed
Executive Director
Ottawa Community Immigrant Services Organization
13. Carl Nicholson
Executive Director
Catholic Immigration Centre
14. Nicole Olivier
Program Coordinator
La Cité collégiale
15. Dick Stewart
Private Citizen

16. Mengis Tsegaye
Executive Director
LASI World Skills
17. Cathy Turnbull
Vice President
Employment, Enterprise and Newcomer Services
YMCA-YWCA National Capital Region
18. Mark Zarecki
Executive Director
Jewish Family Services

OLIP Council Members

1. Caroline Andrew
Director, Centre on Governance, University of Ottawa
Ottawa Welcoming Communities Initiative
2. Marcia Aronson
Private Citizen
3. François Benoît
Director of Education
Conseil des écoles publiques de l'Est de l'Ontario
4. Nelly Beylouni-Zamat
Manager, Diversity and Accessibility Services
Ottawa Public Library
5. Ronald Bisson
President, Ronald Bisson and Associates
Private Citizen
6. Aaron Burry
General Manager
Community and Social Services Department
City of Ottawa
7. Naini Cloutier
Director, Community Services
Pincrest-Queensway Community Health Centre
8. Jeffrey Dale
Private Citizen
9. St-Phard Desir
Coordinator
Réseau de Soutien à l'Immigration Francophone de l'Est de l'Ontario

10. Jephtée Elysée (Vice-Chair)
OLIP Council
Programs Manager
Conseil Économique et Social d'Ottawa-Carleton
11. Jane Field
Associate Director
Youth Services Bureau of Ottawa
12. Suzanne Gagnon
Private Citizen
13. Donna Gray
Director
Organizational Development and Performance Department
City of Ottawa
14. Colleen Hendrick
Manager
Community and Social Services Department
City of Ottawa
15. Armand Kayolo
Program Manager
Overbrook-Forbes Community Resource Centre
16. Kenny Leon
Manager, Communications
Ottawa Chamber of Commerce
17. Émile Maheu
Manager, Community Relations
Conseil des écoles catholiques du Centre-Est
18. Jack McCarthy
Executive Director
Somerset West Community Health Centre
19. Elaine Medline
Special Projects and Communications Coordinator
Champlain Local Health Integration Network
20. Hamdi Mohamed
Executive Director
Ottawa Community Immigrant Services Organization
21. Hindia Mohamoud
Director
Ottawa Local Immigration Partnership
22. Carl Nicholson

- Executive Director
Catholic Immigration Centre
23. Nicole Olivier
Program Coordinator
La Cité collégiale
24. Walter Piovesan
Superintendent of Instruction
Ottawa-Carleton District School Board
25. Richard Plummer
Director of Inclusion
United Way/Centraide Ottawa
26. Nicole Rhéaume
Community Development Manager
Ottawa Community Housing
27. Neil Roy
Detective
Ottawa Police Service
28. Dick Stewart (Chair)
OLIP Council
29. Mengis Tsegaye
Executive Director
LASI World Skills
30. Tanya Mendes-Gagnon
Senior Director
Newcomer Services
National Capital Region YMCA-YWCA
31. Adnan Türegün
Executive Director
Centre for International Migration and Settlement Studies
Carleton University
32. Shailja Verma
Manager
Continuing and Community Education
Ottawa Catholic School Board
33. Mark Zarecki
Executive Director
Jewish Family Services

Chapter 5: North Bay case study - John Nadeau

This case study reports on LIP and municipal interactions based on a review of documents including the 2010 North Bay Newcomer Network LIP Action Plan, the 2007 North Bay Immigration Plan, a 2011 memorandum of understanding between the City of North Bay and the North Bay Newcomer Network, the City of North Bay Official Plan, and the 2011 Cultural Plan for the City of North Bay. In addition, the report draws on discussions with persons who are involved in the LIP and are able to comment on interactions between the North Bay Newcomer Network (NNN) and the City of North Bay. The interviewees include the LIP Coordinator and the LIP co-chairs (drawn from the NNN). In the case of North Bay, one of the LIP co-chairs is a senior official in the Economic Development Office. As the subsequent discussion illustrates, this individual provides the focal point for the vast majority of interactions with the City. Given the stature of the interviewees, the sample quickly provided a saturation of perspectives on LIP-municipal interactions in North Bay.

The following discussion presents a synopsis of these interactions in terms of the background context, structure and goals, city involvement in LIP planning, city involvement in LIP implementation, structural and process changes at the municipal level induced by the LIP and, finally, future directions.

Background context

A discussion of the historical background in the establishment of the North Bay LIP is critical to understanding current interactions between the NNN and the City. Indeed, the impetus for setting up the network was provided by the mayor and council with words like “tremendous importance” (Participant A) and “hugely important” (Participant C) associated with descriptions about the influence the City had on establishing the NNN. Clearly, the City recognized the important role that immigration could play in the region in meeting the economic and workforce imperatives that were confronting local businesses and the broader community. This perspective is evident in the interviews as well as the Tossutti and Esses (2011) report:

“In 2004-05, the Business Retention and Expansion Program surveyed companies in the region about challenges, issues, positives and negatives to keep local business and support expansion. A lack of labour pool and local demographics were identified as the major issues limiting expansion.... Immigration was one part of the strategy.... New immigrants were looking for jobs and we have the jobs.” (Participant C)

“Opinion leaders in Windsor and North Bay unanimously agreed that their respective municipalities were interested in the subject (of immigration) ... [In] North Bay, opinion leaders linked municipal interest in immigration to perceptions that it could be a vehicle for investment and increased tax revenues for northern communities (transcript 2), as well as for labour market and demographic renewal.” (Tossutti & Esses 2011, p.11)

“Interviewees in North Bay and Ottawa were most likely to refer to economic factors as constituting some of the advantages associated with immigration... North Bay interviewees echoed sentiments about desirable immigrant skill sets, ideas and innovation in a community that will need to fill positions vacated by retirees (transcripts 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8).” (Tossutti & Esses 2011, p.16)

The local demographic context of the City was also clearly mentioned as a driving force. Specifically, Participant A summed up the fundamental demographic factors for motivating action as: (1) baby boomer retirement, (2) youth-out migration and (3) low birth rate. The documents reviewed for this report also highlight the demographic demands on the City:

“Today, 53,966 people live in the City of North Bay. The greater North Bay area (Township of Bonfield, Municipality of Callander, Township of East Ferris and City of North Bay) has a population of 63,424. According to C.N. Watson and Associates Ltd., North Bay’s population is projected to grow at an annual rate of 0.25 – 0.37 between 2006 and 2031 ...only one-tenth of the provincial growth rate. This growth will primarily be in the seniors’ age group and by 2031, seniors are anticipated to represent 21% of the population.... Youth out-migration also adds to the demographic concerns throughout northern Ontario as young people leave the area in search of education and employment.” (North Bay Immigration Plan 2007, p.6)

“Steady growth [will require] retention of youth, strengthening of post-secondary education opportunities, support for the elderly and the attraction of new immigrants” (City of North Bay Official Plan, pp.6-7)

“... It is estimated that the local labour force will start decreasing after 2011 and by 2031, seniors will comprise approximately one third of the Muskoka, Nipissing & Parry Sound population.” (North Bay Immigration Plan 2007, p.7)

“Not only does immigration work as an economic growth strategy for its ability to reverse the trends of declining population, it is also attractive for its intake of skilled and professional trades.” (North Bay Immigration Plan 2007, p.9)

Therefore, given the motivation for investing in the NNN as a means to help meet workforce demands and stimulate economic growth in the region, North Bay’s council and mayor directed the Economic Development Office to take advantage of the opportunity provided by the LIP call for proposals (Participant A). While economic development and attracting skilled workers and investment provided the impetus for NNN’s creation (Participant B), there was an acknowledgement that support for newcomers was critical for their retention (Participant C). A symposium was held on a Saturday which resulted in the attendance of about 80 people from the community. The symposium identified the need for a settlement office and English language training, which became the focus of the successful funding applications that were developed. (Participant B).

The City had no ‘machinery’ in place to assist with newcomer settlement and language training because external financial support had heretofore been directed to Sudbury; this same reason was also given for rejecting previous funding requests by the NNN (Participant B). It would appear that prior to the NNN, there were very few people who were doing anything to help newcomers to settle in North Bay, an observation that was quickly confirmed (Participant B). There was an organization active in the 1980’s with a part-time person employed to provide settlement services but the Chair of what was then called the North Bay Immigrant Support Service decided that there was no longer a need for settlement services in North Bay and disbanded the organization (Participant A). The city was not involved in the North Bay Immigrant Support Services because the organization was seen as dysfunctional featuring frequent clashes between the organization and authorities. (Participant A). Nonetheless, the need for settlement services and newcomer attraction persisted (Participants A, B and C) which allowed the NNN to successfully focus attention on the importance of making the community more welcoming (Participant C). This is an important priority for North Bay and its need is underlined in the Tossutti and Esses (2011) report:

“In St. Catharines-Niagara, North Bay and London, as many as three in ten opinion leaders felt that visible minorities would not feel welcome. The reasons for discomfort in these and other communities were almost exclusively linked to negative community attitudes (Table 13).”
(p.20)

Structure and goals

To achieve a more welcoming community that attracts newcomers, a network of supportive organizations is required. The City of North Bay is a critical actor in the network and has taken a leadership role in establishing and operating the NNN. From a structural perspective, the City is represented in the NNN by a municipal employee who works in the Economic Development Office and shares leadership of the network by serving as its co-chair (2010 North Bay Newcomer Network LIP Action Plan). In addition, the City representative is also involved in various NNN committees (2010 North Bay Newcomer Network LIP Action Plan). Despite its extensive involvement and leadership, “the City does not see itself as the sole lead and neither does the multicultural center; it is a partnership right at the executive level of the LIP” (Participant C). Another interviewee explains it this way:

“Typically what happens, for attraction related projects, the City leads them. For retention stuff, it is more the Multicultural Centre. But, NNN is really the overall umbrella that gets the overall contribution. We set priorities together on the NNN ... and typically what happens is the committees come back with priorities and the Executive decides on how to proceed based on what makes senses. Depending on what the project is, the City might implement or provide funds.” (Participant B)

For example, during the initial setup of the NNN, the City provided space for meetings and an employee’s time to support the establishment of the network (Participant A). The involvement of the

City with NNN has changed over time as the employee from Economic Development is [now] less involved with operations (Participant B). In another example, the City, with support from Ontario's Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration (MCI), funds the operation of an immigrant information portal and offers services to newcomers who do not qualify for Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) assistance (e.g. international students) (Participant A).

Although the Economic Development office is well represented in the NNN, other departments at the City also interact with network partners, perhaps in different ways than in the past (Participant B). For example, the Parks and Recreation department has been helping to establish cricket as an alternative sport in North Bay and the Human Resources department is interacting with the NNN to develop HRNorth, an initiative to help support small and medium sized enterprises (SME's) to attract and retain newcomer talent. In addition, the NNN has been involved with the city to develop a broader cultural plan to encourage diversity and create a more attractive and vibrant city (Participant A). There is a great deal of political support and interest in the NNN's activities, as indicated by mayoral and councilor attention. (Participant A).

Interestingly, the keen interest and involvement by the City in the NNN did not require the City to hold the LIP agreement with CIC. The agreement is held by the North Bay and District Multicultural Centre (NBDMC). This is seen as a successful structural advantage:

"(The CIC agreement is) through the Multicultural Centre. But, I have seen in other cities such as Sudbury and Sault Saint Marie where the City has the LIP agreement that it doesn't work well. It gets bogged down at City Hall. It is not working well at either of those two cities as compared to North Bay and Thunder Bay where it is working really well. Because, the Multicultural Centre has responsibility for settlement and the LIP so you get much more synergy going." (Participant A)

While the LIP Coordinator is housed at the NBDMC, the person has a dual reporting relationship to the co-chairs. Having the Coordinator at the NBDMC was seen to be very positive, as illustrated by the following quotation:

"This was a conscious decision because, rather than link to the municipality where there are constraints and issues, by linking to the multicultural centre, it gave (the NNN) broader scope. Rather than being focused only on economic development, it really does allow you to bring in all of the aspects that are required. That was a good decision because it also focused the LIP coordination through the hub of multiculturalism so it never loses perspective on what the LIP is about" (Participant C)

Because of the dual reporting structure, the LIP coordinator has a close relationship with the City representative characterized by regular meetings, particularly with respect to employer matters (Participant A & B). This is also viewed as very positive and was described by one respondent in the following manner, highlighting a high quality, productive and enduring relationship:

“The relationship is very good, honest, direct and with a willingness to try new things ... the relationship is solid and people have seen the benefit of the arrangement so new people can only benefit by bringing in a new perspective to build on the solid relationship and the reputation of the City and the NNN to deliver.” (Participant C)

Some opportunities exist for the City and the NNN to interact with provincial ministries, mediated by both the City and the NBDMC. For instance, the City is engaged with MCI because of funding the Ministry provides for the immigration portal. Similarly, the NBDMC has two interns that are provincially funded through the Ontario Heritage fund (Participant A). Generally, much of the funding for newcomer initiatives requires partners, so the current arrangement allows the City to apply for and manage the money, while working with partners to implement the projects (Participant B).

City involvement in LIP planning

The distinction in North Bay between planning and implementation - where planning refers to setting goals and determining how best to reach them while implementation refers to putting plans into action – cannot be cleanly divided. This has to do with the circular nature of planning, feedback and action that characterizes the operation of the NNN in recent years. One respondent suggested that the NNN is at a different stage from many other provincial LIPs which may only be in their first year or two of existence. (Participant B). This is not the case in North Bay where many NNN activities predate the 2008 LIP call for proposals and the planning process has reached a more mature stage.

The involvement of the City in NNN strategic planning is evident from the following quote drawn from NNN’s action plan (2010):

“The attraction of newcomers to North Bay is a priority for the City of North Bay ... while NNN works on related initiatives designed to retain those who move here, via supportive programs and the celebration of culture. Currently the NNN is working on:

- An immigration portal, launched January 2010 www.northbayimmigration.ca
- The Connector Program (social and professional networking for newcomers)
- A business immigration attraction project
- Various community events
- A resource guide for newcomers and agencies that serve newcomers
- A resource guide for employers regarding the recruitment of global talent
- Ongoing community education about diversity
- NNN’s long-term strategy is to facilitate the cooperative integration of newcomers and enhance their ability to participate in community and civic life, while growing the population base, local labour pool and investment.” (p.4)

The NNN Action Plan (2010) highlights strategic priorities which are directly linked to the attraction and retention priorities of the City. These NNN strategic priorities include access to appropriate language development for newcomers; appropriate employment opportunities to attract, retain and integrate newcomers; the creation of a welcoming community; and strengthened collaborative partnerships with newcomer groups.

The City was heavily involved in the planning and start-up of the NNN (i.e. hosting meetings, taking minutes, etc.) but gradually downloaded many administrative tasks to NNN dedicated resources. Throughout, the City representative dedicated enormous amounts of time (upwards of 50%) contributing to developing the NNN's strategy and action plans; this involvement continues, especially during crunch times, with the representative continuing in her role as NNN co-chair (Participant B).

In addition to work time, a major contribution by the City to the LIP planning process was the credibility and reputation it brought to the task. (Participant B). The City actively participates by introducing potential partners to the local network and following up to encourage commitment (Participant C). This support is seen as critical to the NNN's success (Participant C). Indeed, the support offered by the City has helped resolve barriers created by other City departments (Participant C). In particular, the evolution of the City's machinery from an Employment Committee to an Employer Council represents an excellent example of planning success resulting from NNN-City interaction. This example highlights the importance for the LIP of being able to leverage the City's community connections in support of NNN's objectives by shifting the focus and composition of existing municipal structures. In the process, the emphasis shifted from a space dominated by employment service providers to one where employer needs are dominant:

“[The] biggest impact of the city was with the Employment Council because we moved it from an Employment Committee to an Employment Council.... They were very supportive and helped recruit various employers for that through the Economic Development office... They are an integral part of the whole process. This was a big success ... [converting the Committee] from one employer and a group of service providers who looked at it from a perspective about how we put people into jobs. What was missing was the people who actually [created] the jobs and knowing about their needs. So, by going to an Employers Council, we were able to determine what ... needs, tools and supports are required by employers to support international recruitment“(Participant C).

A second example illustrating the successful partnership between the LIP and the City involves the ability to find financial resources to support NNN initiatives. The City has been able to help the LIP leverage up to \$3 million for immigration projects (Participant B) so the City is an important enabler. According to Participant C, the City representative:

“has been very good at finding other resources for funding within the municipality or through MCI, Employment, etc. ... can take a dollar and create a million.... uses a systems approach and identifies linkages within the community (e.g. Chamber of Commerce, school boards, etc.)

[that are] open to creativity and [are] responsive... and looking at how we can use partnerships to the max.”(Participant C)

One of the principles associated with the LIP’s successful efforts to leverage financial support has been a decision to specialize and to have only one applicant develop a funding proposal. One respondent explains the decision to focus funding efforts as:

“We are small. There will be one center, and one center only; and we will only do one proposal... concentrate funding, build services and become a hub that is recognized throughout the community ... this was a conscious decision, not something by accident” (Participant C).

The collaborative and constructive nature of the relationship has undoubtedly contributed to these successes. For instance:

“As a partner, the City has had an influence on LIP planning but has not overridden or changed the process. They respect what others say and are open to that and are still active participants in the process ... when they highlight issues, we try to solve them. It is collaborative and builds the partnerships necessary to resolve the issues” (Participant C).

Political support in North Bay has been good with Mayors, Councilors, MPs and MPPs supportive of LIP activities and having met with the LIP Coordinator (Participant C). However, the main input into the planning process by the municipality has come from the City’s representative along with several fringe players. As a result, economic development issues, which are the co-chair’s portfolio in the City, are a priority. The presence of the City co-chair has also encouraged a reciprocal influence, ensuring that immigration concerns are considered in both regional planning activities (e.g. Growth North mention of immigration, the Cultural Plan) and in annual planning by the City (Participant B).

City involvement in LIP implementation

Building on its involvement in LIP planning, the City has also been deeply involved in the implementation of NNN (LIP) newcomer initiatives. Coordination and integration of City plans with the NNN’s planning process is elaborated through an annual Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU specifies the services that will be delivered to support the attraction and integration of newcomers, including further investments in the immigration portal, the Connector program, and settlement-relocation services.

While the NNN is responsible for the implementation and promotion of services, as well as tracking and reporting to the City, the City monitors activities and performance, assists in promotion and provides ongoing program and administrative support. The City also contributes significant financial resources to the NNN to enable it to fulfill its roles and responsibilities as outlined in the MOU. This has made possible such initiatives as the creation of a local Employers’ Resource Guide and the development of an accessible database of diversity trainers (Andrew & Nicholson, 2011).

The City has maintained its involvement throughout the project implementation phase; this involvement is perhaps best characterized as ongoing leveraging of the City's network. Even though the NNN has been in existence for several years, the City's network remains valuable because potential partners can be enticed to participate by messages from the City focusing on business development and making a business case for immigration rather than focusing on social benefits alone. (Participant B). City involvement also adds credibility to partner negotiations, which encourages community involvement. One participant described the importance and influence of the City to involve others in NNN initiatives in the following way:

"Credibility ... a good reputation and support. They have lent their name and credibility to the LIP and ... when we go to talk to employers or service providers, it is almost like it is already there. They pave the way and add solid credibility to any new partnerships we are trying to develop ... There are always letters of support." (Participant C)

Of course, the City's overall involvement is cemented into place by virtue of the City representative serving as the NNN's co-chair. This ensures municipal involvement in all stages of planning and implementation of newcomer initiatives. Put succinctly, the "City's priorities are reflected in the NNN's priorities" (Participant B). Moreover, the City continues to provide logistical support for the implementation of initiatives (i.e. structuring meetings, launches, introductions and coordinating dates to ensure that any NNN events do not clash with other important events for key participants) (Participant C).

Structural and process changes at the municipal level induced by LIP

While structural and procedural changes (owing to the NNN) in how the City conducts its business have been modest, significant adjustments have, nonetheless, occurred. Above, the case study describes the change that resulted from replacing the Employment Committee by an Employers Council. Other changes had to do with the manner in which the City undertakes community consultations. The NNN/NBDMC is now on the City's 'checklist' of key agencies to survey to ensure that the views of newcomers are represented. There may be some confusion as to which organization to contact (i.e. NNN or NBDMC), but both organizations involve the same people so the impact is negligible. One interview participant describes the situation in the following manner:

"The distinction between the NNN and the NBDMC is not really made often in the community. While the NNN is about the broad partnerships, the other is about service delivery. But, that is not so bad; as long as one is contacted, the connection can be made" (Participant C)

An example of a recent consultation can be found in the request for the NNN to be involved in the development of the City's Cultural Plan. During the consultations and subsequent development of the actual plan, the NNN was positioned as a key player in establishing a new cultural roundtable. The structure of the NNN is viewed by local community organizations as a success and is held up as a model

to be replicated. The positive results come about from growing partnerships organically and building on previous successes. This is highlighted in the following excerpt from the City's Cultural Plan (2011):

"Partnerships and collaboration – It was suggested to examine the partnership model used by the North Bay Newcomer Network supported by the North Bay & District Multicultural Centre and the City's Economic Development office. The Network connects more than 50 not-for-profit groups and supports coordination and collaboration through a series of standing committees." (2011 Culture Plan, p.27)

The Cultural Plan (2011) cites, as a key condition for success, the provision of adequate resources to support the network along with a shared leadership structure anchored in well chosen co-chairs.

Future directions

The future direction of the NNN will likely follow the vector indicated by recent successes. Several NNN accomplishments are likely to be sustained, including the portal and the pan-Northern work associated with newcomer attraction (Participant B). In addition, the structure of the NNN is likely to remain, along with the emphasis on economic development. An interviewee explains the future of the NNN and the central role of economic development in Northern Ontario as continuing to provide momentum for newcomer initiatives:

"A really effective working partnership has led to our success. We are held up as a model in Northern Ontario as the LIP with the most success. I think it is because of the good working partnership and we have had it from day one. And, we have been linked to Economic Development from the beginning, both the multicultural centre and the LIP. Whereas in Toronto and those places, economic development is not a big concern, they have other issues, here, it is the overriding issue." (Participant A)

Future work by the NNN will require vigilance with respect to efforts to promote a welcoming community. While there has been success in encouraging a more welcoming attitude (as indicated by Participant C below), attitudes toward newcomers have not been favourable until recently. This perspective is indicated by Participant B and emphasizes the need for ongoing attention:

"A community that is much more open to immigrants. I have also seen a greater willingness for collaboration. It is no longer pulling teeth and seeing a pile of hidden agendas. Also, employers are more comfortable with where they can look for support. Those that need to look to the international community are probably less afraid" (Participant C)

"Community awareness was step one. It has improved. When the symposium was announced by press conference, there was a sickening backlash ... letters to the editor, anonymous letters with little response from the community. Now, we might get 1-2 negative comments, no letters, no stopping me at the grocery store. If there is a negative in the newspaper, there would now be 20 people setting them right." (Participant B)

The philosophy of the NNN is expected to be maintained in the coming years. This philosophy is punctuated by an emphasis on placing newcomers first: “It should always be about the client” (Participant B) when considering newcomer retention and settlement issues and services. This orientation was elaborated by another of the interviewees as: “Ensure you can retain them first, then [worry about] attraction. Get the community on board and behind you. Don’t assume you know what they need; ask the newcomers what they need” (Participant B).

Apart from its guiding philosophy, the NNN is successful because the partners respect each other and value what they can each bring to the network. One participant highlighted the importance of this perspective stating: “We each play a significant role and know what our roles are ... Therefore, we can be clear about our roles and responsibilities with our partners... You don’t have to do it all. Trust your partners” (Participant C).

The strength of the City-NNN partnership is expected to at least remain the same (Participants A & B) or intensify as the NNN begins to extend its reach to other municipal departments (Participant C). One participant opined that “[City involvement is] expected to stay the same ... [without] any major changes coming ... The City should always be involved in immigration because of the job shortage issue that is not going away” (Participant A). However, there was concern that the relationship between the City and the NNN might vary according to changes in the key personnel who must interact regularly. Changes in personnel could affect the personal affinity that presently exists: “It would be a new person, a different connection” (Participant B). Yet there is optimism that the NNN has matured to the point where it could easily adapt to such a change (Participant C).

Annex A – North Bay Newcomer Network Community Partners

(From the North Bay Newcomer Network – LIP Action Plan, 2010)

The City of North Bay
North Bay & District Multicultural Centre
North Bay Literacy Council
North Bay & District Chamber of Commerce
The Labour Market Group
Ministry of Citizenship & Immigration
Near North District School Board
Ministry of Northern Development, Mines and Forestry
Nipissing University
Canadore College
District of Nipissing Social Services Administration Board
Rotary Club of Nipissing
YES! Employment Services
Volunteer Centre of Blue Sky Region
North Bay YMCA
Big Brothers Big Sisters of North Bay & District
Citizenship and Immigration Canada
Salvation Army
The Business Centre – Nipissing Parry Sound
Gateway Treasures Practice Firm
True Self Employment and Training
Building Up Individuals Through Learning and Teamwork (BUILT) Network
DEOC Employment Information Resource Centre
CTS Employment Resource Centre
Cementation Canada
Human Resources Professionals Association of Ontario (North Bay)
Call Edge Practice Firm
The Early Years Centre
Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities
Employers' Council Members
 TeleTech
 PGI Fabrene
 North Bay and District Hospital
 Atlas Copco
 North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit
 Ontario Northland
 Stantec

Chapter 6: Sudbury case study - Aurelie Lacassagne

List of acronyms:

LIP: Local Immigration Partnership

GSDC: Greater Sudbury Development Corporation

CIFS: Contact Interculturel Francophone de Sudbury

SMFAA: Sudbury Multicultural and Folks Arts Association

MCI: Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration (Province of Ontario)

CIC: Citizenship and Immigration Canada (Federal government)

NOHFC: Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corporation (Province of Ontario)

SAMSAA: Sudbury Area Mining Supply and Service Association

Background context

Before the Local Immigration Partnership (LIP) initiative was put forward, immigration was of minimal concern to the City Of Greater Sudbury, mainly because of the local economic situation. Up until 2006-2007, the City experienced high unemployment levels; then the Sudbury economy changed dramatically with the increase in demand for resources (mainly copper and nickel). Labour shortages became a primary concern and, with it, the interest in immigration became a reality. Yet as the local LIP coordinator, pointed out “there were some delicate issues as the mining companies were bought by foreign companies.”

These factors aside, three elements must be noted. Firstly, that there was a political will to foster immigration as the mayor of the time (2006-2010), John Rodriguez, was himself a first-generation immigrant. And before him, Mayor David Courtemanche also acknowledged the critical importance of immigration (Block, 2006:36), as did the local councillor who was interviewed for this project and stressed that immigration was on the radar because of demographic concerns. Secondly, in regards to the Municipality’s inclusion machinery, a diversity advisory panel existed prior to the LIP, led by the Growth and Development Department, but its focus was on aboriginal matters and related cultural diversity and inclusion issues. The panel was not concerned with newcomer attraction. Also, municipal involvement in the operations of the panel was minimal. Usually it involved a one-year intern who was responsible for minor projects prioritized by the panel. This panel had been pushed politically by a

councillor who no longer holds a seat. Thirdly, the only “media” or communications presence involving immigration was the web portal that the Municipality had developed with a grant from the Ministry of Citizenship (MCI). According to the LIP coordinator, without this grant, the immigration portal would not have been put in place.

The Municipality’s initial reaction to the LIP initiative was positive because the economic context had changed and because of strong mayoral support. Yet, there was an internal debate to decide who should take the lead on the LIP. The Growth and Development department did not initially seek the lead because it felt that “immigration was not community development”. The Greater Sudbury Development Corporation (GSDC), on the other hand, had put the attraction of skilled talent at the top of its priority list so there was definite interest. The GSDC respondent had participated in a Destination Canada mission (a federal program promoting immigration to Canada) a few months before the issuance of the LIP call for proposals and ‘could see the bigger picture’. The GSDC respondent was aware of employer needs and understood that a full support network (settlement, retention, inclusion, housing, culture, and other social services) would be needed to successfully keep skilled workers. So, the GSDC agreed to take charge of the project. The Corporation’s representative then helped the service provider, Sudbury Multicultural and Folk Arts Association (SMFAA), draft the submission for the LIP contract. Shortly thereafter, all the other service providers and community organizations asked the Municipality to take a strong lead as there was a degree of discomfort with having a potential competitor in a coordinating and decision-making role.

The Municipality’s involvement continues to be driven almost entirely by the GSDC’s interest in attracting skilled workers. As a result, economic concerns dominate all others though the chair of the diversity advisory panel (who was not involved in the LIP) feels that there is also a linkage to demographic concerns and an interest in cultural flourishing. These findings are consistent with what the literature has been showing (Block, 2006; Tossutti & Esses, 2011: 3).

Structure and goals

The Municipality holds the contract with CIC and is responsible for the financial management and audits of the LIP initiative. The LIP has been assigned to the GSDC and is situated with the business officer who is also responsible for attraction initiatives within his portfolio (he is the only bilingual business development officer in this department). The LIP coordinator is also housed by the GSDC. According to the GSDC officer who supervises the coordinator, “From the City’s perspective, he [the LIP coordinator] is an employee but his position is funded by CIC – which is not unusual for Economic Development Corporations... He reports administratively to me and the director; and [is accountable] for activities, technically, to the GSDC management board.” The GSDC officer has indicated that, to date, the management board has only received an interim report on the LIP. The LIP plan itself has not been formally approved (it is on the agenda for an April 2012 agency meeting). Despite this, the LIP plan was publicly launched on November 15, 2011.

From the City's perspective, the LIP is seen as an add-on to the GSDC's work, complementing its attraction initiatives. The LIP is expected to take care of the 'other' aspects, including settlement, housing, and so forth. The Municipality is far less engaged if the subject-matter is not economically focused, a tendency that was reinforced in the recent municipal elections which strengthened the pro-business focus. Relations between the LIP coordinator and the City tend to be harmonious and the GSDC continues to be viewed as the best 'home' for the LIP, in part because the GSDC is a relatively autonomous department. The structural link between the LIP and the GSDC also gives the LIP more clout and allows it to be heard; the downside is that immigration tends to be considered exclusively from an economic angle.

The LIP is structured as follows: There is an *executive committee* consisting of the GSDC representative and two committee co-chairs – the Sudbury Multicultural and Folk Arts Association (SMFAA) and the Contact Interculturel Francophone de Sudbury (CIFS); a *management board* consisting of the GSDC representative, the co-chairs, the YMCA, and several other organizations; and the *LIP Council* which gathers together over thirty organizations. It would appear that the executive committee does not meet; instead, the management board is the main decision-making body, as stated in the terms of reference. That said, according to one service provider, the management board also does not meet regularly and has not endorsed the LIP strategic plan, a view that is at odds with that held by the GSDC. It would appear that the strategic plan was circulated to LIP Council but, as noted earlier, has yet to be formally approved.

Among the more important achievements of the LIP so far has been to draw attention to the fact that the SMFAA was primarily an Anglophone service-provider and that Francophone services were deficient, despite financing to deliver services in both official languages. CIC has since turned to the YMCA to offer bilingual settlement services. According to the GSDC representative, the LIP was the driving force in addressing this situation. In the Sudbury context, this was very important, clarifying responsibility for settlement services, as well as leading to improvements in service quality.

The LIP structure has not yet developed formal sub-committees to advance planning and implementation (only very broad sectoral roundtables were organized during the planning phase). Discussions have started, however, with the diversity advisory panel to coordinate sub-committees once they are launched. This approach has received considerable support from the diversity panel which strongly endorsed the LIP strategic plan. As to the question about possible duplication between the diversity panel and the LIP, both the LIP coordinator and the responsible GSDC manager felt that better coordination would ensue between the two bodies.

Apart from GSDC, no city staff or councillors sit on any LIP structures (although the former Mayor participated in a planning session). According to the GSDC manager, the LIP is not yet on the radar of other municipal departments: "We have not really pushed it too much to others. I hope to see more on that in the near future, now that the LIP plan is out." In anticipation, the LIP coordinator has launched informal discussions with the recreational services department as well as the planning department. The coordinator recognizes, however (as does GSDC), that other municipal departments, especially Human Resources, will also need to be engaged. Currently, the coordinator's contact with Human Resources

revolves around administrative issues related to LIP management but does not extend to issues of municipal policy and programming.

In terms of opportunities to engage with provincial ministries, the situation is unclear. According to the LIP coordinator, “Being housed in the City is a huge advantage [allowing the LIP to do business with] FEDNOR, Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corporation (OHFC) ... it helps the LIP to get these contacts and be taken seriously.” From the City’s perspective, the LIP value added is somewhat less evident: The GSDC manager pointed out that the City had good working relations with the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration (MCI) and the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines before the LIP was formed. He also noted that attraction initiatives undertaken by the City involved not only provincial ministries but other Northern cities. This suggests that having each LIP acting independently on all fronts may not constitute the optimal arrangement. The attraction model employed by the francophone network (Réseau de soutien à l’immigration francophone) could also be looked at as a potential mechanism for encouraging “Anglophone” immigration. Networked relations across municipalities of the North already exist, de facto: The North Bay LIP is already closely aligned with the Timmins LIP, for example. Better coordination and partnerships among Northern LIPs would, likely, enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of attraction strategies and, ultimately, settlement services. According to the councillor who was interviewed, a stronger province-wide role would increase immigration to the North. His view was that immigrants are welcome and that existing residents want them to stay and settle.

In terms of opportunities to engage with other groups, the success of the LIP has definitely been affirmed by the interviewees. In particular, there is a consensus that the LIP initiative has fostered discussions and promoted the involvement of economic stakeholders such as the Sudbury Chamber of Commerce and the Sudbury Area Mining Supply and Service Association (SAMSSA) which gathers together most of the local employers in the mining sector. These actors now have immigration on their radar. The City also recognizes that the LIP offers a useful platform for systematically engaging post-secondary institutions and ethnic groups.

By participating more actively in the LIP, the Municipality hopes to fill in the missing elements of its attraction initiative - i.e. the retention and integration components. The entire focus of the City has been on obtaining skilled workers to meet the needs of local companies and investors. The LIP complements the City’s efforts, especially on the cultural and francophone fronts. The GSDC manager recognizes that the participation of the francophone service-provider, Contact Interculturel Francophone de Sudbury (CIFS), has demonstrated the value of better coordination and collaboration: “The City is interested in the following LIP objectives: attraction and retention; employment; workforce integration; education (as in advanced research and innovation, as part of the learning cities initiative)”.

To date, as noted above, the City does not see the LIP as an important mechanism for engaging other levels of government. For this to change, municipal departments other than GSDC would need to become more involved in the LIP with a view to exploiting potential leverage opportunities. Some interviewees stated that the City does not fully appreciate the potential for collaborating with federal

and provincial ministries, apart from traditional partners such as FEDNOR, the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines and the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corporation.

City involvement in LIP planning

The City provided both financial and in-kind support during the LIP planning phase. The financial charges accrued as support for the LIP coordinator who is a city employee. The in-kind support came mainly in the form of staff time (for instance translators, communications officers, secretaries) and space for meetings. The City also paid to train the LIP coordinator on a spatial database; and the City shared the cost of census data, GIS information, and other statistics that were used for mapping purposes in developing the LIP strategic plan.

The City also played a key role as a “door opener” with important strategic stakeholders, especially the main economic actors such as the Vale Mining Company and the Sudbury Area Mining Supply and Service Association (SAMSSA). The City’s efforts, during the LIP planning process, were all channelled through the GSDC manager. As a result, municipal involvement appears to be narrowly constructed, relying on a single department and, primarily, on a single staff member. This may prove to be problematic and structurally weak. The two service-providers that co-chair the LIP acknowledge this deficiency: Their contacts are limited to front-line workers and there are no links to middle or senior management. Essentially, relations with the city have not expanded beyond the GSDC.

Notwithstanding municipal oversight, the LIP planning process was conducted primarily by community organizations. Thus, the LIP plan largely reflects the community’s interests. The GSDC objective was limited to ensuring that employment, attraction and workforce integration were listed as priorities. The Municipality did not have much involvement in the planning processes itself, except to reach out to its economic partners and to bring them to the LIP table in order to make sure that economic development was a key priority.

Because of limited municipal involvement in LIP planning, intersections between the LIP strategic vision and the City’s strategic plan are scarce. That said, the City’s plan is currently being reviewed and some elements of the LIP plan may find their way into the City’s economic strategy. Among the more important ideas that were mentioned are the following:

“A growing proportion of knowledge workers [to Sudbury] are coming from overseas. In many cases, these workers do more than fill occupational gaps; they contribute new perspectives and knowledge drawn from other places, and they enhance Greater Sudbury’s innovative capacity Since 2007, Greater Sudbury has been engaged in the development of a local settlement strategy to address issues around settlement, integration, retention and attraction of newcomers to the community. (City of Greater Sudbury, 2009a: 14)

Elected officials have also not played a major role in the LIP process. The councillor who was interviewed stated that the LIP strategic plan had not been presented to City Council, though he believed "... there would be much buy-in". According to the councillor, "the [City] Council and the bureaucrats must be sensitized to the importance of immigration." A similar sentiment has been expressed by CIFS, the Francophone service-provider: "The City's involvement should increase; the LIP results should be taken seriously; and politicians and senior managers should be [more] involved". The YMCA shared this view, arguing that "we should not miss the momentum" if the implementation phase is to succeed.

City involvement in LIP implementation

Given that the LIP strategic plan was only released in November of 2011, it is still too early to assess the City's involvement in LIP implementation. Nevertheless, according to GSDC, the Municipality is committed to moving the plan forward. As long as the LIP is funded, the City will continue to support LIP projects. The City will also attempt to bring a wider range of players on board, including officials from other municipal departments. On both sides, LIP and City, there would appear to be a new sense of urgency to expand municipal involvement in order to help implement the LIP action plan (though very few municipal departments are named in the plan). In the same manner, the United Way, an important local stakeholder that has not been at the planning table, should, according to the GSDC and the LIP coordinator, be brought into the LIP.

The primary focus of the City will continue to be in the sectors and programs that advance the City's interest in economic development. Measures such as a proposed mentoring network could lead to changes in City programming. On the other hand, there does not appear to be much municipal appetite to become directly involved in the implementation of the Plan's social and cultural elements. In this respect, the LIP has not produced better coordination and collaboration among municipal departments that operate in the social and cultural arena. According to the YMCA this will need to change: "the City needs to be an active player; [and] the City must have a vision and must put in place the necessary means [to realize that vision]."

The LIP Settlement Strategy (Greater Sudbury LIP, 2011) identifies five key sectors (language services; employment; housing; education; and government) and five themes (attraction and retention; settlement; healthy families; social inclusion; and workforce integration). The GSDC manager believes the City will work closely with the LIP to implement actions in three domains: employment, attraction and retention, and workforce integration. For the LIP to advance its plans in regards to housing, healthy families and social inclusion, it will need to extend its reach within the city as well as strengthen its connections with agencies such as the Social Planning Council and the 'Our Children, Our Future NGO' (<http://www.ourchildren-ourfuture.net/default2.aspx>). In recent years, the City of Greater Sudbury, through its Children Services department, has been very active in working with this NGO to develop various tools and programs, including Best Start, Healthy Babies, and Get Healthy (City of Greater Sudbury, 2009b). As the LIP moves from planning to implementation, it will need to anchor its actions

within these programs, and other existing measures, in order to avoid duplication (Our Children, Our Future was created expressly for this purpose) and to promote leveraging.

The section of the LIP Settlement Strategy (Greater Sudbury LIP, 2011: 40-42) entitled “government” reveals the extent of the work that remains to be done. The list includes actions such as data collection, needs evaluation and a broadening of contacts with government that normally precede the development of strategic plans. As well, some of the broad implementation parameters remain to be clarified. For example, the plan advocates that “Various government departments provide more outreach services to immigrant communities” without clarifying whether the intent is for government agencies to provide those directly or, as is generally the case, to fund service provider agencies to deliver these services. It would also appear that many of the proposed actions are not specific to Sudbury, which suggests that a good deal of analysis still needs to be conducted to decide what might work best in Sudbury. This reinforces the idea that the LIPs need to invest more in partnerships that assist them in conducting the necessary research and analysis to support planning and implementation.

At the time of writing, the LIP action plan (see the LIP Settlement Strategy section entitled “Planning for action”, Greater Sudbury LIP, 2011: 63-65) does not contain many specifics. Three major priorities are identified - settlement, employment and attraction/retention – however the accompanying actions contain few specificities and the lead municipal department is rarely identified, notwithstanding the fact that, in most cases, the City of Greater Sudbury is listed as a “resource” and in three instances as “lead”. Similarly, the section of the Strategy called “The Next Steps (implementation strategy)”, in only one and a half pages in length and focuses primarily on the management structure that will need to be put in place for implementation. In particular, it proposes the creation of a “Technical Advisory Group” whose activities would entail:

The first step would be to consider identifying government departments and community agencies mandated to provide immigrant services. Once listed, the next step would be to determine those persons who are responsible to lead the service charge. The final step would be to excite these individuals to form a group that would provide support to the Local Immigration Partnership. (Greater Sudbury LIP, 2011: 66).

Given its state of development, the LIP Settlement Strategy and action plan lack the precision that would be needed to engage other levels of government with a view to leveraging support. For example, strategy 1.3 in the Settlement section urges: “Advocate for more service in the Sudbury Area”. The accompanying list of actions describes the steps for effective advocacy as: “identify which type(s) of government (municipal/provincial/federal) should be targeted in advocating more/better services” (Greater Sudbury LIP, 2011: 48). Clearly, the plan will need to mature before progress can be made; it is likely that the economic areas where intergovernmental relations are more developed will be able to advance more quickly.

To conclude, the Settlement Strategy contains many gaps that the LIP, as well as GSDC, will need to address for the project to progress and achieve its full complement of objectives.

Structural and process changes at the municipal level induced by the LIP

According to interviews with both GSDC and the LIP coordinator, the LIP has not yet induced structural or process changes at the municipal level. This was confirmed by the service provider co-chairs.

One area where change might have been expected is the City's Diversity Advisory Panel. The councillor who was interviewed for this project would like to see more involvement by elected officials and city bureaucrats in the work of the panel and did not feel that the LIP and the Panel posed a problem of duplication. The councillor was, nevertheless, very receptive to the idea of assigning the immigration portfolio to the LIP, while focusing the Advisory Panel on Aboriginal concerns. The two portfolios are sufficiently different and large enough to support such a change.

The fact that elected officials, municipal senior management and municipal departments, other than GSDC, did not participate in the development of the LIP plan may lead to difficulties in broadening support during LIP implementation. An example is the lack of involvement by the Greater Sudbury Police force. The importance of municipal police involvement is well supported by the literature (Frisken & Wallace, 2002: 160-192) and the fact that most LIPs have invited the police to join their Councils and to engage in discussions around policing (Burr, 2001: 1 & 5). Yet, there was no mention of policing during the interviews and this element is absent in the Settlement Strategy.

The final element that bears mention is a feature that makes Sudbury unique: the Municipality of Greater Sudbury is the largest municipal entity in Canada (and the second largest in North America). As a result, the question of territoriality should have entered into the strategic plan in some form. In particular, the Municipality has, in the last few years, developed Community Action Networks (CAN) which engage citizens around various tables to tackle issues related to their neighbourhoods. The possibility of linking the LIP with the CANs was not discussed.

Future directions

The major success of LIP-municipal engagement has been to raise awareness about immigration with important stakeholders like the Chamber of Commerce. The City also raised its profile among community organizations who now feel that the City is prepared to listen. The challenges for the City originated in the fact that the planning phase did not extensively engage city employees during the consultations. It would also appear that GSDC management did not, prior to the current director, recognize the potentialities of the LIP project. Since the change in management, the GSDC has been really supportive.

The most important change that is required is to elevate the involvement of senior management, the mayor's office, and important municipal departments, such as Human Resources (in part because the Municipality is a "highly unionized environment"). It was universally agreed that the City's involvement would increase only if the LIP is able to 'sell itself' to other key stakeholders within City Hall (beyond GSDC).

To conclude, the City is certainly aware of immigration and the actors who are at the table are working in good faith. That said, concrete change must occur. So far, the LIP's effort to improve coordination and collaboration has fostered developments at the community level, but not at governmental levels: the City has not changed fundamental structures, practices or processes in order to better address immigration issues. An opportunity may have been lost to involve elected officials earlier in the LIP process who, according to interviews and an opinion leaders' survey (Tossutti & Esses, 2011:15), are very enthusiastic about the prospects of attracting and retaining more immigrants in a community they see as "naturally welcoming" (Dupuis). In fact, the confidence exhibited by community leaders and the community at large (Tossutti & Esses, 2011:18-19) in Sudbury's welcoming capabilities might undermine efforts to attract and retain more immigrants as residents underestimate the work that remains.

To summarize:

- The municipality sees the LIP as complementing its strategy of attracting skilled workers by focusing on the social and cultural aspects of immigration. The paradox is that, apart from the GSDC, no other municipal agency (social planning, housing, leisure, police, etc.) has, so far, participated in LIP discussions. On a positive note, the Social Planning Council has recently become a member of the LIP Council (see the list of members in the appendix).
- The City of Greater Sudbury holds the LIP contract, houses the LIP coordinator and considers the coordinator to be an employee of the City. Yet, not one municipal employee or elected official has been involved in the LIP, apart from the responsible GSDC manager. This problem needs to be addressed as a matter of priority.
- The LIP discussions have been almost exclusively focused on community organizations. There was virtually no representation by the three levels of government, so there was little opportunity to exert leverage of any sort. This undermined a key CIC strategic objective.

References

Block, Tina (2006), “Approaches to Attracting and Retaining Newcomers in the City of Greater Sudbury”, *Our Diverse Cities*, no. 2: 36-42.

Burr, Kathleen (2011), “Local Immigration Partnerships: Building Welcoming and Inclusive Communities through Multi-level Governance”, Horizons, Policy Research Initiative. Government of Canada.

<http://welcomingcommunities.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/Local-Immigration-Partnerships-Building-Welcoming-and-Inclusive-Communities.pdf> [Accessed 12 Feb. 2012]

City of Greater Sudbury, (2009a). “Coming of Age in the 21st Century, Digging Deeper. An Economic Development strategic Plan for Greater Sudbury 2020”.

http://www.mysudbury.ca/NR/rdonlyres/08B30CB5-6080-4F00-B9C1-B0E766ACEFE1/8941/strat_plan_ENG1.pdf, [Accessed 31 Jan. 2012]

City of Greater Sudbury (2009b). Programs for Families and Parents to Be. Sudbury.

http://www.greatersudbury.ca/content/div_childrengservices/documents/CalendarFamilies%20sept09-jan10.pdf, [Accessed 27 Feb. 2012]

Friskin, Frances and Marcia Wallace, (2002). “The Response of the Municipal Public Service Sector to the Challenge of Immigrant Settlement”, Report for CIC-Ontario and OASIS.

http://www.settlement.org/downloads/municipal_sector.pdf [Accessed 12 Feb. 2012]

Greater Sudbury Local Immigration Partnership (2011). Creating a Sanctuary for New Citizens. Taking Action. Local Settlement Strategy. Sudbury.

Tossutti Livianna and Victoria Esses (2011), “Local Perspectives on Immigration and Diversity in 15 Ontario Municipalities, WCI.

Interviews conducted

- Scott Fisher, LIP coordinator, 1 February 2012.
- Jean-Mathieu Chenier, GSDC business developer officer in charge of the LIP portfolio, 2 February 2012.
- Christine Bisson and Sylvie Montpellier, YMCA, settlement services, 7 February 2012.
- Gouled Hassan, CIFS, 9 February 2012. (In French)
- Ron Dupuis, City Councillor, chair of the City diversity advisory panel, 13 February 2012. (In French)

Organizations represented on LIP Council

- Laurentian International and Laurentian University
- Huntington University
- Cambrian International and Cambrian College
- Collège Boréal
- Rainbow District School Board
- Centre for Excellence in Mining Innovation (CEMI)
- Sudbury District Health Unit
- Sudbury Manitoulin Workforce Partnership Board
- The Sudbury Chamber of Commerce
- Le Réseau de développement économique et d’employabilité de la francophonie
- Professions North/Nord
- Sudbury Multicultural Folks Arts Association
- Y Newcomer Services
- Contact Interculturel Francophone de Sudbury
- Korean Sudbury Association
- Indo-Canada Association of Sudbury
- Sudbury Interfaith Dialogue
- LINC – Church of the Epiphany
- Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada
- Social Planning Council (new member)
- Volunteer Sudbury (new member)
- Diversity Advisory Panel (to the City of Greater Sudbury)

Annex 1: Interview guide

General topic	Interview questions	Possible Probes
Background context		
Prior to the LIP, how active was the city in addressing diversity and immigration issues?	How much importance did the city attach to immigration?	What 'machinery' or activities already existed within the city or were sponsored by the city?
	What was the city's initial reaction to the idea of the LIP initiative?	Was immigration a city concern prior to the arrival of the LIP? Was the city's interest centred on a particular issue, such as integration, economic prosperity and/or attraction and retention of newcomers? How has the city's interest evolved? (This point is explored in greater depth at the end of the interview.)
Structure and goals		
What is the relationship between the municipality and the LIP and how is it structured?	What role does the municipality play in the LIP partnership?	Did the city sign the LIP agreement with CIC? Did this build on existing departmental interests or responsibilities for dealing with related subject matter?
[Obtain formal agreements; seek minutes of key meetings; obtain key letters between city and the LIP.]	Does the partnership council or other LIP committees afford the city opportunities to engage with provincial ministries? (If so, which ones?)	Probe to determine the extent of these opportunities.
	Which other groups can the city engage by virtue of its membership?	
	How is the city represented on the partnership council (staff, councilors, etc.) and other committees?	Does the city chair or co-chair the partnership council? What other LIP-related committees does the city participate in? (for example, steering committees,

		consultative bodies, planning sub-committees, etc.)
	Which city departments are engaged in or responsible for the city's interactions with the LIP?	What non-LIP committees or activities is the city's lead LIP representative responsible for (or deeply involved in)? What responsibilities does the city's lead representative have within the city?
	What is the city's relationship with the LIP coordinator?	Does the LIP coordinator report to the city? If so, what other roles does the coordinator have within the city? Is the coordinator housed by the city? With which municipal department does the LIP coordinator interact? Where is the primary point of contact?
What does the city hope to achieve by participating in the LIP process?	What municipal interests does participation in the LIP serve?	Probe for economic objectives (employment, attraction/retention); social and cultural objectives; better coordination; adaptation of mainstream service; viability of the Francophone community.
	Which LIP objectives is the city particularly interested in advancing?	
	Does the city see the LIP as an important vehicle for engaging the federal and provincial governments?	If so, around what issues? Probe for health, education, and housing. How does the municipality view its role in relation to federal and provincial interests, involvement and interaction?
City involvement in LIP planning		
How was the city involved in the planning process?	In what way has the city contributed to the LIP planning process and to core activities such as organization of meetings, communications, etc.?	Did the city provide the LIP with financial or in-kind support (e.g. staff time, space, assistance with events) to assist with planning?
	Describe the resources that the city has committed to LIP planning and	Probe for city contributions related to: staff time, reports, data & information;

associated activities such as consultations, discussions with third parties, chairing meetings, etc.

planning expertise; help with consultations; help in recruiting other participants; providing meeting space and facilities for planning activities.

Did the city lead or actively participate in planning activities or workshops (such as employment, education, health, and other workshops – if held)?

Who from the city was involved in LIP planning activities?

- City employees? Which departments?
- Did the economic development unit play an important role in planning?
- Have the mayor or city councilors attended LIP meetings or events?

Has the city had much influence on the LIP planning process and planning outcomes?

How did the LIP plan change as a result of city involvement? Were the changes confined to areas of municipal jurisdiction or were they broader?

Has the city instigated or supported changes in the configuration of the 'planning' table or planning activities?

Has the city helped to broaden the LIP planning process?

What role has the city played in involving other levels of government in LIP planning? Probe to establish which ministries or services the city sought to involve.

What role has the city played in involving mainstream service organizations in the LIP planning process?

What role has the city played in involving employers and employer organizations?

Probe for the city's role in promoting the involvement of the following institutions: other levels of government; quasi-public institutions, such as libraries and school boards; mainstream agencies, such as the United Way; employers and employer organizations; ethno-cultural leaders.

Has the LIP coordinator met with planning department officials? With

Has the LIP interacted with/made presentations or submissions to municipal planning bodies?

members of city council or committees? With the mayor?

Have the city or the LIP sought to integrate the LIP planning process with the city's own strategic planning machinery?

If such integration has been contemplated, how would this operate?

City involvement in LIP implementation

How is the city implicated in LIP strategic and action plans?

Has the city made commitments in regard to implementing the LIP action plan?

Is the city offering to introduce, change or build on city programs and services in support of the LIP strategic or action plans? (Probe for specifics.)

What program changes have taken place? In particular, do these involve the city's economic development unit? Training and mentoring? Employer engagement? Recreation, sports and culture services? Francophone services?

Has the LIP organized any specific projects in conjunction with the city?

Is the city offering continued logistical support for LIP implementation?

Has the municipality served as a connector for the LIP to develop partnerships with specific people or organizations?

What changes – in the behaviour of other players – have resulted (or have been facilitated) as a result of the city's participation in the LIP? (Probe for changes in programming, goals and mandate, human resource policies.)

What role has the city played in persuading other levels of government, employers and mainstream service agencies to participate in, or contribute to, the implementation of the LIP plan?

Probe for specific actions and resources that the city has committed to help the LIP implement its agenda. (This includes actions such as legitimizing the LIP by referring to it in city communication and planning documents.) (Probe the city's interactions, if any, with other

levels of government. Also, establish whether the city has plans for such actions.)

Structural and process changes at the municipal level induced by LIP

What changes – in city structures and city activities - have resulted from participating in the LIP?

Have special coordinating structures been created to link LIP to broader city processes (e.g. planning)?

Has the city modified consultative and planning activities?

Have special city-led structures been created to address specific issues, such as employer liaison, consultation of ethno-cultural communities, etc.

What role does the LIP and the LIP coordinator play in the structures or processes that have been modified?

Future directions

How does the city assess its role in the LIP and how will the relationship evolve?

What are the major successes that have resulted from LIP-municipal engagement?

What specific lessons/learnings have resulted?

Is the city's involvement with the LIP expected to increase?

What changes might be expected in the city-LIP relationship? Why are these needed?

Does the city plan to increase or adjust its interactions with either the provincial or federal government?

Probe for specific difficulties or challenges that were encountered by the LIP? By the city?

Are there areas/issues where the LIP and the municipality need specific help to implement projects or realize objectives?

What changes are required in the LIP-municipal relationship to increase its effectiveness?

If so, how, and in pursuit of what objectives?

Annex 2: Results of opinion leader study for case study cities (Tossutti & Esses, 2011)

Perceptions of community receptivity to immigrants and diversity

City	London-Middlesex	Ottawa	North Bay	Greater Sudbury
Total population	422,333	812,129	53,966	157,857
Percent of leaders who feel that municipality wants more immigrants	70.0	60.0	100.0	70.0
Percent of leaders who feel that immigrants contribute to economic growth	90.0	100.0	90.0	70.0
Percent of leaders who feel that immigrants contribute to social/cultural life	90.0	90.0	80.0	100.0
Percent of leaders who feel that immigrants contribute to civic/political life	60.0	70.0	30.0	70.0
Percent of leaders who feel that community wants more immigration	20.0	20.0	10.0	60.0
Percent of leaders who feel that community welcomes newcomers	50.0	80.0	80.0	80.0
Percent of leaders who feel that community welcomes visible minorities	30.0	70.0	50.0	60.0
Percent of leaders who feel that community has the capacity to serve recent immigrants	80.0	90.0	70.0	50.0

Annex 3: Excerpt from LIP organizational best practices study (Qayyum & Burstein, 2012)

Numerous inputs and processes were shown to be statistically associated with outputs. In total 319 chi-square analyses were conducted between independent and dependent measures. Of these, 35 were shown to be statistically significant associations. Appendix 4 shows the complete list of organizational indicators that were statistically significant.

For example, the independent measure, “Did the city sign the LIP agreement with CIC?” was associated with the output measure “Does the plan/activities include public education and/or media campaigns?” This association was likely not by chance ($p < .05$). This means that if the city signed the LIP agreement, there was increased likelihood that the strategic plan had a public education or media component. Each of the results in Appendix 4 can be read in this manner.

As there were over 30 different statistically significant results, it is worthwhile highlighting a few. Three organizational practices in particular were associated with more than two positive outputs in the strategic plan. By far the most recurring significant practice was the inclusiveness of the LIP central council. Item 28 measured if a LIP central council included members from a majority of the following – federal ministries, provincial ministries, municipal departments, employer bodies/employers, schools/boards, hospitals/health units and networks, justice/police, media, university, college, immigrant representatives, ethnocultural organizations, religious organizations, francophone organization/network. If this was the case, the following outputs were more likely:

- special coordinating structures were created to link LIP to broader city processes
- the plan included public education and/or media campaigns
- the city indicated an intent to modify its immigrant liaison activities
- the city provided financing or in-kind support for planning activities
- planning bodies focused on areas of provincial and municipal, as well as federal, jurisdiction
- the plan contained recommendations regarding changes in policy
- the plan clearly distinguished between strategic directions and specific actions

If the city actively participated in the majority of individual planning workshops (item 11), the following outputs were more likely:

- special coordinating structures were created to link LIP to broader city processes
- the city indicated an intent to modify its immigrant liaison activities
- the city financed or provided in-kind support for planning activities
- the strategic plan discussed linking with the Immigration Portal

Additionally, if the city signed the LIP agreement with CIC (item 3), the following outputs were more likely:

- the strategic plan included public education and/or media campaigns
- the city financed or provided in-kind support for planning activities
- the strategic plan discussed linking with the Immigration Portal