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Abstract

In recent years, there has been increasing attention paid to the role of municipal government on issues related to the settlement of immigrants. The City of Toronto provides a case study for a municipal government that is increasingly involved in the coordination of services across the city.

This research will provide an overview of the role of the City of Toronto in the coordination of settlement services since the signing of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement in 2005. This agreement set the stage for tri-level government overview of settlement services to occur, and for a formalized collaboration between government and community stakeholders. The findings of this research indicate that initiatives such as the Local Immigration Partnerships and Newcomer Leadership Table are allowing for such intergovernmental and cross-sectoral collaboration to occur.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

This research examines the issue of Immigrant Settlement in Canadian cities. It focusses on why the inclusion of municipal governments in the 2005 Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement has resulted in a model of collaborative governance within the city of Toronto. Since the 2005 agreement, federal initiatives such as Local Immigration Partnerships have formalized the involvement of municipal governments in the immigrant settlement process. This research finds that the inclusion of local government in issues related to immigrant settlement has resulted in a shift from “government” to a more collaborative form of “governance”, where decision-making involves the systematized inclusion of key community stakeholders.

As the Canadian city to welcome the largest newcomer\(^1\) population, the case study of Toronto provides the opportunity to witness two significant shifts to the immigrant settlement sector in Canada: 1. from bilateral to multilevel oversight of settlement through the inclusion of municipal governments and 2. from government to governance through formal collaboration between governmental and non-governmental stakeholders on decisions related to immigrant settlement. As the federal government continues to expand initiatives that explicitly involve the municipal government in immigrant settlement services, such as Local Immigration Partnerships, lessons learned from the Toronto experience will inform how Canadian cities make decisions related to immigrant settlement.

\(^1\) “Newcomer” is defined by Citizenship and Immigration Canada as “immigrants who have been in Canada for less than 10 years” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2012a, p. 25 - footnote)
1.1. Research question

This research poses the following questions:

1. Why have municipal governments in Canada signaled a desire for an active role in the immigrant settlement process?

2. Why has Ontario witnessed a shift towards multilevel oversight of immigrant settlement since the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement?

3. How has the inclusion of municipalities in the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement led to formalized collaboration between the City of Toronto and key community stakeholders?

In order to answer these questions, I conducted extensive research and several interviews with employees of the City of Toronto and key community stakeholders. The methodology for my research can be found in Chapter 5, including information on those I interviewed and their role in immigrant settlement services for the city of Toronto. Chapter 2 will provide a review of literature examining the changing role of municipalities in Canada, what demographic and economic factors have contributed to those changes, and how cities are considering collaborative governance models to manage. Chapter 3 will provide information on the city of Toronto itself, examining how the history of cooperation between the municipal and community stakeholders has allowed a transition to formalized collaborative governance on immigrant settlement services. Chapter 4 will look at the details of the Canada-Ontario-Immigration Agreement. Chapter 6 will discuss the research findings which will themselves be analyzed in Chapter 7 where I will address answers to the questions above. A short conclusion will be provided in the final chapter.
1.2. Justification

As cities across the world experience an increase in population (World Health Organization, 2014), they face challenges ensuring the wellbeing of ethnically- and culturally-diverse populations.

Our societies, in all latitudes, are and will be multicultural, and the cities (especially the large cities) are the places in which the greatest diversity is concentrated. Learning to live with this situation, succeeding in managing cultural exchange on the basis of ethnic difference and remedying the inequalities arising from discrimination are essential aspects of the new local policy in the conditions arising out of the new global interdependence. (Borja and Castells, 2003, p. 89)

To address issues arising from diversifying populations, municipalities in Canada have begun to assert their place in the sector of immigrant settlement services. In 2011, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities produced a document titled “Starting on Solid Ground: The municipal role in immigrant settlement”, outlining the municipal government’s current role in the immigrant settlement process as well as proposals for the improved provision of these services in Canadian municipalities.

Changing role of municipalities in settlement process

While settlement services have traditionally been under the purview of either the federal or provincial government, new initiatives such as Local Immigration Partnerships (“LIPs”) are demonstrating an increased role for local municipal governments (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, n.d.). There is a strong argument for the greater inclusion of cities in policy formation and the local coordination of immigrant settlement services. The vast majority of immigrants to Canada ultimately decide to settle in the country’s largest city-regions (Frisken and Wallace, 2003, p. 175). Municipal governments are often at the forefront of social services offered to the local population and are thus keenly aware of, and uniquely placed to meet, the specific needs of their residents. As Fourot states, the settlement and integration of immigrants is primarily an

---

2 “Settlement” is defined by Citizenship and Immigration Canada as the short-term transitional issues faced by newcomers to Canada (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2012b)
urban phenomenon (2013, p. 16). Local governments are direct witnesses to the problems that can arise when the social integration needs of newcomers to Canada are not adequately addressed. There is an increasing risk of homelessness among the immigrant population in Canada’s major cities (Murdie 2004, Fiedler, Schuurman, Hyndman, 2006), and policymakers now face “increasing challenges in creating functioning, sustainable, multicultural cities” (Agyeman, 2011). According to Smith and Ley, it is local, place-based interventions that will “improve immigrant lives, foster inclusion, and facilitate the experience and perception of national citizenship for both newcomers and established Canadians” (2008, p. 687).

There is not only a social but also an economic reason for greater involvement of local government in the arena of immigrant settlement services. The ability of cities to provide a welcome atmosphere to new immigrants and to demonstrate successful integration of the immigrant population is increasingly important as cities are becoming important players in the global competition for talent and investment. At the national level, there is an “emerging importance of cities as economic drivers” (Siegel, 2009, p. 21), and the ability of certain cities to attract skilled newcomers plays an important factor in this.

Immigration from abroad is producing explosive growth in the larger centres…there is a sense that cities are vital for national competitiveness in the globalized economy as loci of human capital and innovation (Young, 2009, 107)

As the document produced by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities attests, cities are already providing services that are used by immigrants, and are seeking to increase their role in the settlement process. The successful integration of immigrants is seen not only as a social and cultural success, but as an “opportunity to enrich the city economically” (City of Toronto 2014a, p. 12).

3 “Integration” is defined by Citizenship and Immigration Canada as “an ongoing process of mutual accommodation between an individual and society” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012b)

4 Sassen argues that cities now act as “highly concentrated command points in the organization of the world economy” (2001, 3). She posits that these “Global cities” act as strategic sites for the transnationalization of labour and have become the “key engine for economic growth and social patterning” (2001, 344)
Focus on the City of Toronto

The City of Toronto has considerable experience responding to the needs of a population that is rapidly growing and increasingly diverse. As Canada’s “largest metropolitan region and pre-eminent global city” (Walks, 2014, p. 104), as well as the number one destination for immigrants (Statistics Canada 2011), Toronto provides the basis of a highly appropriate case study for examining trends in urban immigrant settlement in Canada.

Over 381,700 newcomers chose to settle in the city of Toronto between 2006 and 2011, accounting for approximately one-third of all newcomers to Canada (Statistics Canada 2011). Toronto has a long history of newcomer settlement service provision\(^5\), and the city is currently home to at least 108 organizations providing support to immigrants in finding housing and employment, skills training, employment programs and other services (Stasiulus, Hughes, Amery, 2011, p. 106). “Canada”, Sancton states, “is a highly urbanized nation” where municipal governments contribute to the process of shaping the economic and social fabric of communities (2002). Sharing lessons on immigrant settlement between Canadian municipalities provides an important avenue for learning, and “as Canada faces an urban future, Toronto is one very influential model to understand how certain developments will shape up elsewhere” (Boudreau, Keil, Young, 2009, p. 219).

Toronto is located in the province of Ontario, where the “Common Sense Revolution” rolled out by Conservative Premier Mike Harris during the 1990’s resulted in an extensive downloading of responsibilities from the provincial government to municipalities and the amalgamation of major city-regions into larger municipal structures. As a result, Toronto and other Ontario municipalities have both “significant financial responsibilities…(and) more room for policy initiatives, particularly in the area of

\(^5\) In 1902, the first settlement house opened in the City of Toronto, Evangelia (Koengetter, “Transnational Roots of Settlement”, M-45). This was followed in 1910 by the establishment of University Settlement, an organization that today still provides settlement services to newcomers in Toronto (universitysettlement.ca).
health and social services” (Tolley, Biles, Andrews, Esses, Burstein, 2012, p. 6). These significant financial responsibilities mean that Ontario municipalities have become increasingly reliant on their own revenue sources (McMillan, 2004, p. 57). While their own revenue sources have become increasingly important to Ontario municipalities, recent government agreements such as the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement and Stronger City of Toronto Act have provided municipalities with increasing authority over their own affairs. This research will demonstrate how the City of Toronto has taken advantage of these new liberties since 2005 and is using a collaborative governance approach to address local immigrant settlement issues.

**Intergovernmental cooperation and the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement**

The signing of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA) between the federal and provincial government in 2005 was significant as it was the first to explicitly indicate a role for municipal governments in the formal planning process of immigration within the province of Ontario (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2005). The inclusion of Toronto in the COIA fundamentally “changed governance relations and institutional configurations” (Tolley et al., 2012, p. 6). Since that time, agreements between the City of Toronto and the federal government of Canada have signalled a more significant role for the municipal government in the coordination of local settlement services.

Since COIA, the federal government has funded multiple city-run initiatives relating to the coordination of settlement services within the city of Toronto, including the formation of a city-wide Local Immigration Partnership (LIP) Table. COIA set the stage for the formation of LIPs within the province of Ontario (Bradford and Andrew, 2010, p. 9). The LIP initiative plays an important role in the collaborative governance approach that has formed within the city of Toronto to address immigrant settlement issues.

**Collaborative governance in the City of Toronto**

Newcomers to Canada often gain entry through the federal government, yet they establish their lives in Canada’s cities or towns, which are under the direction of municipal governments. Many newcomers also rely on the services provided by non-governmental organizations to obtain information and support throughout their search for
housing, employment and social connections. In order to be effective, the settlement sector requires both collaboration at both the intergovernmental and cross-sectoral levels (Tolley, 2011, p. 37).

Collaborative governance is a form of governance that brings together public and private stakeholders in collective forums with public agencies, such as municipal governments, to make consensus-oriented decisions (Ansell and Gash, 2007, p. 543). The Newcomer Leadership Table is such an example of a collective forum that has brought together stakeholders from across the public and private sector within the city of Toronto. This research will indicate that, not only has there been an increased role in immigrant settlement services from the municipal government in the city of Toronto, but that the new municipal role relies heavily on the model of collaborative governance through intergovernmental cooperation and partnerships with settlement service-providing organizations, foundations and the other local stakeholders.

Summary

Immigration has played an important role in shaping Canadian cities and will continue to do so.

We are often told that Canada has been and will continue to be defined by immigration. The ebb and flow of immigration levels, diverse countries of origin of newcomers, and the range of communities in which they settle have shaped our country and will play a critical role in defining our future (Tolley et. al, 2012, p. 1)

This research will inform why the City of Toronto has become more involved in the settlement process since signing of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement in 2005. It will provide evidence of the intergovernmental, primarily municipal-federal, policies related to immigrant settlement that have been created since that time, and will examine how the City of Toronto is employing collaborative governance techniques in coordinating settlement services within the city. The lessons learned from the city of Toronto may lead the way for other Canadian cities as they take on new responsibilities related to immigrant settlement services.
Chapter 2. Literature review

As this research will evidence, the role of municipal governments in Canada is changing as it relates to the coordination and delivery of immigrant settlement services. This examination of academic literature will analyze why municipal responsibilities towards immigrant settlement services are changing and how demographic and economic factors contribute. It will examine how the new role of cities in a global market has elevated the importance of effective immigrant settlement. Finally, we investigate how the model of “collaborative governance” provide cities the ability to manage newfound responsibilities and resident needs.

2.1. Changing role of city government

Municipalities have certain powers to set local policy, yet they have traditionally operated within a restrictive legislative and financial framework as a responsibility of the provincial government (Tindal and Tindal, 2008, p. 10). Ontario’s Baldwin Act of 1849 template and the British North American Act (“Constitution Act) of 1867 have guided Canadian municipalities, yet since that time, major changes have occurred in Canadian society and within municipalities. Urbanization has become “the central force shaping our social, economic and political realities” (Oberlander, 1962, p. 68), resulting in new priorities for Canada’s municipalities.

In recent years, one of the areas in which municipal governments in Canada have begun taking on more responsibility is that of immigrant settlement and integration. Services that cities have traditionally provided for their residents (recreation, library, public health) are now being accessed by a more diverse population. As federal and provincial governments download more responsibilities to the local level, municipalities declare that additional funding is required to provide adequate services.
Municipalities are neither mandated nor funded to provide immigrant support services but out of necessity and in recognition of the value new immigrants bring to communities, municipalities are integrating immigrant needs into their budget and service plans, despite the economic pressures they are already under. (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2011, p. 27-28)

The coordination and delivery of settlement services to immigrants is one area that has experienced significant growth and has led to more collaboration between both governmental and nongovernmental partners.

**Municipalities as subordinate to upper levels of government**

Municipal governments, states Magnusson in his 2005 article, are still viewed by many as simply “creatures of the province”. The position here is that political power lies solely in the hands of those at the provincial and federal level, while municipal governments lie “at the bottom of a hierarchy of state authority” (Magnusson, 2005, p. 8). As Siegel states, “the traditional culture of provincial-municipal relations has been based on treating all municipalities in the same manner – as subordinate entities created for the purpose of carrying out provincial policy” (2009, p. 22).

The basis for this structure lies in Ontario’s Municipal Corporations Act of 1849 (also known as the “Baldwin Act) and the British North America Act of 1867, which identify municipalities or “municipal institutions” as areas under provincial jurisdiction (The Constitution Act, 1867). Municipal governments, therefore, face certain legislative constraints when implementing new policies.

Canadian municipalities have no constitutional recognition as an order of government...local governments are entirely subject to the dictates of provincial governments, which can alter municipal responsibilities, finances and boundaries as they see fit. (Young, 2009, p. 113)

Changes have occurred in Canadian municipalities since the British North America Act when Canada was primarily a country of rural settlements. Since World War II, Canada has experienced rapid patterns of urbanization. This increased urbanization has placed greater pressure on the major cities, not least around immigration settlement issues. Canada is no longer the “thinly-populated undeveloped country of farming
communities” (Oberlander, 1962, p. 68), and municipalities are now demanding re-examination of the rules under which they operate. “The pressures of urbanization and offloading have resulted in Canada’s municipalities providing much more than their traditional responsibilities of basic services to property” (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2011, p. 26). The Federation of Canadian Municipalities lists immigrant settlement as a newly-added municipal responsibility, and recommends that the federal government “recognize the work municipalities are currently doing to support successful immigrant settlement” and “find ways to engage municipalities in immigration policy development and service delivery” (2011, p. 29).

Canadian cities are embedded in a larger context over which their influence is limited (Good, Triadafilopoulos, Turgeon, 2014, p. 22). Local governments continue to operate largely within the political structure established during the mid-19th century, despite considerable changes to the political and economic climate. For many municipalities, this has meant that decisions impacting the daily lives of their residents at the local level, such as the provision of settlement services for immigrants, lies in the hands of provincial and federal authorities. It is the “lack of power of the urban municipalities”, Caroline Andrew posits, “that renders them incapable of effective action” (2001, p. 100). While some municipalities remain subservient to the policies set by upper levels of government, others are testing the limits of their authority through progressive policies and collaborative partnership arrangements.

**Downloading and the changing role of municipalities**

Various factors have contributed to the more prominent role that cities are now taking in political, economic, social, cultural and media life (Borja and Castells, 2003, p. 90). Downloading to municipalities from provinces and the federal government began occurring at a large scale in the 1990’s and early 2000’s. This shift in responsibilities has often been unaccompanied by financial transfers (Stasiulus et al., 2011, p. 81) and required innovation on the part of municipalities to manage. “Upper levels of government have withdrawn from many policy areas, with important repercussions for cities” (Good, 2009, p. 40).
In conjunction with this, increasing numbers of immigrants now mean that cities face critical questions of how best to respond when policies from higher levels of government are lacking or non-existent. Some mayors and municipal councils have sought to maintain a status quo while others have responded to these pressures by partnering with businesses and community groups to deliver services. This new model, wherein the leadership demonstrated by municipal governments has created “policy responses despite a lack of formal authority”, is referred to by Smith and Stewart as the “mushy middle” (2006).

Canadian municipalities are redefining their own role in public policy creation and execution. While viewed at one time as constrained by their role as creations of senior governments (Frisken and Wallace, 2003, p. 158), many municipalities are realizing that they have “significantly more autonomy and scope to address urban needs than the traditional definition of municipalities as “creatures of the province” would suggest” (Siemiatycki, 2012, p. 30). Increasingly, municipalities are providing more services, including immigrant settlement programs, affordable housing, and even daycare.

Scholars (Keil 2002, Good 2009, Young 2009) have noted that municipalities are now experiencing a “structural gap” (Federation of Canadian Municipalities 12) between the new responsibilities expected of them and the funding available. While “there has been an increase in legislative autonomy in municipal systems across Canada…this has not yet been coupled with additional fiscal policy instruments” (Good, 2009, p. 38). Meeting the needs of immigrant populations has been one policy area where this “mushy middle” has been particularly evident in municipalities. “Municipalities have increasingly recognized the need to respond – and indeed in some cases to be proactive – to immigration issues at the local level without legislative capacity” (Stasiulus et. al, 2011, p. 94). As immigrants live within municipalities and access services locally, there is an expectation that the local government will have the capacity to respond to their needs. As Stasiulis et al. state, however, many municipal governments find themselves addressing problems without the necessary jurisdiction, resources or capacity (2011, p. 78).
The challenges faced by municipalities in meeting the needs of an increasingly diverse immigrant population was detailed in the 2011 report, “Starting on Solid Ground: The Municipal Role in Immigrant Settlement” from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. The report highlights the importance of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement of 2005, and its inclusion of municipalities in the decision-making process on immigrant settlement issues. “Where the participation of municipalities is formally recognized,” the report states, “the intergovernmental partnerships are paying off” (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2011, p. 3). One of the report’s final recommendations was for the federal government to “build on its successful relationship with Toronto” and engage municipal governments to a greater degree on immigration policy development.

**Importance of the “local”**

Local government policies are seen as important, not only for the outcomes they aspire to achieve, but also “symbolically for the civic tone they set” (Siemiatycki, 2012, p. 34). Municipal governments play a key role in deciding the social character and quality of life in their jurisdictions (Frisken, Bourne, Gad, Murdie, 2000, p. 71). As society continues to urbanize, Sancton posits that the importance of municipal governments is growing (2009, p. 13). It is in the local, in cities, Andrew states, where some of the most important public policy issues in Canada are being addressed (2001, p. 103).

As a result of their proximity to residents, local governments are inevitably more attuned to the complexity of local conditions than upper-level governments (Stasiulus, Hughes, Amery, 2011, p. 132). Municipal governments are “important vehicles of the democratic will of local communities” (Good, 2009, p. 5). Young asserts that as the demographics and economic powers of cities increase, so too will the role of local authorities (2009, p. 126).

**Local government role in the immigrant settlement process**

Recent literature (Tolley 2011; Young 2011; Turgeon et. al, 2014) has underscored the importance of the role of local government in policy decisions related to immigrant settlement. As Tolley, Biles, Andrew, Esses and Burstein state, “Immigrants
do not integrate into a province or a nation, at least not initially” (2012, p. 10) and it is therefore the responsibility of their local community to facilitate the integration process. Immigrants experience relations with their host society at the local level. The cities where immigrant live, Good et al. state, have the ability to create “social sustainability”, wherein bonds between different ethnicities and cultures are easily formed. “Cities can be places of opportunity, inclusion and innovation…nevertheless…urbanization and city life also have the potential to solidify divisions and to further segment populations” (Good et al., 2014, p. 4). As wide-scale immigration has the potential for adverse reaction on a community, municipal governments can play an important role in managing the direction of this change and setting a tone for interactions between immigrants and long-standing residents (Good, 2009, p. 91).

As Young states, “municipalities bring information, legitimacy, and the capacity to mobilize at the local level. Their role in the immigrant settlement system should be a larger one” (2011, p. 318). Municipal authorities are familiar with services relevant to immigrants, yet they also understand the culture and politics of a community – “they know about the local organizations and stakeholders of all kinds” (Young, 2011, p. 316). Apart from local infrastructure and services, local governments can provide expertise on programmes linking new immigrants to the local labour market, as well (Broadbent, 2008, p. 106).

Municipal governments in Canada vary in their involvement with the coordination and delivery of immigrant settlement services. The City of Toronto provides one example of a city that seeks to actively address the needs of newcomer residents, instead of leaving service policy decisions in the hands of the provincial and federal governments (Good, 2009, p. 57-69). While the municipal role began as one subordinate to the province, municipal governments now “have options when it comes to deciding how to address the challenges of ethno-racial diversity within their own communities, even with a national setting that makes them clearly subordinate to the provinces” (Frisken and Wallace, 2003, p. 175). Cities have begun to recognize the important role that they are playing in a globalized economy, and the social and economic benefits that successful integration of immigrants can bring. As such, cities have begun changing their traditional role by partnering with businesses and community organizations to
actively attract, integrate and retain immigrant populations (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2011, p. 2). This research will show that one successful Canadian example of this engaged partnership with nongovernmental stakeholders is the City of Toronto.

2.2. Demographics and the “super-diversity” of cities

Cities around the world are experiencing large-scale immigration accompanied by even greater ethnic and cultural diversity among the population. The diversity of cities through migration processes, Borja and Castells posit, has led to the “interpenetration of populations and dissimilar ways of life within the sphere of the world’s main metropolitan areas” (2003, p. 68). As cities are the locations where the greatest diversity of population is concentrated, the ability of a municipality to manage ethnic differences and discrimination is, therefore, becoming as essential aspect of local policy (Borja and Castells, 2003; Rodriguez-Garcia, 2012).

This increased diversity of ethnic and cultural diversity within cities, and the accompanying impacts, has been termed “Super-Diversity” by Steven Vertovec. Factors such as “differential immigration statuses and their concomitant entitlements and restrictions of rights, divergent labour market experiences, discrete gender and age profiles, patterns of spatial distribution and mixed local area responses” (Vertovec, 2007, p. 1025) have created an urban environment of such diversity that “most areas of service provision have not (yet) caught up” (Vertovec, 2007, p. 1048). This has impacted the structures and modes of governance traditionally used to serve newcomer populations.

While local authorities have grown accustomed to liaising with large and well-organized immigrant associations, Vertovec states, the new complexity of immigration requires “fresh and novel ways of understanding and responding” (2007, p. 1049). The City of Toronto stands out as a key example of a city that is experimenting with such “fresh and novel ways” of responding to diversity. While immigrants are not the only source of diversity in a city, their integration is an important factor in diversity management. Local Immigration Partnerships, the focus of this research, provide cities with new mechanisms to coordinate service provision for immigrants.
2.3. Effective settlement as an economic incentive

As was discussed above, the role of local authorities will increase as the economic powers of cities across the world grows. This growing economic power is being accompanied by an increasing diversity, a “super-diversity”, of population in cities. The operational success of cities in this new dynamic will depend on their ability to demonstrate successful integration of immigrants. The promotion of immigrant integration, Siemiatycki states, is simply good politics and business (2012, p. 30). As we see from the findings in this research, policies passed by the City of Toronto provide evidence of the City’s conviction that their reputation as a welcoming city to immigrants is strongly correlated to continued economic prosperity.

Global cities

“The literature on world cities”, says Good et al., “posits that we are in a stage of capitalist development in which cities are the central driving force – cities have become the places of economic growth, development, and innovation as well as the command and control centres of the global economy” (2014, p. 1-2). Sassen uses the term “Global City” to describe cities which are major “command and control centres” of the global economy, linked together in a transnational labour market (2001, Chp. 6). The largest city in Canada, the city of Toronto, was listed 12th on the “Global Cities” Index of 2014 (AT Kearney).

Economic case for immigration

In many Canadian municipalities, the sole source of population growth and sometimes critical factor to filling local labour shortages, is immigration (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2011, p. 8). Municipalities have begun to understand that promoting ethnic and cultural diversity can contribute to an overall strategy in attracting educated and/or professional migrants who are highly mobile. As Good et al. state, “success at managing diversity is fundamental to economic growth. Immigrant attraction/retention has become an economic development strategy in many cities” (Good et al., 2014, p. 9). Stasiulus et al. support this statement, claiming that “municipalities are acting upon a perceived priority to attract skilled immigrants for the
purpose of better positioning themselves in the globalized competition among cities and mixed urban-rural-suburban regions for talent and investment” (2011, p. 74).

**Settlement as an economic strategy**

Effective immigrant settlement policy contributes to the economic goals of Canadian cities and can be an effective strategy in the competition for global talent. Borja and Castells posit that the city’s ability to manage cultural and ethnic diversity is a central function of local government (Borja and Castells, 2003, p. 89).

Research focusing on immigrant integration within municipalities is of timely interest to both academics and policy makers, as Frisken and Wallace state, as immigrants are continuing to gain importance in both the national and regional economies (2003, p. 176). The skills, talent and ethnic background of immigrants, Abu-Laban and Gabriel posit, can be “commodified, marketed, and billed as trade-enhancing” (2002, p. 12). Immigrants become agents involved in the rehabilitation of economic sectors of the city, states Sassen (2001, p. 321). Not only that, immigration is a critical “necessary base” for the economic development of municipalities, one that can be facilitated by the “appropriate activities of local government, in partnership with the full range of local community actors” (Andrew and Hima, 2011, p. 68).

**Attracting immigration through municipal policy**

Immigrant settlement is a critical national activity that occurs locally (Broadbent, 2008, p. 81). The prioritization of economic objectives when considering immigration policy is evident at the federal level (Stasiulus et al., 2011, p. 76) and has begun to materialize in policies set at the local level, as well. Cities tend to focus attention on economic development goals that maintain their competitiveness in a globalizing market (Stasiulus et. al, 2011, p. 126). Initiatives such as the gentrification of inner cities benefit not only local businesses, but aid cities with attracting a global elite population (Keil, 2002, p. 592). As municipalities focus more and more on their own economic and social objectives, the case becomes stronger for implementing policies that aid in the settlement and integration of immigrants.
With the rise of prominence of the idea that diversity is a comparative advantage in a global economy, and with the realization that failing to settle immigrants adequately leads to billions of dollars of lost GSP, immigration politics have become central to growth machine politics (Good, 2009, p. 131)

There are examples of municipal policy promoting effective immigrant integration as a means of attracting business interests all over the globe. Cities have begun institutionalizing the immigrant integration process: New York City has a “Commissioner of Immigrant Affairs”, the City of Chicago has opened an “Office of New Americans”, and the City of Boston has introduced “The Mayor’s Office of New Bostonians”. In addition, the Eurocities Charter on Integrating Cities” has been signed by 33 European cities.

It is not only municipal governments that understand the importance of marketing a city as multicultural and immigrant-friendly, Good posits that the support of a business community towards the development of multiculturalism policies allows the municipality to become more responsive to immigrant needs (Good, 2009, p. 219).

*Importance of immigration to the economy*

The city of Toronto and other communities are responding to the needs of immigrants as they recognize that rapid and effective settlement policies and programs have multiple economic benefits. “Fostering socially sustainable cities involves building on Canada’s strengths in diversity management at the federal level and appropriately tailored responses at the community level” (Good, 2009, p. 12). Not only does effective settlement enable immigrants to find appropriate employment and contribute back to their new community, it can also be used strategically by cities to attract global talent. In order to provide effective settlement services to new immigrants, municipalities like Toronto have begun to examine the role that collaborative governance models can play in effective immigrant settlement.
2.4. Managing settlement through collaborative governance

As municipalities face financial burdens and additional responsibilities, many are now seeking forms of collaborative governance to address service gaps as they arise. The City of Toronto provides a leading example, as we will see, of collaborative governance in action to address issues related to the coordination of immigrant settlement services in the city.

Collaborative governance brings stakeholders from both the public and private sector together with public agencies to engage in consensus-oriented decision making (Ansell and Gash, 2007, p. 543). The model of governance has been appearing in various forms across Canadian municipalities as local governments seek alternate sources of funding and methods of service delivery. As Bozzini and Enjolras state, collaborative governance is expected to “foster solidarity, a sense of common identity among participants and a shared understanding of the public good” (2012, p. 18). Collaborative forms of governance engage players from a wider spectrum, leading to the belief that “better knowledge of, extensive discussion on, policy problems and options lead to more informed and more effective collective decision” (Bozzini and Enjolras, 2012, p. 18).

There is a recognition among urban literature that the status quo will no longer address the needs of modern cities and that collaboration among multiple players across sectors and levels of government is necessary. This is especially true when addressing the needs of newcomers to a city. As discussed above, newcomers rely on services provided by multiple levels of government, as well as those offered by both governmental and non-governmental organizations, in order to be truly effective. The needs of newcomers present government with a sector that will require a reordering of standard procedures.

Traditional conceptualization of the municipal government’s role as supplicant to higher levels of government will have to be overcome in order to see spheres of government as capable of working in partnership with each other and civil-society actors in ways that will improve the life chances of newcomers. (Stasiulus et. al, 2011, p. 133)
Independent action on the part of either the government or community organizations is “neither desirable nor possible” (Tolley, 2011, p. 37), and increasingly forms of collaborative governance are being used to address issues of service delivery for immigrants. “Immigrant settlement must be approached collaboratively, with governments, communities, and other stakeholders working together, though with clearly articulated accountability” (Tolley, 2011, p. 37).

**Collaborative governance: municipal government and community stakeholders**

There have been partnerships between local governments and community organizations in Canada for many years, in fact, “most municipalities have spun off agencies, board, and commissions that fulfill specialized functions” (Young, 2009, p. 111). Such joint institutions between government and community are very common among municipal governments in Canada. Evidence from the city of Toronto and other municipalities indicates, however, that a deeper and more systematized level of engagement is occurring between municipal governments and community stakeholders, especially on initiatives related to the settlement of newcomers (Good, 2009, p. 65).

One factor that has played a significant role in municipal governments' interest in greater collaboration with community partners is the downloading of responsibilities to municipalities from provincial governments. As the report from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities states, local governments are experiencing increasing financial strains as they attempt to fill service gap needs for local residents. This has led some to seek partnerships with other service provider organizations working locally, in order to offset costs. As we will see with the City of Toronto, there have been numerous partnerships between the City and service provider organizations on initiatives related to the public health and education of the newcomer population.

**Intergovernmental collaboration**

The ability of municipal governments to respond more quickly and with deeper knowledge of the factors impacting the local environment, are important factors in considering the collaboration that occurs between different levels of government.
As stated above, collaboration between local government and community organizations is on the rise in some Canadian municipalities, and evidence suggests that the same is needed between various levels of government. Intergovernmental collaboration to a greater and more meaningful degree is necessary, some scholars state, to improve service delivery and Coordination in Canadian cities.

Numerous urban scholars, including Tolley (2011, 4), Andrew and Hima (2011, 50), Turgeon, Good and Triadafilopolous (2014, 290), Fourot (2013, 36), have impressed the importance of deeper collaboration between the municipal and upper levels of government to implement policies that effectively address the needs of residents living in Canadian cities. As Oberlander states:

The federal, provincial and municipal governments should represent three ways of attacking a joint problem and each ought to do what it can do best, rather than engage in fruitless debate as to who ought to do anything…The municipalities…are closest to the real issue and needs of people and are therefore most effective in dealing with the problem locally (1962, p. 70)

The municipal levels of government in Canada have historically played the roles of “policy takers, not full partners” (Young, 2011, p. 120) in the planning and creation of policy, yet this is beginning to change. Local governments are able to respond to issues “more quickly than other levels (of government) and in a more flexible manner” (Good et. al, 2014, p. 22) due in part to the partnerships that already exist between them and local organizations and stakeholders.

The provision of settlement services to newcomers is an ever-changing sector that requires swift and effective government response. “Governance of issues related to immigration and settlement increasingly involves – perhaps even demands – the involvement of more than one level of government” (Tolley, 2011, p. 4). As policies related to immigration are often set at the federal level, the impression is that these areas remain strictly “federal” issues. The policies themselves, however, play often at the municipal level and affect how services are provided locally.
In situating research about immigration and diversity, much focus is often placed on federal achievements and contributions…but rarely do we hear of a municipal or local model, even though many cities are actively involved (Good 2009). The focus on the federal, and to a lesser extent, provincial role in immigration, integration, and inclusion may leave observers with the (mistaken) impression that only these “higher” levels of government play a role. (Tolley et. al, 2012, p. 10)

Collaboration not only between civil society actors and multiple levels of government “does not eliminate the role of the federal government; it simply increases the number of significant governmental and non-governmental players involved in immigration policy” (Andrew and Hima, 2011, p. 50).

Formal documentation of this collaboration is evident in the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement and accompanying Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Toronto. This research focusses on these documents as they set a precedent for increased participation of Canadian municipalities in planning and policy formation of settlement services, with the validation of both provincial and federal levels of government. As Turgeon et al. state, a key factor ensuring the ability of cities to respond to diverse populations is support from upper levels of government (2014, p. 22)

Cities themselves are seeking to increase their role in the attraction, retention, settlement, and integration of immigrants through greater intergovernmental collaboration (Tolley, 2011, p. 37-38). As Siemiatycki states, addressing the needs of newcomers within Canadian cities is viewed as sound political strategy for gaining votes, as well as gaining negotiating greater authority and resources with upper levels of government (2012, p. 31)

Collaboration between the major cities and upper levels of government is already occurring on a regular basis, with the City of Toronto at the forefront. “The governments of large cities have separate relations with the federal government. Mayors and senior officials have access to top-ranking federal bureaucrats, and they can also meet with ministers” (Young, 2009, p. 125), and some cities have departments focused on intergovernmental relations (City of Surrey). Still, municipalities posit that there is “no central portal for dealing with the federal government” (Young, 2009, p. 124), and stress the need for providing local governments with more power in setting policy.
Achieving this power, however, “will depend on how the big cities perform as their economic and demographic weight increases and on whether citizens identify more strongly with active and visible local governments” (Young, 2009, p. 114). As literature on urban studies shows, the need for greater collaboration with municipal governments has increased as more focus is put on localized or “place-based” solutions. The coordination and delivery of immigrant settlement services is one sector that is highlighting this need for collaborative governance models.
Chapter 3. **Context: The City of Toronto**

This section will investigate the context within which the municipality of Toronto operates. It will examine the demographics of the population of the city, and provide a brief history on what factors have led to an increase in the power of the municipal government. It will also provide an outline of the partnerships that existed between settlement service providers prior to the signing of COIA, and discuss how this laid the foundation for the Local Immigration Partnerships that we will see later in this research. This section will also examine the municipal government’s involvement in service provision prior to COIA. This context will set the stage for the formalized collaboration between the municipal government and community partners that have resulted from COIA and that will be detailed later in this research.

The City of Toronto is the fifth largest municipal government in North America and has an operating budget of $10.858 billion. In 1998, the city underwent an amalgamation that brought together six municipalities into a single city. The amalgamated City is made up of 44 “wards”, each represented by a single Councillor at the Toronto City Council. The Mayor of the City of Toronto is directly elected, and in 2010, the current mayor received over 383,000 votes, more than any other politician in Canada (Toronto City Clerk’s office). The next municipal election is slated for October 2014.

In 2012, Canada welcomed 257,887 immigrants through a variety of channels and from all over the world (Citizenship and Immigration Canada). The city that accepts the largest number of these immigrants, by far, is the city of Toronto. As one of the largest cities in North America, the City of Toronto has been the destination of choice for more than one-third of all immigrants to Canada since 1971 (Frisken and Wallace, 2003, p. 154). According to the National Household Survey of 2011, 32.8% of recent immigrants in the past 5 years have chosen the Toronto area to settle. The same survey
indicated that 49% of the population of Toronto were immigrants, and that there were more than 200 distinct ethnic origins reported among the population of Toronto (Statistics Canada, 2011). The city is considered likely to have the highest proportion of foreign-born residents of any major city in the western world (Stren and Polese, 2000, p. 6). Toronto has, therefore, extensive experience on facing the challenges that integration of diverse populations can bring.

The city of Toronto is both the largest city and the financial centre of Canada. In 1998, the 6 municipalities of East York, Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough York and the City of Toronto were forcibly amalgamated by the province of Ontario to form the current City of Toronto. As the geographic territory of the Toronto is so large, the city was divided into four Quadrants, representing the areas of Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough and Toronto/East York. City council members serve on “Community Councils” representing each of the four Quadrants, and issues discussed at each of these Community Council meetings are subsequently brought forth to the Full City Council for voting. The City has 7 Standing Committees with mandates on public service delivery and corporate operations, as well as several subcommittees. Previously, there existed five access and equity policy advisors committees, as well as a working group on Immigration and Refugee Issues and another on Language, Equity and Literacy, however under the most recent Toronto administration, these have been disbanded (C. Brillinger, December 2013).

3.1. Amalgamation

The amalgamation of the city of Toronto in 1998 provided an “immediate incentive for political mobilization in Toronto” (Good, 2009, p. 247) and created the opportunity for relationships to be built between community organizations, including immigrant service organizations. It was a highly controversial move by the provincial government that was met with widespread local public disapproval. This move, in combination with other downloading of responsibilities to municipal governments led to an urban regime advocating for greater municipal empowerment for the city of Toronto (Good, 2009, p. 246).
The Conservative government of Mike Harris implemented widespread reform in the province of Ontario during the mid-90s in the name of a “common sense revolution”. Some of these changes took the form of municipal mergers or amalgamations. When the Harris government first came to power, there were over 800 municipalities in Ontario, as compared to the current 444 (Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, 2014). The provincial government sought to establish better equity of funding for education across Ontario by reducing municipalities’ access to property taxes, thereby ensuring that the majority of their funding came from provincial transfers (Siegel, 2005, p. 128). The province’s downloading of responsibilities to municipalities during this period was, according to Siegel, “probably the greatest single realignment of powers in the history of the municipal system” (2009, p. 31). Siegel posits that the push to amalgamate came from a “need to make Ontario more competitive in the international environment” by ensuring well-functioning municipalities that would attract international business (2005, p. 129). By “simplify(ing) the structure” of municipalities, the province sought to exercise a greater level of control over local governments (Hamilton, 2012, p. 61).

The amalgamation of the City of Toronto was seen as being “handled abruptly and in the face of heated opposition from city residents and politicians” (Broadbent, 2008, p. 202). It created widespread dissatisfaction among residents, causing some to demand a “New Deal” for the city of Toronto. Advocates saw this “New Deal” as one that would “empower municipal government within the intergovernmental system” (Good 246) with a range of perspectives on how wide this new level of authority would extend.

In response to these transfers of responsibilities and associated significant funding cuts, local leaders and various community organizations began to focus attention on lobbying the federal government. A group of citizens and organizations mobilized under the name of “Citizens for Local Democracy” (C4LD) to build local capacity in the fight against amalgamation. A separate group representing immigrant and minority organizations called “New Voices of the New City” formed to explain how the amalgamation would impact the immigrant population of Toronto. Though they were not successful in stopping amalgamation, the process had provided an incentive to cooperate and “inadvertently built bridges linking Toronto’s diverse immigrant communities” (Good, 2009, p. 248). These bridges would form the foundation for a more
formalized collaboration between immigrant organizations that would come with the arrival of the Local Immigration Partnerships.

3.2. Provincial-Municipal Acts

The provincial downloading and amalgamations implemented by the Harris government were followed by provincial legislation that has had significant impact on the way in which municipalities in Ontario, including the City of Toronto, govern. This legislation has permitted the municipal government of Toronto to enter into agreements with upper levels of government and while it does not provide the City of Toronto with complete independence, it does provide the City with more permissive powers.

In January 2003, the Ontario Municipal Act (OMA) came into force, governing administration of all Ontario municipalities excluding Toronto. This act replaced the previous Municipal Act of 1990, and provided municipalities with greater levels of autonomy. The OMA provided a more permissive framework for municipalities, granting them “natural person” powers which would allow them to enter into contracts and levy certain taxes (Siegel, 2005, p. 144). The new Municipal Act meant that municipalities had “considerably more autonomy of action than they had under the previous Baldwin Act” (Siegel, 2009, p. 22). The extent to this autonomy, according to Siegel, will depend on how municipalities decide to exercise their newfound authority (2009, p. 63)

The “Stronger City of Toronto for a Stronger Ontario Act” was passed in legislature in May 2006. This Act, introduced by the Ontario government, permits the City of Toronto government to enter into agreements with other governments, and provides them with a greater scope for raising revenue for the City. The Act “recognizes the importance of providing the City with a legislative framework within which the City can build a strong, vibrant and sustainable city that is capable of thriving in the global economy” (Ontario, 2006, City of Toronto Act preamble). Despite the new taxation and fiscal authority granted in this Act, the provincial government does retain power. “Some constraints have been eased, but provincial supremacy remains” (Young, 2009, p. 114) The “Stronger City of Toronto for a stronger Ontario Act”, however, provided the municipal government with wider permissive powers to pass bylaws and contributed to
the municipality government’s current role in the coordination of immigrant settlement services. The Act meant that the City “could take the initiative to pass bylaws on issues they deem important” (Boudreau et. al, 2009, p. 81) even when such issues were not expressly indicated in the provincial municipal act. The “Stronger City of Toronto for a stronger Ontario Act” was intended to empower the City of Toronto to initiate its own agreements, a move that has since resulted in multiple federal-municipal agreements on the coordination of immigrant settlement services.

3.3. Settlement services in Toronto – setting the stage for Local Immigration Partnerships

On issues related to the settlement of newcomers, there are “long traditions of cooperation among civil society groups in Toronto” (Stasiulus et. al, 2009, p. 123). This long-standing history set the stage for deeper cooperation through the more recent formation of Local Immigration Partnerships (“LIPs”) across the city. As we will see, the LIPs have provided an obvious point of access for the municipal government to engage in a systematized collaborative governance process through the Newcomer Leadership Table. This formal cross-sectoral collaboration between government and community stakeholders would likely have been more difficult, if not impossible, had there not existed a strong history of cooperation between service providers and other community stakeholders in the city. As Fourot states, the way in which the issue of immigrant integration is constructed by local actors profoundly influences the evolution of municipal politics (2013, p. 206).

Prior to amalgamation, “the old city of Toronto had developed a well-known participatory culture...diversity was slowly becoming a defining character of Canadian-and Toronto’s-identity” (Boudreau et. al, 2009, p. 86-87). There remains today a “relative ease with which coalitions develop” among community partners involved in immigrant settlement. “The presence of this large institutional network in Toronto has nurtured a dynamic cadre of immigrant community leaders” and has provided a strong foundation for the introduction of Local Immigration Partnerships. Much of the municipal government’s ability to engage with community stakeholders today is as a result of this pre-existing institutional network within the settlement community.
3.4. Community leaders in immigrant settlement

Toronto is seen as a successful “Gateway City”, meaning that it accepts a large number of immigrants who find paths of upward mobility after arriving. “People who enter, often from village backgrounds, have an amazingly consistent record of entering the middle-class urban mainstream within a generation” (Saunders, 2011, p. 314). Much of this can be attributed to the fact that the city itself is rich in settlement service provider organizations serving immigrants and newcomers. The majority of these organizations currently receive funding from the federal government, whose core funding “supports the provision of information and orientation services, language training, mentoring programs, workplace and employment assistance, multiculturalism and anti-racism initiatives, and a host of other services” (Tolley et. al, 2012, p. 4).

One of the loudest voices on immigrant settlement issues in Toronto is emerging from OCASI – the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants, first founded in 1978. This umbrella organization advocates for the immigrant-serving sector in Ontario and has more than 200 members. Of equal weight is the voice of the United Way, who targeted more than $9.1 million in 2012 to agencies delivering settlement programs (United Way). They have also partnered with the Metcalf Foundation to provide the “Emerging Leaders” program which supports leaders in the immigrants and refugee serving sectors, and co-produced the “Poverty by Postal Code” report which highlighted the vulnerability of newcomers towards poverty.

It is not only traditional settlement service provider organizations that are involved with the settlement process in Toronto, there is significant support from both foundations and think tanks, as well. Specifically, the Maytree Foundation, a private foundation established in 1982 by business and philanthropist Alan Broadbent, has played an important role in supporting initiatives related to settlement and integration in the city. Finally, CERIS – the Ontario Metropolis Centre, was established in 1996 as a consortium of universities and community partners, to promote and support research related to immigrant settlement and integration.

Prior to COIA, there were already multiple partnerships between community stakeholders involved in the immigrant settlement process. These involved direct
immigrant service provider organizations, foundations, think tanks and other community partners. Cooperation between community partners and municipal government, however, occurred only sporadically as needs arose and was not part of a formalized collaborative process.

3.5. Municipal involvement in settlement prior to COIA

The City of Toronto provides services that are accessed by newcomers and thus, while not formally providing immigrant settlement services, has long had an interest in service provision to the local immigrant population of Toronto. Prior to COIA, the City of Toronto would sometimes collaborate with local service provider organizations on issues related to immigrant settlement through initiatives such as the Immigrant Mentorship program and the “Access and Equity Grants Program”. There was, however, no funding from upper levels of government to establish a forum for ongoing, formal collaboration between municipal government and community partners on settlement issues. As we will see, the establishment of Local Immigration Partnerships has since provided such a forum that has allowed the governmental and community-based sector to establish a formalized collaborative process.

As “the activities of municipal government are an important source of inspiration for how a city will design its institutional structures” (Tate and Quesnel, 1995, p. 326), the activities of the City of Toronto provided a basis for how the rest of the city would respond to immigrant settlement issues. Prior to COIA, there were some City departments involved in settlement issues. The Toronto Public Health office, for example, is responsible for monitoring communicable diseases within the city, and for monitoring the health of newborn infants and their mothers. This meant that Public Health has been the only municipal office whose employees and volunteers routinely visit the homes of immigrant residents (Frisken and Wallace, 2003, p. 167). In addition, the Toronto School Board had conducted studies of the performance of immigrant and minority-origin students, and partnered with the federal government to run a program titled “Settlement Workers in Schools”, providing support to immigrant students and their families. In the early 1970’s, the Toronto School Board began offering “Heritage
Language programs” to students, a program which has since expanded to offering over 50 languages (Toronto District School Board, 2014)

The official documentation coming out of the City of Toronto prior to the signing of COIA also displayed a municipal interest in immigrant-related issues. The City had launched its own “Immigration and Settlement Policy Framework”, a framework which encouraged the City’s “ongoing exploration” for “a new relationship between federal and municipal governments” (Toronto, City Clerk, 2001, p. 5). The Framework posited that the City should be able to negotiate directly with the federal government on matters related to immigrant settlement in the city, a foreshadowing of what would come with COIA and subsequent federal-municipal agreements. In 2003, The Plan of Action for the Elimination of Racism and Discrimination was released, outlining the City’s plan to fulfill 97 recommendations towards promoting equitable participation of residents in building an inclusive society (Toronto, Office of Equity, Diversity and Human Rights Division, 2014d). That same year, the City Council adopted a Vision Statement on Access, Equity and Diversity (Toronto, Office of Equity, Diversity and Human Rights Division, 2014e). Various other policies, including those on employment equity, multilingualism and hate activity, built a strong policy foundation for immigrant needs within the city. Despite the interest and various policies from the local government of Toronto’s prior to COIA, the City departments “were not in the driver’s seat. It was a federally built system” (C. Brillinger, December 2013). Jill Gross referred to Toronto as a city with a “split personality”: one that celebrate(d) its own diversity, yet lack(ed) the capacity to engage the same population (2007, p. 85). The experience of the City of Toronto was consistent with those of other municipalities: local governments were unlikely to implement costly policies related to immigration unless there was a mandate from senior levels of government (Frisken et. al, 2000, p. 91).
3.6. Conclusion

This analysis of the context of the city of Toronto prior to the signing of COIA in 2005 indicates that there was both a history of cooperation between organizations in the community sector on issues related to immigrant settlement, and an ongoing interest from the municipal government. Despite this interest, there was no formalized forum for collaboration between the two sectors, and the City had not received funding from the federal government to formally engage in issues related to immigrant settlement. The evidence suggests, however, that the City of Toronto presented the federal government with an example of a city that already had strong partnerships between community players and was ready to take on the next level of collaboration between “non-traditional partners, non-traditional players” to address and strategically plan for city-wide issues that impact immigrant settlement. The signing of COIA in 2005 would set the stage for this formalized collaborative process between municipal government and community partners to begin.
Chapter 4. Canada Ontario Immigration Agreement and the Canada-Ontario-Toronto Memorandum of Understanding

Finalized on November 21, 2005, the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (“COIA”) was the first agreement of its kind, formally bringing together all three levels of government: federal, provincial and municipal. COIA “provided a concrete policy commitment and new funding, ushered in new players and partnerships, and changed governance relations and institutional configurations” (Tolley et. al, 2012, p. 6).

The stated purpose of the COIA was “to establish a framework for a long-term partnership between Canada and Ontario with respect to immigration” by defining the respective roles of each with regards to immigrants (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2005a, Purpose and objectives). As was outlined by Stasiulus et al., COIA also indicated that new solutions and a broader-based strategy were required to address the issues immigrants were facing in the integration process (2011, p. 127-128). While new solutions and strategies were required to address these needs, COIA was also one in a series of federal agreements that shifted responsibility from the federal to provincial and municipal levels. As outlined above, downloading to municipalities from provinces and the federal government began occurring at a large scale in the 1990’s and early 2000’s. While COIA committed upper-levels of government to working with various stakeholders, including municipal governments and community partners, on policies, programs and infrastructure related to immigrant integration, it also shifted responsibility to the provincial and municipal level.

The agreement, however, came with a financial guarantee. It provided Ontario with a commitment of $920 million over five years for the delivery of settlement services and language training to newcomers (Tolley et. al, 2012, p. 7), and was decidedly collaborative in scope. “There has been a discernible movement in Ontario’s immigrant-
receiving centres from government to multilevel, multisectoral governance in the policy area of immigrant settlement” (Stasiulus et. al, 2011, p. 74-75).

The three clear goals laid out in COIA were to improve immigrants’ economic and social outcomes, to increase the economic benefits of migration, and to build partnerships with municipalities and communities (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2005a). To achieve these goals, Steering and Management Committees made up of deputy ministers from both the federal and provincial governments were established. The Annex on “Partnerships with Municipalities” provided a framework for collaboration between the three levels of government: federal, provincial and municipal. The federal and provincial government agreed to work with municipal governments through the “Municipal Immigration Committee”, a committee chaired by the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) as well as the Assistant Deputy Ministers of Citizenship and Immigration Canada, and the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration. As the City of Toronto was no longer a member of AMO, the document explained that, “where appropriate, the City of Toronto may participate in discussions involving the Municipal Immigration Committee” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2005, Annex F). The document goes on to explain, however, that based on the particular challenges of the City of Toronto, a separate Memorandum of Understanding will be signed between the three levels of government to address Toronto-specific issues (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2005, Annex F).

As outlined above, the “Stronger City of Toronto for a Stronger Ontario Act” (“Stronger City Act”) granted the City of Toronto greater authority in establishing by-laws and entering into agreements and negotiations with the federal government (Toronto, City Clerk, 2006). The COIA contained within it a commitment to formally recognize the role of the city of Toronto in the area of immigrant integration.

In May of 2006, the “Stronger City” Act was passed, granting Toronto the ability to enter into agreements with various levels of government. That September, the federal Immigration Minister (Monte Solberg) the provincial Immigration Minister (Mike Colle) and the Toronto Mayor (David Miller) joined together to sign the first tri-level agreement on immigration: the Canada-Ontario-Toronto Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on
Immigration and Settlement. This agreement was the “culmination of years of lobbying by the City” (Siemiatycki, 2012, p. 32) and was meant to provide a seat at the planning table on immigrant services for the City of Toronto. The MOU focused on four “primary areas of interest” for immigrant settlement: **Access to employment, Access to education and training, Access to services** and **Citizenship and Civic engagement** (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2006).

It was anticipated that COIA and the accompanying MOU would provide “the foundation for a New Deal in immigration and settlement policy for the City of Toronto” (Good, 2009, p. 271). This research seeks to show whether this occurred. COIA and the MOU were viewed as the basis for partnership (Stasiulus et. al, 2011, p. 103) on matters related to immigrant settlement within the city of Toronto. The expectation was that the municipal government would contribute to decisions made on settlement, and that this would catalyze local government to engage in multisectoral forms of governance (Stasiulus et. al, 2011, p. 82). A review of COIA in 2010 revealed that while the agreement was viewed as a “major achievement” and “an innovative example of multilevel governance”, implementation of change had been “slower than many would have liked…(collaborative initiatives) do not take shape overnight” (Seidle, 2010, p. 17). Some of the intergovernmental collaborations since COIA include: research on the impact of Temporary Foreign Worker programs in Toronto, the development of an inventory of settlement services, the exchange of immigration data and the completion of an Immigration Portal on the City of Toronto website (Siemiatycki, 2012, p. 33). One of the most significant collaborations to date, has been the intergovernmental cooperation on Local Immigration Partnerships. After a five year term, COIA was extended for an additional year, at which point control of the funding for immigrant settlement services returned to the federal government.
Chapter 5. Research methodology

In order to understand how the role of the City of Toronto has changed in the coordination of immigrant settlement services since the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement, I was required to gather information on what role the City played prior to, and following, implementation of the agreement. I used multiple methods of data collection in order to gather this information.

By analyzing City of Toronto Council and Committee agendas, reports and minutes from the years leading up to 2005, I gained an understanding of the role that the City had played in delivering services to the newcomer population prior to signing of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement. These documents provided me with information on policies related to immigration in the city and provided a deeper understanding of the City’s interest in becoming more involved with newcomer settlement issues.

I then constructed semi-structured key informant interviews that provided me with a more detailed understanding of how the City had become involved with the coordination of immigrant settlement services since the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement. During these interviews, I came to understand the important role that the Quadrant Local Immigration Partnerships played in collaborating with the City of Toronto. I gathered more information about how the City’s role had changed since the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement and the subsequent introduction of the Local Immigration Partnership model to Toronto. The questions that I asked provided me with more details on the power dynamic between the employees in the Toronto Newcomer Office who coordinated the Citywide LIP as well as the key community stakeholders, including the employees of the four Quadrant LIPs. Through the semi-structured interviews, I gained a clear view on the City’s role in immigrant settlement services prior
to the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement and how the City of Toronto had since been implementing a model of collaborative governance on immigrant settlement issues.

5.1. Content analysis

In order to gain an understanding of the City’s role in the immigrant settlement sector both prior to and following the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement, I analyzed the City of Toronto agendas, reports and minutes, as well as key municipal documents including the Immigration and Settlement Policy Framework, The Plan of Action for the Elimination of Racism and Discrimination as well as the annual reports from the Human Rights Office of the City of Toronto.

I also researched the provincial and municipal government websites on immigrant settlement services to gain a better understanding of the history of the settlement sector within the city of Toronto. Finally, I examined key federal documents including the Handbook and original Call for Proposals and on the Local Immigration Partnerships in Ontario, and the House of Commons report on Best Practices in Settlement Services.

5.2. Semi-structured interviews

For the semi-structured interviews, it was important for me to interview those in charge of recommending policies for newcomers as well as those directly coordinating services at the community level. I therefore sought to interview both key employees of the City and representatives from the regional Quadrant LIPs.

In total, I spoke to 9 people in 8 interviews that lasted between 1-2 hours conducted over a 2-week period in December 2013. I also attended the one-year anniversary meeting of the Newcomer Leadership Table. The interviews with stakeholders covered two basic areas: why the role of the municipality in the coordination of settlement services within the city of Toronto had changed since 2005, and how this changing role was having an impact on local community-based
organizations working with settlement service providers. Through these interviews, common themes emerged including the City’s ability to impact newcomer settlement services through the formation of policy, the role each stakeholder felt the City should play in the coordination of immigrant settlement services, and the importance of relationship building in the creation and implementation of municipal policy.

At the outset, I sought to interview those most engaged in the current processes with the City, including the Executive Director of Social Development, Finance and Administration (Chris Brillinger) and the Director of the Office of Equity, Diversity and Human Rights (Uzma Shakir). Both are members of the Newcomer Leadership Table and would bring a high-level perspective on the City’s involvement in the process. It was also important that I interview a current employee of the Toronto Newcomer Office to provide insight into the work that was underway, as well as the process of developing partnerships with community stakeholders.

From the community stakeholder perspective, I aimed to interview two Managers from the four regional Quadrant LIPs in order to understand the level of collaboration they have had with the City of Toronto since 2005. I was ultimately able to obtain interviews with three Managers from the regional Quadrant LIPs, plus an additional Project Manager within the Toronto North LIP who works closely with various City departments on immigrant employment issues.

In addition to gaining interviews with each of my original targeted interviewees, I interviewed an employee involved with the establishment of the City of Toronto’s Newcomer Initiative. This interview proved invaluable as it provided me with a historical perspective on the development of the Citywide LIP. During the course of my interviews, it came up that an additional valuable interview would be with the Executive Director of the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI) who could provide more understanding of the collaborative relationship between the municipality and community stakeholders. I was unable to gain an interview with her, however, as OCASI acts as a collective voice of their membership throughout Ontario, my interviews with the majority of Regional Local Immigration Partnership managers provided a clear representation of the community stakeholder perspective within the city of Toronto.
Chapter 6. Research findings

This section will provide details on the findings of this research, including key initiatives that have emerged as a result of the signing of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement.

First among these initiatives is the development of Local Immigration Partnerships, (or “LIPs”), throughout the province of Ontario. These Partnerships were a new initiative in the immigrant settlement sector and have since spread to other provinces. This section will also discuss the introduction of LIPs to the city of Toronto, and outline why the development of LIPs in Toronto has been so different to others in the province. Following the introduction of LIPs to Toronto was the establishment of a “Toronto Newcomer Initiative” within the City, and the subsequent development of the Toronto Newcomer Strategy. The Strategy is developed around a base of four pillars, discussed below, outlining key aspects of the City’s immigrant settlement strategy. This section will discuss the creation of a “Newcomer Leadership Table” which has introduced a formalized collaborative governance model to the immigrant settlement sector to Toronto. This is followed by an outline of other key City initiatives related to immigrant settlement that have occurred since the signing of COIA. This section terminates with an overview of the Toronto’s Newcomer Office’s progress towards meeting the goals of the four pillars.

6.1. Local Immigration Partnerships

As stated above, the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement highlighted a need for greater intergovernmental collaboration between all three levels of government: federal, provincial and municipal. The agreement also anticipated a formalized collaboration between the municipal government and local community stakeholders involved in the settlement sector as part of the implementation strategy. Contained
within the agreement is a statement supporting the strength of community partnerships in the immigrant integration process:

Canada and Ontario agree on the need to foster community-based involvement, including a broad range of government and non-government stakeholders, in order to create and support new and innovative approaches to the social and economic integration of immigrants. (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2005)

The Agreement goes on to explain that the federal and provincial governments have a “mutual interest in fostering partnerships and the participation of municipal governments and community and private sector stakeholders in immigration” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2005, Annex F, 1.1). In 2008, Citizenship and Immigration Canada issued a call for proposals on a pilot project in partnership with the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration that would achieve each of these goals. As described below, this project would see the roll-out of Local Immigration Partnerships, or “LIPs”, across Ontario municipalities.

Rather than funding settlement organizations directly, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (“CIC”) was electing to fund the creation of new partnerships that would “encourage a community-driven strategic planning process” (Bradford and Andrew, 2010, p. 10). These partnerships would be run by coordinating councils, or “partnership councils”, comprised of local key stakeholders in the immigrant settlement process. Councils would be responsible for developing a local immigrant settlement strategy and setting out an action plan to create an inclusive community. The goal of LIPs was to “provide a collaborative framework for, and facilitate the development and implementation of, sustainable local and regional solutions for successful integration of immigrants to Ontario” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2008). According to Jehad Aliweiwi, Executive Director of Thorncliffe Neighbourhood House and a member of the Newcomer Leadership Table, the LIP model of service coordination has been:

One of the most creative funding initiatives that Citizenship and Immigration Canada put forward in a long time…. (the LIP model) really tries to introduce settlement to non-traditional partners, non-traditional players. For the first time it attempts at making settlement the business of a wide sector of businesses: private, public institutions like hospitals, education systems, school boards, local employers, libraries, parks and
The key to the robust engagement of cities today and the issue of settlement and immigration, is the VIP, the local immigration partnerships. That’s really a wonderful thing (December 2013)

As Tolley et al. state, immigrant settlement involves all three levels of government, in addition to the business, non-governmental and community sectors (2012, p. 15). The Local Immigration Partnerships were such a new and innovative concept for CIC, as they were designed to bring together each of these levels and sectors.

The four primary objectives of LIPs included:

1. **Improved access to, and coordination of services that facilitate immigrant settlement and integration.**

2. **Improved access to the labour market for immigrants.**

3. **Strengthened local and regional awareness and capacity to integrate immigrants.** and

4. **The establishment or enhanced partnerships and participation of multiple stakeholders in planning and coordinating the delivery of integration services**

   (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2008)

Dedicated resources were provided for a LIP coordinator’s position, hired by the Partnership Council, which meant that relationships with partners and stakeholders could be managed. The LIP Coordinator position also provided a "point person" to track progress and encourage action that would further the LIPs strategic plans (Biles, Tolley, Esses, Andrew, Burstein, 2012, p. 329-330).

The LIP model has been widely considered a significant and positive contribution to the immigrant settlement and integration process in Ontario (Bradford and Andrew, 2010; various interviews; Biles et. al, 2012, 329-330). As this research attests, there has been an undeniable and lasting impact on the settlement sector in Toronto since the
introduction of LIPs. In 2010, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration recognized LIPs as a best practice in settlement with “great potential”, encouraging CIC to introduce the model to provinces across Canada (Canada, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration 2010, p. 13-14) Since then, LIPs have been developed in Halifax, St. John’s, Calgary (Pathways to Prosperity) and are currently being developed in communities across British Columbia.

6.1.1. Toronto Local Immigration Partnerships

While the lead organization for LIPs across Ontario is typically the municipality, the city of Toronto was one of the few exceptions.

As the Memorandum of Understanding outlined, Toronto holds a unique place in the landscape of immigrant settlement services within Ontario, due primarily to the size of its immigrant population and the high volume of service organizations. As a result, the mandate for LIPs within Toronto was slightly different than for those of other Ontario municipalities. While most municipalities outside the City of Toronto sought to attract and retain immigrant populations, Toronto was focussed on the improved operation and coordination of services currently offered.

*It’s about system organizing and effectiveness... there’s too much and we’re super saturated with demand...So very different exercises in Toronto versus some of the other LIPs...Toronto is unique and has unique needs when it comes to LIPs (LIP Manager, December 2013)*

The City of Toronto was approached by the federal and provincial governments following the implementation of COIA, with a request to take the lead on a “city-wide planning initiative” that would plan local partnerships. At the time, the City declined, encouraging the upper levels of government to instead approach pre-existing neighbourhood organizations (C. Brillinger, December 2013). The city of 2.5 million was too large to approach LIPs in the same way as was being done in smaller Ontario municipalities (City employee, December 2013). As a result, when the federal government issued the LIP Call for Proposals in 2008, they issued a separate one specifically for the City of Toronto. Toronto became the one municipality in Ontario with
multiple LIPs, each hosted not by the municipality, but by different funding agencies (Stasiulis, Hughes, Amery, p.120). Applicants for LIP funding within the City of Toronto were non-profit community-based organizations, each of whom decided on their own geographic scope of responsibility. “Sometimes (the scope) was exactly aligned with the City Priority neighbourhood (see Appendix)\(^6\), and sometimes it was a much larger area, depending on what sort of consortium they decided to build” (City employee 2, December 2013). As a result, the first round of LIP funding in Toronto resulted in 17 different LIP planning tables across the city, each led by a separate settlement organization. When comparing the number of LIPs (17) to the number of immigrants served, it was estimated that the number of LIPs in Toronto at that time was actually in line with most other LIPs across the province (City employee, December 2013). These 17 LIP planning tables, however, did not cover the entire territory of the city of Toronto. This was later remedied when the 17 LIP planning tables were amalgamated into 4 Regional LIPs, as described below, ensuring that each neighbourhood in Toronto was now represented by a LIP (LIP Manager, December 2013).

At that time, the municipal government of Toronto had no contract with CIC, but did allocate its own community development staff to sit on each of the various LIP planning tables, many of whom aided the community organizations in their subsequent applications for CIC funding (City employee 2, December 2013). The interviews revealed that many viewed the initial stage of LIP funding as critical to gathering the necessary information before proceeding with further development of service coordination across the city of Toronto.

\[I \text{ don't think in the early stage it could have been much different. The early stage is about research, it's about consultation and getting a good scan. And we needed 17 different scans, there's no way the scale of engagement and research could have been done if we had split it up into}\]

\(^6\) “The Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy was first adopted by Council in 2005, premised on the understanding that an historic under-investment in the community infrastructure of some Toronto neighbourhoods had resulted in a variety of challenges, particularly in the area of community safety, and particularly for racialized youth. The Strategy introduced Priority Neighbourhood Areas for Investment (PNI), neighbourhoods where targeted investments in community infrastructure were most urgently needed.” - Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy 2020 – Recommended Neighbourhood Improvement Areas Date: March 4, 2014
just a few areas, it would have been too big (City employee, December 2013)

6.1.2. Toronto Citywide LIP

The landscape changed in February 2010 when the Toronto City Council authorized the Mayor and/or City Manager to enter into a contribution agreement with Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

This contribution agreement had been precipitated by discussions between the federal and municipal government on the disparity between the Toronto model of LIPs and LIPs across the rest of the province, each of which had engagement from the municipal government. The intention of the LIP model, after all, had been to foster partnerships between municipal governments and various non-governmental stakeholders. “By the City of Toronto not leading a LIP or not having a more formalized role, (there was) a disconnect in what the intention of the LIP was” (City employee, December 2013). The federal government also saw a sustainability issue in maintaining and coordinating 17 LIPs across the city of Toronto.

How sustainable is it to have 17 different tables?” that’s a lot of funding allocation to Toronto, how can you actually coordinate planning? The whole point of this exercise is to coordinate and we’re having now a lot of difficulty just getting the 17 groups to meet together. So actually achieving coordination was going to be a challenge (City employee, December 2013).

The federal government impressed the importance of having a municipal-led LIP in the city of Toronto and initiated discussions with the municipal government directly for the formation of such a LIP.

In May 2010, a federal-municipal contribution agreement was signed for the transfer of more than $4 million in funds to the City of Toronto. These funds were to be used for initiatives related to the support of “City settlement planning and community capacity building” (Toronto, City Council, 2010b), including the establishment of a “Toronto Newcomer Initiative” (TNI) within the municipality (Toronto, Community Development and Recreation Committee, 2010a). One of the main tasks would be the
establishment of a “city-wide LIP”. The TNI staff was to report directly to Citizenship and Immigration Canada, but also to the Director of Social Policy for the City of Toronto, Lydia Fitchko (City employee, December 2013), creating a dual reporting structure. The team, however, would be housed within a division of Social Development, Finance and Administration at the City of Toronto, led by Chris Brillinger, Executive Director. The agreement with CIC indicated that the newly-established TNI would consist of five activity streams, related to immigrant settlement:

1. **The establishment of a City-wide Local Immigration Partnership (LIP)**

2. **Development of newcomer programming with Parks and Recreation**

3. **The placement of settlement workers within City facilities**

4. **Support of successful programs related to family reunification**

5. **Research related to newcomer groups**

(Toronto 2010 Update)

As was stated with my interview with a City official, by this point in the roll-out of the LIP model in Toronto, “there was some appetite for a city wide table” (City employee 2, December 2013) that would bring together representatives from each of the 17 LIP planning tables in Toronto. Many of these planning tables had sought to engage participation in their respective tables from citywide organizations, such as United Way, but had been unable to do so as a result of staffing or resource shortages (City employee 2, December 2013). This new “city-wide LIP” would bring together all participants to discuss systemic issues that crossed geographic boundaries across the city. This move was significant as it finally formalized participation between the municipal government of the City of Toronto and community stakeholders. Both governmental and non-governmental players would be brought to a planning table that would examine system issues related to immigrant settlement in the city.
In its first iteration, the new city-wide LIP consisted of 17 representatives from the Toronto LIP planning tables, as well as 10 additional representatives from other citywide sectorial and institutional stakeholders (City employee 2, December 2013). The consensus, however, was that the makeup of the city-wide table “didn’t work so well, it was actually quite a slog” (C. Brillinger, December 2013). There were too many members, “it was confusing…it was harder to see a link between what the City was doing and what was happening on a very local internally-focussed project” (City employee, December 2013) and clearly “wasn’t the ideal model for a collaboration table” (City employee 2, December 2013). Upon the second iteration of the city-wide LIP, extensive planning was put into the membership of the Newcomer Leadership Table, as we shall see below.

Despite its failure, the first iteration of the city-wide LIP was evidence that the federal and municipal governments were committed to formalizing collaboration between the City of Toronto and community stakeholders involved in the immigrant settlement sector. The number of players at the table, however, was too large, and brought up questions of the city-wide LIPs goal: with so many involved, was the goal of the LIP to engage as many players in the sector as possible, or to improve collaboration on immigrant settlement issues that impacted the city? “Are we trying to work on the issues raised by the 17 and coordinating them? Or are we trying to engage the others?” (City employee 2, December 2013). It was evident that change would be required to improve collaboration. This change came with Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s decision to amalgamate the 17 neighbourhood LIPs in Toronto.
6.1.3. LIP amalgamation: The “forced marriage”

In December 2011, CIC invited Executive Directors from each of Toronto’s 17 LIPs to a meeting planned and facilitated by the City of Toronto (City employee, December 2013).

Figure 6-1. City of Toronto Neighbourhood Local Immigration Partnership Map
Source: Balancing the budget report 2012

During this meeting, representatives from CIC outlined that they no longer viewed the model of 17 LIPs as sustainable, and were intending to reduce the number in Toronto to 4, plus one city-wide LIP, now referred to as the “four-plus-one model”.
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During this meeting, representatives from CIC outlined that they no longer viewed the model of 17 LIPs as sustainable, and were intending to reduce the number in Toronto to 4, plus one city-wide LIP, now referred to as the “four-plus-one model”.
CIC looked at the neighbourhood-based structure...an unsustainable thing and they wanted there to be better coordination between the City and between the LIPs. And also to fill the gaps, cause there were neighbourhoods and organizations who had never been engaged. And there were newcomer populations who had never been engaged...the initial transition from local to Quadrant LIPs and that was a really challenging time and I think people felt the tension around that was incredibly high and I think people had the perception that somehow the City of Toronto was going to take control of the whole city or like work in a more directed way which wasn’t the plan and hasn’t happened. But I think it also created a forced marriage between settlement agencies that may or may not have had a relationship prior to being forced into Quadrant structures.... it created a lot of confusion and tension (City employee, December 2013)

With the threat from CIC that LIPs would have to submit an official bid for more federal funding if an agreement could not be reached that day, the 17 LIPs divided themselves into 4 regional “Quadrant” LIPs that roughly reflected the geographic regions of Scarborough, Etobicoke, North York and the area of Old Toronto.

Figure 6-2. City of Toronto Quadrant Local Immigration Partnership Map
Source: LIP and Réseaux Report 2014
This geographic breakdown was decided by the LIP representatives present at
the meeting (B. Sinclair, December 2013). Each new Quadrant LIP decided which LIP
among them would take the “lead” and sign the contribution agreement with CIC for
funding of the new LIP formation. Each new Quadrant LIP was made up of between 3-5
pre-existing neighbourhoods LIPs. Though there was some conflict over which
organization would sign the contract with CIC in some of the Quadrants, these were
quickly resolved (City employee, December 2013), and the LIPs began the process of
discovering how the new Quadrant model would change their operations.

I think Toronto’s model really has been a learning curve….CIC
experimented in the idea of local, neighbourhood-based LIPs…it was an
experiment and I wonder will they ever run with this model again. I think
it’s been a learning curve….I’m not sure how the regional tables ever
could have worked without there being a preceding local table….I think
the cool challenge but also the great thing about it is that it has kind of
forged new relationships. They may be forced marriages in a way, but it
has forged new relationships across settlement organizations that may
not have previously been working together and are traditionally pitched
against each other in funding proposals (City employee, December 2013)

The LIP model in Toronto had begun with 17 neighbourhood LIPs which had
proved valuable for the information-gathering stage. In a city of 2.5 million, those I
interviewed felt that a single city-wide LIP, as had been the model for most other Ontario
municipalities, would not have worked because of the total number of population to
serve. The initial 17 neighbourhood LIPs were thus important to set the stage and gather
localized information on the immigrant settlement situation for each of the geographical
areas. To engage in the kind of systemic decision-making between municipality and
community stakeholders, however, the number was too large. The reduction to four
Quadrant LIPs, as we shall see, has allowed for a much deeper collaboration between
governmental and non-governmental stakeholders and has helped in the formation of
long-standing relationships in the immigrant settlement sector.
6.2. Toronto Newcomer Initiative

As discussed above, the establishment of a city-wide LIP had been one activity delegated to the newly-created “Toronto Newcomer Initiative (TNI)” within the City of Toronto. The TNI was formed in May 2010 as a result of the contribution agreement between the City of Toronto and CIC. Apart from the city-wide Local Immigration Partnership, the TNI had been tasked with five activity streams related to immigrant settlement.

The initial phase of TNI consisted of a set of pilot projects that took place between September 2010 and December 2011, focussing on the City’s role in immigrant settlement. The pilot projects were as follows:

1. **City-wide Local Immigration Partnership** – The city-wide LIP table was formed in 2010 and described above

2. **Recreational Programming** – new programs including female-only swim programs, introduced as outreach to the newcomer population.

3. **Settlement Workers in City Facilities** – a project that placed settlement workers on location in City services to help design programs and facilities more welcoming to the newcomer population.

4. **Reunification and Adaptation** – a partnership between Toronto Public Health and settlement organizations to counsel experiencing family separation.

5. **Health Research on Newcomers** – The resulting report, The Global City: Newcomer Health in Toronto provided in-depth information on the state of newcomer health, as well as suggestions for activities to better support newcomers

(Toronto Newcomer Initiative Program Report, 2012, p. 3-4)
The outcomes of these pilot projects did result in some substantial change for the City. For the Settlement Workers project, new marketing tools were developed “to share with community-based settlement agencies and newcomers that explained services in a simple one-page format”, and “Welcome to Ontario” kiosks were placed in some City facilities, which provided basic information on services in 17 different languages (Toronto Newcomer Initiative Program 6). The Recreation department underwent Service Planning Consultation in 2011, focussed specifically on gathering input from the newcomer population. In particular, the City staff sought input from newcomer families and settlement organizations on their partnership during the pilot project (Toronto Newcomer Initiative Program 8). Community specific brochures on public health services were created in three Local Immigration Partnerships to provide newcomers with information on those facilities able to provide support to newcomers without health cards (Toronto Newcomer Initiative Program 11). The city-wide Local Immigration Partnership met in its first iteration, with the participation of 17 neighbourhood LIPs, in 2010, before the neighbourhood LIPs were amalgamated into four Quadrant LIPs.

The precedent had been set for ongoing federal-municipal negotiations and it was clear that both parties were keen on continuing. Following the initial pilot projects of the TNI, and the concurrent amalgamation of Toronto Neighbourhood LIPs into four Quadrant LIPs, the City demonstrated its own interest in engaging in the settlement sector by entering into another bilateral funding agreement with Citizenship and Immigration Canada. The next generation of TNI was to be funded for the fiscal year of 2012-13 and included “the establishment of a multisectoral and intergovernmental city-Wide Local Immigration Partnership Table that will include community and stakeholder representation” (Toronto, Budget Committee, 2011). The focus with this newest agreement was to be on the improvement of newcomer outcomes with regards to health, employment access to municipal services and civic engagement (Toronto, Budget Committee, 2011). This was a clear signal that both the federal and municipal governments were witnessing benefits from their continued partnership. Staffing for the Toronto Newcomer Initiative has increased from two to three in the 2012 fiscal year, where it has remained since.
It should be noted, however, that while there is a clear indication for sustained federal-municipal collaboration, there has been a reduction in annual funding from CIC since 2012/13. The total amount of funds transferred from CIC from April 2012 to March 2013 for the Toronto Newcomer Initiative was $479,885. This was reduced the following year, to $400,000 (Toronto, Budget Committee, 2013 Extension Contract), and has again been reduced to $386,000 annually in the most recent agreement (Toronto, Community Development and Recreation Committee, 2014). The implications of this reduction in funding will be discussed below.

The current work of the Toronto Newcomer Initiative is based on the Four Pillars that were outlined in the “Toronto Newcomer Strategy” document. These pillars “represent broad areas that have been identified as critical for successful newcomer integration” (Toronto, Community Development and Recreation Committee, 2014) and have guided decision-making for the TNI. They also closely mirror the “areas of interest” set out in the Canada-Ontario-Toronto Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on Immigration and Settlement. As Chris Brillinger stated in an interview, “Everything has to relate back to the pillars and advancing those pillars” (December 2013). These four pillars apply to the newcomer population of Toronto and relate back to the priorities outlined in the most recent funding agreement with CIC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Pillars of the Toronto Newcomer Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancing Labour Market Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting and Supporting Good Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Access to Municipal Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Civic Engagement and Community Capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Toronto, Toronto Newcomer Initiative. (n.d.)
The pillars were developed by the City as a means of focussing their efforts on newcomer issues that applied to all four of the Quadrant LIPs. As a City employee stated, since the Strategy was approved in February 2013, the TNI has “moved really well on certain pillars and on other ones there’s a slower movement” (City employee, December 2013). The Pillar relating to newcomer employment, in particular, has been one that is particularly difficult to advance for TNI. “Employment is a city-wide issue…but very hard to address…we’re more responsive than proactive” (City employee, December 2013). There was a palpable frustration from many of those interviewed on the employment issue. Many felt that employment was the primary issue impacting the ability of newcomers to settle and integrate, yet were uncertain of how the issue could be addressed.

Employment is the number one issue for all four of our (Quadrant LIPs), newcomers want jobs...is that really a regional issue? Is that a City issue?...the (Quadrant LIPs) are feeling that they don’t have the right levers at their control for that and even the City isn’t sure that they have the levers to fix that (Bill Sinclair, December 2013).

It was clear that certain pillars have been easier to act on for the TNI than others. The two pillars that have been the easiest to address from the City’s perspective are those related to health and access to services.

They’re the ones that, If we were to list off our work, they’re where maybe more of our work has been weighted…the health pillar is the one that has really moved the most forward, the one that is the most advanced (City employee, December 2013).

As discussed above, the department of Toronto Public Health has long been involved in immigrant issues across the city, thus it follows that the pillar related to health would have been easiest to address in the early stages of the TNI.

In May 2013, City Council authorized an additional extension of the contract with Citizenship and Immigration Canada to support the Toronto Newcomer Initiative from 2013-2014 with a funding injection of $400,000 (Toronto City Council, 2013c). At this time, the name changed from “Toronto Newcomer Initiative” (“TNI”) to “Toronto Newcomer Office” (“TNO”) “to better reflect its role, scope of work and the City’s ongoing
commitment to newcomers (Toronto City Council, 2013c). The funding agreement was again renewed in April 2014, when an extension through to 2016 was guaranteed.

There have been multiple contract renewals, which indicates a desire for sustained federal-municipal collaboration on immigrant settlement issues in the city of Toronto. The continued reduction in funding from the federal government described above, however, leads to speculation that the federal government’s intention is to eventually find alternate funding sources for the Toronto Newcomer Office. There was much speculation on this throughout my interviews. “I think (CIC’s) intention never has been to permanently fund (the Toronto Newcomer Office), it’s meant to be time-limited with maybe some sustainability fed into the province” (City employee, December 2013). Future funding for the TNO is uncertain and may come from various levels of government.

6.2.1. Collaboration within the TNO

Throughout the interviews, it became apparent that the ability to collaborate was a crucial aspect of the TNO. As one TNO employee stated, “It’s kind of like a real dance in between everyone. The City divisions, the federal funder, the Community-based sector. It’s a challenge” (City employee, December 2013). When it comes to the reporting structure, one employee stated that the situation was akin to having “two masters” – the City of Toronto and CIC.

CIC have, they’ve put parameters on what we do…so we do all of those things, and we complete our contract in doing that. But at the same time then a Councillor will make a motion, give a direction about immigrant child welfare that becomes part of our work….But that’s why our Strategic Plan is good because they’ve identified a health pillar. Emerging issues that come under the health pillar can become our work…we can be responsive to what emerges as a need in the city and we’re still completing our contractual (duties) (City employee, December 2013)

There is a very clear mandate to support the work of city departments as they relate to the pillars, and to provide a “newcomer lens” where appropriate. “We’re there to support (City departments) to add a lens to their work and to support building...
connections with the local community and local work” (City employee, December 2013).

TNO is in constant collaboration with other departments within the City of Toronto.

We work very rarely on our own...we would work with the other policy development officers to get advice or input into things. So there would rarely just be the three of us, but they're the only dedicated CIC-funded resources within the City...So we rely so much on working with divisions, getting resources in-kind or getting City of Toronto staff time, like permanent staff, who are funded by the City who work with us. We can leverage sometimes free space in areas owned by the City of Toronto and it's like if we have a relationship with people who will come and speak at our events without charging us money, things like that (City employee, December 2013)

The ability to collaborate well not only with City departments, but with community partners and LIPs as well has been key to the success of the TNO and substantiates the thesis of this research: that Toronto has been engaging in methods of cross-sectoral collaborative governance to address issues related to immigrant settlement. This was apparent in their collaboration with Toronto Public Health and the Quadrant LIPs on distributing information to newcomer parents about immunization.

I worked really closely with Toronto Public Health to develop that plan and it was really looking at, with all the issues that we know are coming out across the city and all the work that's already happening and strategic plans that already exist, where can we support work that's happening at a local level to add a city-wide lens? And where can we complement work or fill gaps and complement what's already happening? And that has been received really, really well. I don't know how this would have worked if the City of Toronto was developing their strategic plan at the same time or before LIPs. So in a way the Quadrant LIPs had their strategic plans before we started the implementation of this and that's worked really, really well because it's an opportunity to look at what's already working at a local level to support and complement rather than, we might have come up with some of the same stuff if we were all blindly moving forward. It worked really well that it has been staged in that way (City employee, December 2013)

Initiatives brought forward by TNO to the Toronto City Council have passed unanimously and indicated a strong support of the Office's mandate: “When our strategy went forward to Council they just unanimously voted that it was great and let's pass it
and start implementing. There wasn’t even questions about it” (City employee, December 2013).

6.3. Newcomer Leadership Table

The most recent iteration of a “city-wide LIP” is the Newcomer Leadership Table (“NLT”) which first gathered for its inaugural meeting in November 2012.

The first iteration the city-wide LIP from 2010-2011 had been unwieldy and ineffective. “The original structure with 17 voices of the LIPs – it was confusing…it was harder to see a link between what the City was doing and what was happening on a very local internally-focussed project” (City employee, December 2013). With the amalgamation from neighbourhood to Quadrant-based LIPs, the City restarted a discussion about revival of the city-wide LIP in the summer of 2012 (City employee 2, December 2013).

At that time, we agreed that we would take on a leadership role with respect to a city-wide table provided the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants, the provincial network and kind of policy group, and United Way Toronto agreed to co-chair, which they did. (C. Brillinger, December 2013)

The City staff put emphasis on the fact that this new city-wide LIP, renamed the Newcomer Leadership Table (“NLT”), was strictly committed to service system planning and should not be used for any other political purposes. Chris Brillinger stated that, at its nascence, there was a suggestion that there be political representation at the NLT, which he resisted (C. Brillinger, December 2013). The Table was to be used for cooperation and collaboration on issues related to immigration and immigrant settlement services within the City of Toronto. Participants are encouraged to find cross-sectoral solutions to issues, “the Newcomer Table allows us to talk about immigration in a way

---
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that we can’t just say “oh it’s a CIC issue”…it allows for those meaningful dialogues…this is about ongoing relationship” (U. Shakir, December 2013).

The makeup of the NLT was decided by a team including the TNO and the new Steering Committee of the NLT, consisting of: the Executive Directors of the Social Development, Finance, and Administration division at the City of Toronto (Chris Brillinger), the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants/OCASI (Debbie Douglas) and the Chief Operations and Strategy Officer of the United Way (JoAnne Doyle). The plan behind the design of the NLT was to keep two representatives from each of the Quadrant LIPs, decided by the LIPs themselves. It was decided by the team that the NLT would also include other important stakeholder from the settlement sector, each of whom “was a network into a bigger group…a well-networked type of individual who also could represent different sectors. In many cases, represent local interests – all of that in combination” (City employee 2, December 2013). The important stakeholders were suggested to the Steering Committee members by the Manager of the TNO, and subsequently agreed as appropriate stakeholders and thus important members of the NLT.

The NLT also consists of representatives from both the provincial Ministry of Citizenship, Immigration and International Trade, as well as Citizenship and Immigration Canada. The inaugural meeting, however, explained to participants that their role on the NLT was as a collaborator.

_It was made clear, we are all here as equals. You are not here at the funder, you are here as a collaborator. When you leave this room and you have a funder issue, you can talk about it after this room. But at this table, everybody has an equal voice. You are there because CIC has an interest in planning things better, you have an interest in planning things better. You’re leaving your ED hat at the door. It’s not your job that you’re here for. You’re here because you have a certain background, expertise or interest in planning the system better. If you have a quibble with CIC, this is not the place to talk about it._ (City employee 2, December 2013)

As Chris Brillinger stated, “the challenge was to create a Table that had the breadth in order to facilitate real conversation…at this point, I think we have the right balance between keeping a manageable size and the breadth of views and interests
represented at the table” (C. Brillinger, December 2013). By explicitly stating at the outset that “at this table, everybody has an equal voice”, the City of Toronto created an atmosphere that allowed for collaborative decision-making to occur. It was during this initial meeting between various government representatives and community stakeholders, all of whom came to the Newcomer Leadership Table “as equals” who “have an interest in planning things better”, that the “consensus-oriented decision-making” of collaborative governance could begin to occur.

The TNO used the inaugural meeting of the Newcomer Leadership Table in November 2012 to unveil its new “Toronto Newcomer Strategy” consisting of the four guiding pillars listed above. The pillars brought cohesion to the work that the City and the TNO had been doing, and clarified their role in immigrant settlement. “I, as someone who worked in the local LIP was like “so what’s the city doing? Don’t really know”…The City was piloting a couple of things…But it was really setting groundwork for the development of a strategy” (City employee, December 2013). The work of the NLT is seen as “more effective…in part because its agenda is based on the four strategic pillars that we have identified in the newcomer strategy and that’s helped keep the table focused and organized” (C. Brillinger, December 2013).

The interviews revealed that individuals from Quadrant LIPs had mixed emotions regarding the city-wide LIP; some saw the NLT as a place to focus efforts on settlement issues that were present in all four Quadrants, while others did not yet feel these issues were being adequately addressed. While the pillars have allowed the City to focus their own efforts, some Quadrant LIPs feel that their needs have not yet been addressed at the city-wide level. “A lot of (the NLT) has been taken up with rightly (the City) reporting to the community…on what they’re doing: getting their house in order, working on their pillars…we have had relatively little opportunity so far to bring regional issues to the table” (B. Sinclair, December 2013). This feeling was reflected in another interview with a representative from a Quadrant LIP:

The Newcomer Leadership Table…works on identifying ways in which the City of Toronto, corporate, can improve its own operations…it’s not really more than that….there are probably quite a few who would say that a city-wide process should be about more than just the City of Toronto (LIP Manager, December 2013)
This idea of the work of the NLT as a corporate process, was one that repeated throughout my interviews with some of the Quadrant LIPs: “most of the work in the last couple of years so far has been the city getting its corporate house in order. The community has injected things like corporate franchise, but even then we are still talking about how people vote, which is a city corporate responsibility” (B. Sinclair, December 2013). There was some recognition, however, that by using the pillars to focus certain efforts at the citywide level, this allowed Quadrant LIPs to better focus their own efforts on localized immigrant settlement issues. “I always try to bring my (Quadrant LIP) council back to let’s not talk about something that every newcomer in the city has as a problem because that’s what the city LIP is for” (B. Sinclair, December 2013).

Despite these reservations by some Quadrant LIPs, others feel that the partnerships developed at the Newcomer Leadership Table have been fruitful and have resulted in significant achievements. While the Table is not an arena for policy formation, it does allow conversations that may not otherwise have occurred, some of which ultimately result in policy change. One example of this is the City of Toronto’s involvement with the Eurocities Integrating Cities Charter. On January 31, 2013, the Toronto City Council voted to adapt the Eurocities Charter, a result of discussions that had originally begun at the NLT. As Chris Brillinger stated, “the Eurocity Charter came to me through the Leadership Table from a community leader…that’s another really good concrete example of the power and the utility of the Table” (C. Brillinger, December 2013). Another example was the decision by City Council in June of 2013 to ask the province of Ontario to provide permanent residents with the right to participate in municipal elections (Toronto City Council, 2013b). This move was viewed as “fairly radical” (U. Shakir, December 2013), “stunning” (C. Brillinger, December 2013), and one that was made possible through the formation of the LIP model. Jehad Aliweiwi was the individual who brought forward the concept of municipal franchise. He had been championing the issue for a number of years, but felt that the LIP model had finally allowed him the appropriate venue to bring it forth to City Council:

This is not a new initiative…but LIP provided us the right mechanism….I told them (City employees)...As long as we can count on that Newcomer Leadership Table to bring forth some new ideas, then you can facilitate…as long as you can facilitate the conversation, the important conversation, back to Council then show us a mechanism of doing that.
And that, they’ve been very effective at doing that. But it’s also how much you push and you really have to build relationships with them. And that’s the important part….people think it’s sometimes one-sided and the City wants to be there and they wanna show that they’re doing really good things. So let’s take advantage of that. (December 2013)

The City has felt an overall satisfaction with progress of the Newcomer Leadership Table, thus far. “It’s evolved in a way that works…that table will exist whether or not the TNO exists…it’s grown its own legs” (City employee, December 2013). Some of the key reasons for that success were the move towards a “four-plus-one” model of the Quadrant LIPs, plus the one citywide LIP, as well as the strong partnerships that have developed between the three stakeholders that make up the Steering Committee.

We have an incredibly deep partnership, the City was always both a financial and colleague relationship with OCASI, but that is a much deeper relationship now. And our relationship with United Way, and the three-way relationship between the community-based sector through OCASI, voluntary funding sector through United Way, and municipal sector through the City, is incredibly deep as a result of all of this work. I think that is a huge benefit and a concrete outcome (C. Brillinger, December 2013)

As discussed above, community organizations in Toronto working on immigrant settlement have occasionally cooperated with various levels of government on initiatives, however, these instances were on a needs basis. The Newcomer Leadership Table marks the first time that key players from across all three levels of government work in formal, ongoing cooperation with key community stakeholders for service-level planning of immigrant settlement across the city of Toronto.

6.4. City of Toronto initiatives

Apart from the Toronto Newcomer Office and the City’s involvement with the Newcomer Leadership Table, other City-led initiatives have demonstrated a shift from
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government to governance in the City’s role in settlement issues since the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement. These include the Audit tool being used in various City departments, and a partnership with the “Settlement Workers in Schools” program. The City has also held “Social Development Open Dialogue” sessions to engage the public and has maintained a strong partnership in working with each of the quadrant LIPs.

In January 2013, the City Department of Social Development, Finance and Administration was tasked with the goal of establishing a structure to facilitate the community, staff and Members of Toronto City Council to be engaged in advocacy opportunities related to immigration issues (Toronto, Community Development and Recreation Committee, 2013a). This move portended a shift in the way in which much of the City structure has been involved with immigrant settlement issues.

*We have a focus (on immigrant settlement issues) from a customer service lens….In a city like Toronto, that means understanding the diversity of the customer base - and ensure that your programs and services are designed and delivered appropriately from a customer service lens. So to work with (city departments) on tools that can help assess that. (C. Brillinger, December 2013)*

One such tool that has been introduced to various City departments is the audit of City services that was developed and distributed by the Toronto Newcomer Office. Under the pillar of “Improving Access to Municipal Supports”, the TNO developed a tool for City divisions to use in their respective workplaces, to assess the level of service delivered to newcomer clients. The Audit Tool, “A series of questions that they can go through to think about their service delivery and service accessibility to newcomers” (C. Brillinger, December 2013), has now been piloted and is being distributed to departments across the City. Tools such as these are being shared through the Pathways to Prosperity website, an alliance of university, community, and government partners “dedicated to fostering welcoming communities and promoting the integration of immigrants and minorities across Canada” (Pathways to Prosperity).

Having the Toronto Newcomer Office housed within the City of Toronto has encouraged greater participation from City departments in initiatives related to newcomer settlement. One example was the TNO’s involvement in three pilot projects,
in partnership with another CIC-funded regional body, Settlement Workers in Schools (SWIS). TNO conducted three pilot projects in cooperation with SWIS and the City, one of which involved bringing together three City departments to form an information panel for newcomer youth (City employee, December 2013).

While the most recent Toronto administration disbanding various working groups related to settlement and integration issues, members of the public have expressed the “feeling that they don’t have that inroads through the committees of Council” to communicate with City officials (C. Brillinger, December 2013). As a result, the City has launched a new series of sessions meant to engage the newcomer population within Toronto. “We actually had our first, we’re calling them “Social Development Open Dialogue Sessions”...in partnership with OCASI and SolidarityCity, looking at access issues for undocumented Torontonians” (C. Brillinger, December 2013). One of the main advocates for access to diverse populations is housed within the City Manager’s office itself, the Office of Equity, Diversity and Human Rights. This Office is now under the direction of Uzma Shakir, whose most recent position was the Executive Director of Council of Agencies Serving South Asians. “The road we are taking in our office is to make sure that we facilitate the sort of city-end of it, in the sense of making sure that the City divisions are open to providing services in an equitable and accessible manner” (U. Shakir, December 2013). The Office has had a strong relationship with the TNO and participates on the NLT.

*What the Newcomer Table and what the Newcomer Strategy allows me, for instance, as a corporate entity to do is to refer to the Strategy as a legitimate strategy that we can then cite as we are trying to do access and equity work within the City of Toronto. So it’s no longer about, oh it’s a Citizenship and Immigration Canada issue, no it’s about us (U. Shakir, December 2013)*

9 OCASI = Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants
10 “Solidarity City” is a network of Toronto residents organizing to promote “access to services for all residents of Toronto, regardless of immigration status and demands status for all” (Solidarity City)
11 The Office of Equity, Diversity and Human Rights is housed within the City Manager’s Office and “ensures that the City’s services, programs and policies are responsive to the needs of Toronto’s diverse communities” (City of Toronto)
Finally, the City has engaged in long-term collaboration with the Quadrant Local Immigration Partnerships. This collaboration is seen, for the most part, as fruitful and with the potential for greater future cooperation.

There’s quite a bit of sharing, there’s quite a bit of our staff supporting our members, our partners, our stakeholders to participate in some of the City’s initiatives. One of the areas where we have, I think, come quite far in that is mental health and health. So the health department has been actually very good about utilizing the Quadrant LIPs and the members at those tables as resources. So there’s some good learnings there as to how this, if further integration were a possibility, what that might look like, what shape that might take (LIP Manager, December 2013)

The fact that City employees attend LIP meetings from various Quadrants was noted as a potential area for even further collaboration:

(City staff) would probably be a great resource to tell us (LIPs), where we could do some more integration in terms of initiatives and rather than us going away trying to figure it out ourselves through a slower process. Maybe they’re an underutilized process in that way, maybe we should tap into them more but they would have a really good worm’s eye view of what could streamline better (LIP Manager, December 2013)

As initiatives such as the Newcomer Leadership Table display, there is a much larger role from the City of Toronto in the sector of immigrant settlement services since the signing of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement in 2005.

6.5. Addressing the Four Pillars

As discussed above, the Toronto Newcomer Office has been tasked with addressing the four pillars outlined in the Toronto Newcomer Strategy document. The first pillar, related to advance labour market outcomes, has been the most challenging for the Toronto Newcomer Office as it involves employers. According to the interviews I conducted, it has been challenging for both the Quadrant LIPs and Citywide LIP to attract employers to their tables. This pillar remains a key aspect of the work that the Toronto Newcomer Office is conducting, and they have partnered with various Quadrant LIPs on employment initiatives for newcomers. They have also begun working with the
City division of Toronto Employment and Social Services to ensure that a newcomer lens is added to their strategic plans (City employee, December 2013).

The second quadrant relates to Newcomer health, an issue which has been easier for the Toronto Newcomer Office and City departments to address. The office of Toronto Public Health has long been involved with the health of newcomers to Toronto, making collaboration easier. In November 2011, Toronto Public Health collaborated with the Toronto Newcomer Office among others to create the first-ever comprehensive report on the health of newcomers to Toronto, titled, “The Global City: Newcomer Health in Toronto”.

The third pillar highlights the need for improved access to municipal supports, and has been a main focus for the Toronto Newcomer Office. Through initiatives such as the Audit tool, the Toronto Newcomer Office is seeking to assess accessibility of City services to the newcomer population, and determine how this can be eased and improved. In order to assess the current state of service delivery to newcomers, the Toronto Newcomer Office developed an interdivisional work group to look at access and barriers to access to services (City employee, December 2013).

Finally, the support for civic engagement and community capacity outlined in the fourth pillar are being addressed by a few activities. The Toronto Newcomer Office has been delivering Open dialogue sessions, discussed below, which allows newcomers to interact with City officials and politicians. They have also been working closely with the Settlement Workers in Schools program, which provides settlement services to newcomer youth and their parents. Finally, the Toronto Newcomer Office has been partnering with Quadrant LIPs to provide presentations on City Services to newcomer families, as well as tours of City Hall (City employee, December 2013).

There has been a clear focus on these four pillars to steer the work being done through the Toronto Newcomer Office. The emphasis on collaboration, both with City departments and the Quadrant LIPs, has been important in accomplishing their work thus far. One primary aspect of this continued collaboration has been the quarterly meetings of the Newcomer Leadership Table. The NLT has enabled the Toronto
Newcomer Office to report their accomplishments on each of the four pillars out to the Quadrant LIPs and other immigrant-serving organizations.

There is now a forum for formalized collaboration between the municipal government and community stakeholders on issues related to immigrant settlement services and there is evidence of ongoing multilevel government cooperation through funding agreements. A deeper analysis and a return to our original questions will be outlined in the following section.
Chapter 7. Analysis and discussion

The initiatives outlined above provide evidence that the role of municipal government in the coordination of immigrant settlement services since the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement has changed, and that this role may continue to shift as the local government takes on additional responsibilities. Throughout this section, the future involvement of municipal government in the immigrant settlement sector will be discussed. This section will also cover how the initiatives demonstrate movement towards multilevel government oversight of immigrant settlement, along with formalized collaboration between governmental and non-governmental players in the sector. The city of Toronto is providing other Canadian municipalities with a new form of decision-making on issues related to immigrant settlement service, and in doing so, demonstrating a shift “from government to governance”.

7.1. Future of City involvement in immigrant service coordination

“I think we are building our bicycle as we ride it, so to speak, in terms of the model” (P. Sibanda, December 2013)

The Newcomer Leadership Table and the Toronto Newcomer Strategy are new changes to the operations of the City of Toronto and there is speculation that the model will continue to change. “Who knows where we’ll end up? There’s not a firm goal in my mind. This is an iterative process, it’s a developmental process and it has to be that, it has to be open” (C. Brillinger, December 2013). The consensus from those interviewed, however, is that the model will continue to follow the same guiding principles of intergovernmental collaboration and engagement with key community stakeholders involved in the immigrant settlement sector.
The City’s Office of Social Development, Finance and Administration received notice this year that federal funding for the Toronto Newcomer Office would be extended until 2016, with an additional $386 thousand for 2014 programming to deliver the Toronto Newcomer Strategy. In June, Toronto City Council adopted recommendations from the Executive Director, Social Development, Finance and Administration on initiatives that the City will undertake in relation to the Toronto Newcomer Strategy. These initiatives included the provision that the Executive Director of Social Development, Finance and Administration would continue to consult with the members of the Newcomer Leadership Table on the implementation of the Toronto Newcomer Strategy (Toronto, City Council Minutes, 2014). There is a clear indication from the Toronto City Council that the collaborative-based Strategy is an important initiative and one that should continue to be supported with municipal resources in order to succeed.

There is a definite conviction that the Local Immigration Partnership model of service coordination is one that will continue in the immigrant settlement sector for the foreseeable future in the city. “They probably will make LIPs into local or regional even funding authorities or bodies for settlement work. So I think this here is the wave of the future” (J. Aliweiwi, December 2013). Many of those in the Quadrant LIPs speculate that the role of the City of Toronto in the overall coordination of immigrant settlement services is one that will continue to grow. “I think you will see the City playing a bigger and bigger role in terms of the LIPs in Toronto” (P. Sibanda, December 2013). Comments such as these recurred throughout my interviews, with speculation from both employees of the City and members of Quadrant LIPs that the City would eventually play a larger role in the coordination of immigrant settlement services within Toronto. With the larger role of the City in the coordination of services comes a fear from some that the Quadrant LIPs will be subsumed by an overarching citywide LIP that attends to the coordination of all settlement services in the city.
I think there’s always fear on the part of the locals that they (are) going to disappear, that there’s only going to be one (LIP)” (City employee 2, December 2013)

There’s certainly concern amongst the regional LIPs that at some point CIC will feel, “ok you’ve done your work, your strategies are starting to look very similar, time to just roll you all up in the Toronto LIP” and that may happen cause we are finding a lot of the same issues (B. Sinclair, December 2013)

There is optimism, however, that the Toronto Newcomer Office and Newcomer Leadership Table is better posed to address issues that affect newcomer settlement at a citywide level. “What I would like them to do is to be more active in driving change on systemic issues….because I think they are in a position to do…they have access to the bigger pieces, the levels where real change can happen” (I. Hutfless, December 2013).

The renewal of funding for the Toronto Newcomer Office indicates a sustained support from the federal government for the involvement of the municipal government in the coordination of immigrant settlement services within the City of Toronto. The City Council decision to pass initiatives recommended by the Toronto Newcomer Office in coordination with the Office of Social Development, Finance and Administration indicate an interest on behalf of the municipality to continue investing staff and resources on immigrant settlement service coordination. As the Report to Council states:

The successful integration of newcomers is an opportunity to enrich the city economically, socially and culturally. Municipalities are the 'first responders' and places where newcomers settle and integrate. The City of Toronto continues to be committed to the successful integration of immigrants (Toronto, Community Development and Recreation Committee, 2014a)

The Toronto case study and the Newcomer Leadership Table exemplify a shift towards collaborative governance, both vertically and horizontally. In this case, the vertical collaboration is occurring primarily through ongoing federal-municipal negotiations and contribution agreements, while the horizontal collaboration is evident through sustained relationships with Local Immigration Partnerships and community stakeholders at the Newcomer Leadership Table.
7.2. From Government to Governance

The beginning of this paper asked the following three questions:

1. Why have municipal governments in Canada signaled a desire for an active role in the immigrant settlement process?

2. Why has Ontario witnessed a shift towards multilevel oversight of immigrant settlement since the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement?

3. How has the inclusion of municipalities in the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement led to formalized collaboration between the City of Toronto and key community stakeholders?

The city of Toronto provides an excellent case study for addressing these questions, and for providing other Canadian municipalities with a city that is actively engaging in the sector of immigrant settlement services.

7.2.1. Municipal government involvement

As is evidenced by Toronto, there is a strong economic argument for the effective settlement of newcomers in a city. As discussed above, newcomers arrive to Canada through the federal government, yet it is an individual decision where to establish. Canadian municipalities such as the City of Toronto are recognizing the importance of effective immigrant settlement in the attraction of talented immigrants to their region and are beginning to invest time into engaging in the sector. As the largest immigrant-welcoming city in the country, Toronto provides Canadian municipalities with an example of how municipal involvement in settlement services can be accomplished through collaborative governance.
7.2.2. Multilevel oversight

The Local Immigration Partnerships and Newcomer Leadership Table provide evidence of multilevel governmental oversight of immigrant settlement within the province of Ontario. It was evident that those interviewed felt grateful for the opportunity to build these relationships as a result of the funding from Citizenship and Immigration towards the LIPs, a new model of immigrant service coordination. The LIPs are “a complete wraparound of services from cultural, economic, social and economic development and everything else in between” (J. Aliweiwi, December 2013). They have had a “profound impact in terms of changing the discourse of immigration and settlement, and the role of municipal government, even in the eyes of the politicians” (U. Shakir, December 2013). There was a feeling of gratitude from those interviewed towards Citizenship and Immigration Canada for their willingness to invest in the service coordination model (Interviews with Chris Brillinger, Jehad Aliweiwi). The gratitude, however, comes with the recognition that, through the development of effective collaborative governance at the local level, the federal government may eventually experience cost-saving results.

"Very few funders have invested in community-driven, service-system planning the way that CIC is doing it. They’re doing it because there’s results. They’re doing it because you end up with a more efficient system that at the end of the day is gonna cost the government less per newcomer. So there’s a business case that backs this up (C. Brillinger, December 2013)

Regardless of the reason behind the federal government’s decision to fund LIPs within the city of Toronto, there is unmistakable evidence that strong intergovernmental and cross-sectoral relationships have been built as a result. Though the provincial government of Ontario has been much less involved in funding provincial settlement services since COIA expired in March of 2011, they maintain a seat at the Newcomer Leadership Table and continue to fund certain immigrant settlement initiatives. One of the most notable funding initiatives was the recent decision by the Province of Ontario to provide health care funding for refugee claimants, an item that was discussed and strongly commended at the Newcomer Leadership Table meeting. The relationships between all three levels of government, as well as between governmental and non-
governmental partners have been strengthened as a result of initiatives implemented since the signing of COIA, most notably the LIPs:

Even if it (LIPs) did disband after a while, I think the legacy is really the relationship and trust that may be built even between the organizations in Toronto that are working together, and it’s a relationship with the City of Toronto…. I think it’s been really good for us to work with the community-based sector in a way of trying to build relationships and trust (City employee, December 2013)

7.2.3. Horizontal collaboration: municipal government and community stakeholders

Throughout the interviews, there was evidence that there were longstanding, formal relationships being built between the City of Toronto and other community stakeholders as a result of the municipal government’s involvement in the coordination of immigrant settlement services.

As Andrew states, “municipal governments can play a significant role in creating, sustaining, and supporting innovative governance structures and can act as an important catalyst in bringing together relevant stakeholders” (Andrew and Doloreux, 137). This ability to bring together stakeholders is important in the process of policy formation at all levels of government. “High performing public policy producing better outcomes for individuals and families comes from governments working with and through local networks to strengthen the fabric of communities” (Bradford and Andrew, 5).

As discussed above, collaborative governance focusses on the development of relationships between the official structures of government and other key stakeholders, including community organizations, private companies and other institutions. This relationship-building is key to the success of collaborative forms of governance and has a significant impact on the formation of policy. The City of Toronto’s engagement with community stakeholders on issues that span across geographic and jurisdictional boundaries provides ample evidence of collaborative governance.

This form of governance is especially important when examining the process of service delivery coordination. “Gathering local knowledge from a variety of local, private,
public and third sector actors becomes an essential strategy for service delivery. Social and economic networks are given a new role in policy processes" (Bozzini and Enjolras 13). The ability of a municipality to implement policy on the coordination of immigrant settlement services is important, but even more crucial is their ability to develop relationships with other community stakeholders involved in the settlement sector. It is in this regard that Toronto offers lessons to other Canadian municipalities as they engage further in the immigrant settlement sector. The interviews displayed how key city employees have been able to create strong partnerships with community stakeholders, thereby securing the benefits that collaborative governance styles can provide. The strength of these relationships will determine the municipality’s knowledge of changes occurring within the sector, and will allow them to introduce policies that are more attuned and appropriate to the needs of their residents.

Formal agreements such as the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement and subsequent Memorandum of Understanding are significant not simply because they impress the importance of intergovernmental policymaking, but also as “governmental catalysts to encourage municipalities to invest in multisectoral forms of governance” (Stasiulus, Hughes, Amery, 82). The City of Toronto has displayed strong evidence of collaborative governance models since the signing of COIA in 2005. Most notably through its implementation of the Newcomer Leadership Table and the partnerships it has developed through the Toronto Newcomer Office. The collaborative relationships that have developed as a result of the Newcomer Leadership Table and Toronto Newcomer Office lead to a strong conclusion that collaborative governance models are evident in the City’s role in the coordination of immigrant settlement services.

“It’s quite interesting that there are informal connections that happen all the time”
(C. Brillinger, December 2013)

As Uzma Shakir, Director of the Office of Equity, Diversity and Human Rights in the City of Toronto, states, the relationships that have been built as a result of the citywide LIP are of particular importance as they are longstanding and collaborative on multiple issues. Relationships between the City and community-based sector prior to the citywide LIP had been “sporadic and issue-based”:
I’ve worked in the sector for twenty years and I can tell you this is the first time in my experience that we have that we’ve had many partnerships, don’t misunderstand me, you can’t run a city of Toronto and not have partnerships. But they’ve been sporadic and issue-based. An issue comes up you have a partnership. This is a different kind of a model. This is a deep, long-standing very strategic and particular partnership over the long haul. It is about producing better results not for the government, not for the community-based organizations but for the residents who are impacted. I think this is the first time I’ve seen this and I’ve done this work for a very long time (U. Shakir, December 2013)

Evidence of this collaborative governance is also demonstrated in other initiatives being carried out by the City of Toronto. The series of “Social Development Open Dialogue Session” are meant to provide a forum for discussing topics related to social development in the city of Toronto and to engage City Council and staff along with community agencies and the general public. Municipal departments have also been involved with organizing various community initiatives, including the Newcomer Health Forum spearheaded by the West Quadrant LIP, as well as the Collaboration Forum led by the East Quadrant LIP in early 2014.

The Toronto Newcomer Strategy document outlines the importance of “shared leadership” between the City of Toronto and community partners in a city the size of Toronto (Toronto, Toronto Newcomer Initiative. (n.d.), p. 19). It is precisely this shared leadership that has resulted in the recent City Council decision to sign on as a member to the EuroCities on Integrating Cities. Jehad Aliweiwi explained that his relationship with a city employee had allowed him to present to the city councillors at a committee meeting on topics related to immigrants voting rights and the EuroCities charter (J. Aliweiwi, December 2013).

She’s the one who made it possible for me to come in at the right time for me to be at Council meeting. For me to talk about immigrants’ voting rights and the City’s charter…the Committee Chair who was Councillor Robinson, she was quite taken with it. We formed an immediate committee, had a one-on-one meeting with her, gave a copy to her and she said, that’s it, it’s done (J. Aliweiwi, December 2013)
The success of the Local Immigration Partnership model and the citywide LIP that is the Newcomer Leadership Table is that it has contributed to building strong relationships between municipal actors, settlement organizations and community partners. This is a key outcome of the formalization of collaboration; key stakeholders, both governmental and non-governmental, have been provided with a forum to discuss issues related to immigrant settlement services. These relationships have contributed to the creation of municipal policies, including the recent City Council decisions to sign on to the Eurocities Charter and to lobby the provincial government for changes to the municipal voting requirements.

As cities in Canada look to further engage in the immigrant settlement sector, Toronto provides an example of a Canadian city that is effectively building relationships with key community players. The municipal government is increasingly involved with decision-making on issues related to immigrant settlement services, and has reached out to stakeholders within the community. The Newcomer Leadership Table provides a formalized arena for the planning of immigrant settlement services in Toronto, drawing in representatives from all three levels of government and various sectors including business, charity and academic. This cross-sectoral and intergovernmental collaboration is a model for other Canadian municipalities to follow.
Chapter 8. Conclusion

The Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement of 2005 set the stage for greater collaboration between all three levels of government regarding matters related to the integration of immigrants in the province of Ontario. More importantly, it provided a formal role for the City of Toronto to participate meaningfully in the immigrant settlement process and planning of settlement services.

Subsequent initiatives such as Local Immigration Partnerships were developed as a result of the precedent set within COIA and have led to greater intergovernmental collaboration in recent years. The City of Toronto has taken on a role in adopting the Toronto Newcomer Office as a part of the City structure, and in co-chairing and facilitating the creation of the Newcomer Leadership Table. This table provides physical evidence of the emerging collaborative governance that is leading to meaningful immigrant settlement policy formation at the municipal level. Initiatives such as the City Council’s decision to become a signatory with the EuroCities charter and to lobby the provincial government on changing legislation for municipal elections – allowing non-citizen residents a more meaningful democratic role, provide concrete examples of the policy change that can result from relationship-building through collaborative governance.

8.1. Recommendations for further inquiry

As a result of this research, there were a few topic areas that emerged as areas where key policy recommendations are usefully posed and that warrant further exploration.

1. What role should the City of Toronto play in delivering or coordinating services for undocumented residents? - While the municipal government
has been involved in the coordination of settlement services for newcomers with official status from the federal government, their work has also been concerned with the needs of undocumented residents of Toronto. In June of 2014, the Toronto City Council passed a motion for staff to avoid collecting immigration documentation from residents whenever possible. This concern for the service provision to undocumented Torontonians was evidenced in my interviews with City staff: “The bigger issue...is providing services to undocumented Torontonians...from a social development perspective, I have an extremely keen interest in the issue” (C. Brillinger, December 2013)

2. How will service coordination be impacted by the suburbanization of the immigrant population? – There is mounting evidence (Federation of Canadian Municipalities (6), Siemiatycki (29), Saunders (95, 318) that new immigrant populations are settling in the suburban areas surrounding the cities of Vancouver, Saskatoon, Toronto, Montreal and Halifax. Future areas of research could focus on how the coordination of services for newcomer settlement will be impacted by the recent trend of new immigrants locating in spread-out suburban areas, often with significantly fewer service providers than large cities such as Toronto.

3. Immigrant political engagement through municipal franchise – The Toronto City Council has recently requested the provincial government to change legislation in order to allow Permanent Residents the right to vote in municipal elections. Further research can focus on the theory that immigrant issues are likely to become more important as more immigrants have the authority to vote and impact the outcomes of local electoral politics (Frisken and Wallace, 155). This may become increasingly important as the municipal role in immigrant settlement continues to grow.

4. What is the municipal government involvement in addressing labour market integration for newcomers to Toronto? – The federal immigration system is changing to allow for better labour market integration of immigrants to Canada. How will this changing system impact services that the City of
Toronto offers to facilitate job searching? As the issue of newcomer unemployment is citywide, what is the role of the municipality in coordinating employment services for newcomers? Do municipalities play a role in addressing issues surrounding temporary foreign workers?

The bicycle is not yet built and the structure of the Toronto Newcomer Office and Newcomer Leadership Table will likely continue to shift. The City of Toronto has recognized the potential economic benefits of improved immigrant integration within the City. The municipality has stepped beyond their traditional boundaries as “creatures of the province” to become involved in both bilateral and trilateral agreements with the provincial and federal governments. The City has led the way in formalizing coordination of settlement services within Toronto, and has provided a compelling example of the shift towards more collaborative forms of governance.
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Appendix. City of Toronto Neighbourhood Improvement Areas (Formerly: “Priority Areas”)

2005 Priority Areas: Toronto

Source: City of Toronto website